

**Mainstreaming environment  
in poverty reduction in Rwanda:  
achievements, impacts and opportunities**

A report to the Rwanda Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI)

Yves Renard  
International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)

April 2011

## Table of contents

<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3. ASSESSING IMPACTS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
3.1. THE NEED FOR IMPACT ASSESSMENT.....	8
3.2. ASSESSING IMPACTS AND OUTCOMES: CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS.....	9
3.3. IMPACTS AND OUTCOMES, WHAT HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT OF PEI'S WORK?.....	10
<b>4. ACHIEVEMENTS, DRIVERS, CONSTRAINTS AND LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....	<b>15</b>
4.1. AN IMPROVED NATIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORK.....	15
4.2. IMPROVED CAPACITY FOR POVERTY-ENVIRONMENT MAINSTREAMING.....	18
4.3. EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF POLICY AND CAPACITY.....	20
<b>5. MAIN STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN PROJECT DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>6. CAPITALISING ON ACHIEVEMENTS, SUSTAINING IMPACTS AND SECURING THE LEGACY</b> .....	<b>22</b>
6.1. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	22
6.2. DESIRED OUTCOMES.....	24
6.3. IMPROVING THE POLICY FRAMEWORK.....	25
6.4. CONSOLIDATING CAPACITY-BUILDING INITIATIVES.....	27
6.5. PROMOTING INCREASED AND IMPROVED INVESTMENTS.....	29
6.6. DOCUMENTING AND DISSEMINATING TOOLS AND EXPERIENCE.....	29
6.7. BROADENING THE PARTNERSHIPS AND ENGAGING NEW SECTORS.....	30
6.8. MAKING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AS EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE AS POSSIBLE.....	32
<b>APPENDIX 1: MAIN PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND BENCHMARKS, 2005 – 2010</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED</b> .....	<b>37</b>

## ***Acronyms and abbreviations***

BCC	Budget Call Circular
CDF	Community Development Fund
CO	Country Office
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
FONERWA	National Fund for Environment
EIA	environmental impact assessment
ENRSS	Environment and Natural Resource Sector Strategy
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
KPI	Key Poverty Indicator
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
MINALOC	Ministry of Local Government
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
MINELA	Ministry of Environment and Lands
MINICOM	Ministry of Trade and Industry
MININFRA	Ministry of Infrastructure
PEER	Public Environmental Expenditure Review
PEI	Poverty – Environment Initiative
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
REMA	Rwanda Environmental Management Agency
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SIP	Strategic Issue Paper
SPIU	Single Project Implementation Unit
SWAp	sector-wide approach
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

## **1. Summary of recommendations**

It is recommended that a third and final phase of PEI Rwanda be implemented over a period of four years (2012 – 2015), with the understanding that the second half of this phase (2014 – 2015) would be devoted almost exclusively to monitoring and evaluation (M&E), documentation and focused technical assistance.

For such a final phase, the project should spell out its desired outcomes, and develop a logical framework that clearly describes how these will be achieved. A 'post-PEI vision' could include the following elements:

- a comprehensive policy framework, with a good integration of environment in all major policy statements and instruments that are relevant to poverty reduction;
- a permanent capacity within REMA to act as a 'champion' of poverty-environment integration;
- a MINECOFIN that has a strong ownership of, and assumes full leadership in, the mainstreaming process, also acting as a 'champion' of poverty-environment integration;
- planning, programming, budgeting, implementing and monitoring capacity within the sector Ministries that are the most directly concerned with the poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda;
- significant progress towards the financial sustainability of poverty-environment mainstreaming processes and activities;
- a widespread availability (and use) of methods, tools and approaches developed or advocated by PEI over the past six years;
- support from and involvement of other sectors (especially research and academic institutions, the private sector, and civil society).

The core elements of PEI Rwanda's policy work during the remainder of 2011 and during an eventual Phase III should include:

- continued collaboration with MINECOFIN and other partners in assessing and documenting the implementation and performance of the EDPRS as well as the actual impacts of the EDPRS on poverty and environment;
- contribution, in collaboration with MINECOFIN and other partners, to the formulation of EDPRS II;
- contribution to the review of Vision 2020 and the identification of new targets;
- consolidation of the framework for monitoring and evaluating the impacts and outcomes of poverty-environment linkages, ensuring that this M&E framework is integrated and applied in the formulation of EDPRS II;
- participation in on-going periodic reviews of sector strategies and joint sector review processes;

- linking with other important national processes, but without losing focus on the core elements of the poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda;
- gathering and integrating lessons from other initiatives and processes.

In support of policy reform and improvements, PEI Rwanda should continue its advocacy and communication work, with three directions emerging:

- consolidate information and 'products' and make them available through various networks;
- develop closer links with the academic community and encourage research institutions to conduct more work on issues relevant to the poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda;
- in the short term, conduct research on the environmental and livelihood impacts of fertilisers, as the basis for a policy review.

In order to consolidate capacity-building initiatives, the PEI project should:

- facilitate a participatory capacity analysis within the seven main participating institutions and identify strategic planning, institutional strengthening, training and other capacity-building requirements, some of which could receive technical support from PEI;
- provide continued technical and financial support to MINECOFIN to monitor and support implementation and extend the process to other sectors;
- continue the arrangement established with the other ministries with respect to the placement of interns until the end of 2012, with the provisions that an evaluation be carried out at the end of 2011, that the original terms of reference be then revised if required, and that agreements be negotiated with the ministries concerned regarding the creation of permanent positions;
- utilise the channels and systems that already exist, especially within MINALOC, and organise, on the basis of the results of the participatory capacity analysis mentioned above, a training-the-trainers programme for the benefit of local government agencies;
- encourage increased collaboration and communication among development partners on environment as a cross-cutting issue;
- support civil society organisations involved in poverty-environment linkages, especially through FONERWA and access to training activities.

Over the remainder of Phase II and during an eventual Phase III, the objective of increasing and enhancing investments could be achieved by:

- pursuing the policy formulation, budgeting and capacity-building processes identified above in relation to MINECOFIN and the other agencies;
- completing the establishment of FONERWA, with a complete strategic planning and institutional development process;

- continuing advocacy with MINECOFIN to ensure that adequate resources are allocated to FONERWA;
- disseminating and advocating with donors to promote mobilisation of resources for FONERWA;
- advocating for environment among development partners through other sectors;
- contributing actively to the formulation of the Private Sector Development Strategy.

In the area of documentation, PEI Rwanda should:

- compile existing documents and place them, when appropriate, on REMA's website, on the PEI global website and on other relevant sites;
- conduct a structured process of analysis of lessons learned and a more systematic exploration and use of dissemination opportunities;
- compile, edit and disseminate all the training modules developed and used by PEI Rwanda;
- prepare a case study of the demonstration project at Rubaya;
- commission and disseminate a small number of other case studies of experiences in linking poverty reduction and environmental management at local level, with a comparative analysis of these various experiences and the formulation of a strategy for replication and sharing of experiences.

In an eventual final phase, PEI Rwanda should aim at engaging other sectors more decisively, and this could be achieved in a number of practical ways:

- ensure that the training activity proposed for 2011 is fully participatory in nature and format, and turn this proposed activity into a "mutual learning exercise" to identify lessons learned and policy implications;
- develop a monitoring and research agenda, in collaboration with other stakeholders, and in support of existing and proposed national systems and frameworks;
- consider a major "stock-taking event", in late 2011, for the purpose of disseminating results, mobilising further support, and launching a final Phase with the increased engagement of other sectors (academia/research, private sector, civil society).

Towards the end of an eventual Phase III, PEI should also undertake a comprehensive evaluation and lessons learning exercise, looking in particular at the processes that are too recent and incomplete to assess at the moment, such as the budgeting process, cross-sectoral linkages and their effectiveness, and changes in capacity within selected organisations.

## **2. Background and introduction**

The Poverty-Environment Initiative (PEI) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is a global UN-led programme that supports country-driven efforts to mainstream poverty-environment linkages into national development planning. PEI provides financial and technical assistance to government partners to set up institutional and capacity strengthening programmes and carry out activities to address specific poverty-environment contexts and needs.

The PEI programme in Africa is managed jointly by UNDP and UNEP, and it is currently active in ten countries: Botswana, Burkina Faso, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Rwanda and Tanzania. Each one of these PEI-supported country programmes has been initiated to meet country-level demand and is tailored to specific national policy processes such as:

- the development or revision of national planning processes such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP), national development plans and national budgets;
- sector development policies and strategies, such as agriculture, water, land other natural resource sectors, and energy;
- mainstreaming initiatives and policies to combat the effects of climate change.

PEI Rwanda is a collaborative effort of the Government of Rwanda, UNDP and UNEP which aims to enhance the contribution of sound environmental management to poverty reduction, sustainable economic growth and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). Its first phase (December 2005 – May 2007) focused on the integration of environment into the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) and on conducting background studies aimed at building the environmental, social and economic rationale for poverty-environment mainstreaming. The second phase (initially scheduled from June 2007 to December 2009, and since extended until December 2011) aims to build on the achievements of Phase I by integrating environment into policy formulation, development planning and public sector budgeting at national and local levels. Specifically, Phase I was designed to support integration of environment in the formulation of the EDPRS whereas Phase II was designed to support its implementation.

The lead institution responsible for project implementation is the Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA), working in close collaboration with its parent Ministry of Environment and Lands (MINELA), with the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN) and with the other sector ministries concerned<sup>1</sup>. The project receives on-going technical support from the PEI Africa Team based in Nairobi. A Project Management Unit<sup>2</sup> is placed under the authority of the Director General of REMA, who serves as Chief Budget Manager for the project.

---

<sup>1</sup> These are the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI), the Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC), the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM) and the Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA).

<sup>2</sup> This Unit will soon be merged with other Project Management Units within REMA to form a Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU), in accordance with decisions and provisions that now apply to the management of externally funded projects in all ministries and government agencies in Rwanda.

The Project Team includes a National Project Manager, a Technical Advisor<sup>3</sup>, a Finance and Administrative Officer, and an Administration Supporting Staff.

As expressed in project documents, the five expected outputs of current Phase II are:

- output 1: Improved capacity within key ministries and institutions to understand and analyse links between poverty and environment and to integrate environment into policymaking, planning and budgets;
- output 2: Improved capacity at district level to understand and analyse links between poverty and environment and to integrate environment into development planning;
- output 3: Increased awareness and more effective participation of stakeholders in environmental policy and planning processes at both district and national level;
- output 4: Improved national funding levels for investing in environmental sustainability;
- output 5: Improved capacity for monitoring poverty and environment linkages at both national and district level.

This study was commissioned by REMA, UNDP and UNEP. Its purpose is to provide strategic guidance and recommendations to enhance the sustainability of poverty-environment mainstreaming efforts in Rwanda. With the second phase of PEI in Rwanda scheduled to end in December 2011, this study specifically seeks to assess impacts and achievements to date, and to identify and document some of the main lessons learned.

Against this background, this study examines five main questions:

- What have been the impacts, and what will be the likely impacts, of the work done under the auspices of PEI in Rwanda since 2005?
- What have been PEI's main processes and achievements, and what are the lessons to be learned from the experience gained?
- How effective have the various partnerships been?
- What are the strategies, approaches and actions that can enhance the sustainability of PEI beyond the life of this project?
- In the short and medium term (i.e. over the final year of the current phase, and as part of an eventual Phase III), what should be the priorities and focus of activities and the strategies to be employed?

While this study focuses on impacts, processes, lessons learned and future priorities and opportunities, it did not specifically consider issues of efficiency and effectiveness in project implementation, as this was not an evaluation *per se*. Significant and relevant issues will however be noted in this report, especially when they have implications for the future of the project and the sustainability of its interventions.

---

<sup>3</sup> This position of Technical Advisor has however remained vacant for significantly long periods, with negative impacts on the capacity of the Project Team.

### **3. Assessing impacts**

#### ***3.1. The need for impact assessment***

It is always difficult to evaluate development initiatives, and especially to assess and document impacts (and to a lesser extent outcomes)<sup>4</sup>, but such assessment is essential, because it is what should guide programme and project planning, it should inform policy formulation, and it is needed in order to report to donors and partners.

Within the PEI project, the instruments and processes of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) that currently exist are:

- the monthly, quarterly and annual reports that are prepared and submitted by the Project Team and that describe activities and results against the logical framework and work plan contained in the overall project document;
- occasional reviews and assessments, such as the evaluation of the PEI partnership with Norway that was conducted by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) in 2009 and that covered in some detail PEI activities in four countries, including Rwanda;
- the regular senior management meetings in REMA.

In the wider context of poverty-environment mainstreaming in Rwanda, the main M&E instruments and processes that are relevant to, and have been supported and implemented by, PEI are as follows:

- poverty-environment indicators were identified at the very beginning of the project, as part of the Pilot Project on Poverty-Environment Mapping (2005);
- key poverty indicators (KPI) have been identified (Twesigye-Bakwatsa and Ntabana 2007) and the proposed strategy has been taken into account in the EDPRS;
- the EDPRS has a policy matrix which is the main instrument to monitor implementation. It includes a specific matrix for each cross-cutting issue, including environment, with goals, objectives, indicators and targets;
- as it approaches the end of its period of implementation (2007 -2012), the current EDPRS will be evaluated to inform the formulation of the next EDPRS;
- the PEI project has supported the development of a comprehensive and harmonised M&E framework (Mahundaza 2009), with a detailed review of existing system having been carried out in 2009. Together with other reports, this document informed the formulation of the environment and climate

---

<sup>4</sup> In this document, 'impact' refers to what is sometimes called the 'high-level impact' or 'long-term result' (e.g. poverty reduction and environmental sustainability in the case of PEI), 'outcome' refers to the medium-term result of a particular project or programme (e.g. knowledge and awareness, policy statements such as the EDPRS, public and private investments, capacity and field demonstration in the case of PEI) and 'output' refers to the direct result that comes out of a specific activity (e.g. new skills or the issuance of a new budget call circular in the case of PEI). This terminology is somewhat different from what is used in the PEI project documents, and this point is discussed later in this report.

change sub-sector strategic plan and was used to formulate a monitoring and evaluation framework for the environment and natural resource sector. The harmonised M&E framework however still needs to be finalised;

- this framework and the recommended indicators (Twesigye-Bakwatsa and Ntabana 2007) have been used to guide the selection of poverty-environment indicators during the process to formulate the Environment and Natural Resource Sector Strategy (ENRSS);
- a framework and a baseline for environmental data management have been developed and validated in one location (Karongi District), and the project is currently developing profiles in selected districts, to demonstrate the value of local information systems in planning, programming and monitoring.

### 3.2. Assessing impacts and outcomes: challenges and limitations

In spite of the existence of the systems and instruments described above, it has proven challenging for PEI Rwanda – as indeed for all other national poverty-environment initiatives – to identify and document the actual impacts and outcomes of its work. There are several factors that are responsible for this, including the following:

- in all development work, especially in processes that relate simultaneously to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of development, it is always extremely difficult to attribute change to a specific action or measure, because change typically happens as a result of a combination of actions by a wide range of actors, and because the situations that are being addressed and improved are usually complex and dynamic;
- this is particularly true in a country like Rwanda, where there has been much progress towards poverty reduction in recent years, and where natural resources are so critical to development, livelihoods and poverty reduction. Policies, programmes and investments related to land management, land titling, rural and urban settlements, access to markets for farm produce or pollution control, just to name some of the key development processes currently underway in the country, all contribute to forging a positive relationship between environment and poverty reduction, which is at the core of PEI's mission;
- the results that are expected from projects such as PEI are changes in governance, awareness, attitudes and capacity which are not easily quantifiable and are therefore far more difficult to measure than those of development projects in sectors such as infrastructure, health or education;
- assessment and attribution are also difficult because most of the impacts of environmental mainstreaming occur over the long-term. New policies or investments in a given ministry will not immediately result in measurable improvements in environmental quality and productivity or in household incomes and access to services. After only six years, it would not be reasonable to expect visible environmental and livelihood impacts directly attributable to PEI, except in the case of site-specific activities;
- the difficulty to identify and attribute change is further increased by the fact that the role of PEI is more one of advocacy and facilitation than

implementation – it is not PEI that has the responsibility to mainstream, its mission is to create the conditions and help build the capacities needed for such mainstreaming to happen;

- impact assessment within PEI is also not helped by the somewhat blurred boundary between the poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda and the stricter environmental agenda. As noted elsewhere in this report, the fact that the PEI project is housed within REMA and that its work is well integrated into the structure of the organisation results in a frequent ‘pull’ towards a narrower environmental agenda, making it more difficult to make a direct link between the work of PEI on mainstreaming and changes in the relationship between environment and poverty (as opposed to changes in environmental quality);
- even if one remains at the level of project outcomes (e.g. policies, investments, capacities, institutional arrangements) the activities of the second phase of PEI are much more difficult to monitor and evaluate than those of the first phase, when the primary focus was on integration of environmental concerns and potentialities into the EDPRS (something that could be assessed on the basis of the contents of the EDPRS);
- evaluation, accountability and visibility in the PEI project also suffer from the fact that the project has not been entirely effective in its reporting to donors and partners. In part because of the formats and language used<sup>5</sup>, and in part because of the information actually provided (or not provided), the reports submitted by the PEI Rwanda team do not pay justice to the importance and quality of the work done, and fail to convey important messages related to actual or expected impacts.

For all these reasons, any attempt at identifying and documenting the impacts and outcomes of PEI Rwanda is difficult and necessarily based on hypotheses and on the extrapolation of findings from specific cases or experiences<sup>6</sup>. Yet, it is a necessary attempt, and the following section seeks to contribute to this identification and documentation of the changes that have come as a result of PEI Rwanda’s work.

### 3.3. Impacts and outcomes, what has changed as a result of PEI’s work?

#### ‘Higher-level’ impacts

It would not be possible to identify and measure the environmental and poverty reduction impacts at the national level that would be directly attributable to the PEI project (and it would not be reasonable to expect that such impacts could be identified), but actual and future impacts can be extrapolated from the following evidence:

- there have been tangible and measured positive environmental impacts that have come as a result of processes initiated and/or supported by PEI in

---

<sup>5</sup> The main issue here, from the standpoint of evaluation, is that the project documents do not identify specific project outcomes. There are five project ‘outputs’, but the language used is a bit vague and does not allow for a real assessment of result (“improved capacity” and “increased awareness” are convenient choices of words, but they do not give a clear sense of the result one wants to achieve).

<sup>6</sup> Project documents also indicate that tracking progress against MDGs 1 and 7 is part of the project outputs, but this evaluation did not find any evidence that this is being done by the project.

specific locations, in collaboration with other institutions. The most notable among these is the restoration of the Rugezi-Bulera-Ruhondo wetland and lake complex, which has contributed to wildlife conservation and has rehabilitated hydropower production capacity<sup>7</sup>, thus demonstrating the symbiotic relationship between conservation, natural resource management and development;

- although it is too early to quantify its long-term impacts, the integrated development project in Rubaya, Gicumbi District, is demonstrating how environmental and poverty reduction benefits can be generated simultaneously, with specific actions contributing to both objectives in a symbiotic and mutually-reinforcing manner;
- these local initiatives are based on the application and implementation of the very systems and practices that PEI is advocating and facilitating at national level, i.e. institutional collaboration and partnership across sectors and levels of governance; approach of environment as a cross-cutting theme, but also as a sector in its own right; increased and enhanced public and private sector investments in pro-poor environmental management; capacity-building at central and decentralised levels; use of evidence to inform policy formulation and programming;
- it can therefore easily be extrapolated that the policy, planning and budgeting processes that are taking place at national level with PEI's support will eventually produce – or may already be producing – comparable results as those that can be observed in Rugezi and Rubaya.

### Project outcomes

While it is difficult to pinpoint and measure impacts, it is easier to identify outcomes that have resulted from PEI project activities and can be attributed, at least in part, to these activities.

*In large part thanks to PEI's work, the dominant policy discourse in Rwanda is one that now fully integrates the environmental dimension of development, with a very explicit link being made between poverty reduction and environmental management.* Of course, this is not an outcome that can be attributed solely to PEI, as there have been several factors and processes that have converged in this direction over the past fifteen years. "We did not need PEI for us to understand the links between poverty and environment", says a senior civil servant, "but PEI gave the arguments, it gave the facts". Others attribute PEI's contribution to the consistency of the message, and to the fact that it has been directed at the most senior policy levels.

*This change in the policy discourse is clearly and explicitly reflected in the language of the EDPRS, which is the main development policy and programming framework.* While Vision 2020, the longer-term development strategy, stipulates the need to mainstream environment into development, it is only in the EDPRS (and more recently in the seven-year programme of government put forward by the ruling party) that policy measures are explicitly spelled out. The mainstreaming of environment into the EDPRS has been a primary result of the first phase of PEI in Rwanda, while

---

<sup>7</sup> This review did not have access to data that would have allowed for a quantification of these benefits. Current research is however being carried out, under the auspices of PEI Rwanda, to document this experience and quantify the contribution of watershed rehabilitation to energy production.

the second phase has been able to translate and apply the policy directions of the EDPRS into sector strategies, especially the five-year ENRSS. *It is undisputable that Rwanda's national policy framework is now explicitly linking environment and poverty reduction, in a very progressive manner, and that this has largely been possible through PEI's efforts.*

*The work of PEI has contributed to the strengthening and a greater visibility of the environment sector.* The support provided to the ENRSS as well as subsector strategic plans has helped reorganise the sector. It has also helped to demonstrate and highlight the role of this sector in sustainable development, with other sectors recognising better the contribution that environment and natural resources make to their performance. These developments have also contributed to the integration of environment into the budget call circular for pilot sectors.

*The changes in the policy discourse are a reflection of a stronger awareness, at many levels in society, of the value of linking good environmental management and poverty reduction.* This comes as a result of a number of factors, some external such as the global attention to environmental issues, most internal, notably the research and field activities that have demonstrated linkages between environment and development, the public education and communication activities of REMA, the training activities that have reached a large number of people in ministries and local government agencies, and the sensitisation actions targeted at specific groups (notably Parliamentarians).

*PEI has also helped to break institutional barriers and has established useful bridges between institutions that were not used to collaborate.* While horizontal, inter-sectoral cooperation remains an issue and a need in Rwanda, there have been significant advances over the past few years in this regard. "The PEI people have really helped us to reach out and communicate with sectors that we did not work with before", says a ministry representative. "In the environment, our main partner is REMA, but thanks to PEI we also discuss environmental matters with many other organisations".

*PEI has not yet generated new investments in poverty-environment processes<sup>8</sup>, and it may not yet have improved the quality of existing investments, but it is putting in place important instruments and systems that will undoubtedly result in quantitative and qualitative improvements in such investments.* One of the important results of the second phase so far has been the inclusion of specific environmental considerations and requirements in the Budget Call Circular (BCC), with a focus on three selected sectors (agriculture, energy, trade and industry), but it is too early to measure the outcomes of this measure. Similarly, the project has spearheaded the establishment of the environmental fund known as FONERWA, and this mechanism, once fully established and operational, will play a critical role in supporting action that contributes to poverty reduction and environmental sustainability.

*PEI has demonstrated the usefulness and relevance of poverty-environment data to local-level planning and implementation.* By providing support to district level data collection and analysis, as an input towards establishing a reliable monitoring and evaluation framework, PEI has demonstrated the key role that poverty and environment data play in district-level evidence-based planning. Indeed, this has

---

<sup>8</sup> Except in the case of the demonstration project in Rubaya, where there were good synergies between the EU-funded construction of terraces and the PEI-supported work in environmental management and poverty reduction.

undoubtedly contributed to the progress Karongi district registered in the national performance contract (Imihigo) evaluation in 2010.

*Thanks to PEI's work, the public sector institutions that are key to the environment-poverty reduction nexus now have a greater capacity to manage and enhance these linkages and to design and implement policies, programmes and actions that result in poverty reduction and improved environmental management.* Looking at the various components of organisational capacity, and not only at skills, a very rapid and preliminary assessment of the capacity of the key institutions reveals the following<sup>9</sup>:

**A rapid assessment of the capacity of MINECOFIN with respect to environmental mainstreaming**

Capacity requirement	Progress made	Priority needs
A vision that includes a good understanding of the poverty-environment relationship	Environment approached both as a cross-cutting issue and a sector Good understanding of needs and benefits of linking environment and poverty reduction	Build a sharper understanding and more systematic identification of potential linkages between environment and poverty reduction
A clear and focused mission that includes the poverty-environment agenda	Clear leadership role in implementation of EDPRS, with mission to facilitate mainstreaming	Sustain current role and mission
Organisational culture	In practice, environment still seen as the responsibility of "the cross-cutting officer", environment mainstreaming not yet reflected in behaviour and practices of the institution and its staff	Sustain and broaden advocacy and training activities, to highlight benefits of mainstreaming and contribution that all can make to that process Bring other staff into the process
Mandate	Clearly defined	No change needed
Skills	Awareness and skills of significant proportion of staff enhanced thanks to PEI activities	Assess the uptake of the skills and identify any future needs for training
Information/knowledge	Studies conducted and made available by PEI Policy briefs produced and made available	Make the policy briefs more widely available Bring the analysis and lessons from demonstration project and other experiences into the policy process
Financial resources	BBC issued with specific request for environmental mainstreaming from three sectors	Assess actual response to BCC and Annex 17 Expand approach to other sectors
Systems	Arrangements in place for addressing cross-cutting issues	Make the cross-cutting issues forum more engaged. PEI can play an influential role in this effort
Partnerships	Clear role to coordinate programming and	No change needed

<sup>9</sup> Section 6.4 below actually recommends the conduct of participatory capacity assessments in all the ministries directly concerned, as a requirement for the design and implementation of a structured capacity-building programme during the next phase of work.

Capacity requirement	Progress made	Priority needs
	budgeting by all sectors	
Legitimacy	MINECOFIN clearly recognised by stakeholders as legitimate leader in development policy and planning	Strengthen visibility and involvement of MINECOFIN in poverty-environment mainstreaming

**A rapid assessment of the capacity of the five sector ministries (MINAGRI, MINELA, MINALOC, MININFRA, MINICOM) with respect to environmental mainstreaming**

Capacity requirement	Progress made	Priority needs
A vision that includes a good understanding of the poverty-environment relationship	All public sector agencies see Vision 2020, EDPRS and the seven-year programme as policy and programming frameworks, and agree on the need to integrate environment	A sharper understanding of the practical linkages between environment and poverty reduction, especially taking into account the negative impacts that some environmental activities could have on livelihoods, and the potential economic and poverty reduction benefits from environmental management in 'new' sectors (e.g. industry, tourism and trade)
A clear and focused mission that includes the poverty-environment agenda	Poverty-environment mainstreaming incorporated in some of the sector strategies, other strategies in preparation (e.g. Private Sector Development Strategy by MINICOM)	Continued advocacy to ensure that all Ministries see poverty-environment linkages (and not simply environment) as part of their mission
Organisational culture	Environment still perceived as a marginal sector	Need to promote integration of poverty-environment in the daily programming and practice of agencies
Mandate	Clearly defined	No change needed
Skills	Significant training provided by PEI to a large number of staff from ministries Placement of interns as a source of additional expertise and support	Assess the uptake of the skills and identify any future needs for training Work towards the transformation of the position of interns into permanent position of technical assistance in poverty-environment mainstreaming
Information/knowledge	Studies conducted and made available by PEI	Make the policy briefs and PEI studies more widely available Bring the analysis and lessons from demonstration project and other experiences into the policy process
Financial resources	BBC just issued	Assess response to BBC,

Capacity requirement	Progress made	Priority needs
		guide response towards creative pro-poor investments
Systems	Arrangements in place for addressing cross-cutting issues	Increase focus on integrating cross cutting issues into programming
Partnerships		Need to broaden partnerships to private sector and civil society
Legitimacy	Role well defined in relevant sectors	No change needed, except to highlight the relevance of poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda to sectors where it is least obvious (e.g. trade and industry)

#### **4. Achievements, drivers, constraints and lessons learned**

This section examines the achievements of the project to date, as well as those that could be expected at the end of the current phase, and looks at the main processes that have led to these achievements. It also identifies some of the challenges encountered, and draws lessons for PEI Rwanda and, more generally, for other processes aimed at mainstreaming environment in poverty reduction. This section is organised around the three main areas where the project has produced outcomes, namely the policy framework (including awareness and participation), capacity-building (including financing) and knowledge.

##### **4.1. An improved national policy framework**

The main achievement of the project is that it has contributed directly to a significant improvement in the national policy framework, in favour of the integration of the environment in poverty reduction policies, strategies and programmes. By participating actively in the preparation of the EDPRS and the ENRSS, the PEI Team has been able to ensure that environmental objectives and measures were included in these documents. By collaborating with other sector ministries, it has also helped in the inclusion of the appropriate language in the strategies developed by other sectors, and such processes are still underway (e.g. the Private Sector Development Strategy that is currently being formulated under the auspices of the Ministry of Trade and Industry). It has also contributed to the sector reviews and the sector-wide approach (SWAp) process for the environment, with a Memorandum of Understanding having recently been signed.

A key achievement of the second phase to date has undoubtedly been the inclusion of environmental requirements in the BCC, with an initial focus on three sectors (energy, agriculture, and trade and industry). In support of this reform in budgeting, the PEI Team has conducted formal and informal training activities to guide the sector ministries in their budget preparations.

During Phase I, the PEI project also contributed directly to the integration of environment and poverty outcomes in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the UNDP country programme. PEI supported the identification of national environment and poverty priorities that were included in the UNDAF and country programme, including development of a monitoring and

evaluation framework that would guide tracking of deliverables and monitoring of progress.

Significant achievements have also been realised in public awareness, with a campaign initiated in 2006 and providing comprehensive coverage of environment and poverty issues in the mainstream media channels. The campaign has grown and expanded its scope beyond the PEI project, and it is now directly supported by REMA. It has however maintained the core focus of the message by linking environment and natural resource issues with poverty reduction, economic growth and sustainable development. There appears to be a broad level of awareness, at the national level, of poverty and environment issues, and this is in large measure attributable to the project.

While these achievements are directly linked to the project's inputs and activities, it is clear that PEI Rwanda has benefited from, and has been able to take full advantage of, a favourable policy and institutional environment. The main factors external to PEI that have contributed to poverty-environment mainstreaming include:

- a policy commitment, already made explicit in 'Vision 2020' (1999), which states that Rwanda will "mainstream the environmental aspect in all policies and programmes of education, sensitisation and development and in all processes of decision-making";
- strong state institutions, with MINECOFIN providing leadership and coordination of development and fiscal policy;
- an effective REMA, established in 2006 following the adoption of the new environmental law the year before, which now provides strong and legitimate leadership in many environmental matters;
- the recent adoption of a National Land Use and Development Master Plan, and a wide-ranging programme of land reform, titling and registration;
- effective coordination among development partners, with the alignment of their programmes on government policies and priorities, with a focus on quality, and with effective coordination mechanisms (e.g. the allocation of sectors among donors as expressed in the Division of Labour, a strong coordination role performed by MINECOFIN, and the consolidation of project management into one Single Project Implementation Unit in each ministry or public agency);
- a strategic capacity-building initiative coordinated by the Public Sector Capacity-Building Secretariat.

Another important factor that has facilitated the mainstreaming process is that the relationship between natural resources, development and poverty reduction is strong and obvious in Rwanda, with the importance of agriculture (approximately 80% of exports, 40% of GDP and 90% of the active population), a high population density and the very direct relationship between land management and human development. In Rwanda, it is not difficult to convince anyone that erosion control and other good environmental practices contribute to reducing poverty and improving livelihoods.

In spite of these favourable conditions, there have been and there remain a number of significant challenges and constraints to the achievement of outcomes and outputs, including:

- while the focus of PEI should be the relationship between environmental management and poverty reduction, there is a frequent 'pull' towards a more narrow environmental agenda. It is for example revealing that the language of the BCC which the PEI project was able to influence, and which asks for environmental mainstreaming in the budgeting process of three selected sectors, calls more specifically for the mitigation of environmental impacts, but does not provide much guidance for the exploration of pro-poor investments in environment;
- while MINECOFIN has become much more involved in PEI-related activities in the past two years, it is not yet providing the type of leadership that would be needed to ensure that all public agencies embrace the concept and the practice of environmental mainstreaming;
- there remains a perception, and at times a fear, in the sector ministries, that environmental mainstreaming is more about control and development constraints than about opportunities. "In the ministries", says a Planning Officer, "environment is still perceived like a social sector, a sector that only has costs and does not generate revenue. This is a shift that we still need to make, to understand that environment is also a poverty reduction and economic development sector. It will take time";
- in the same vein, another factor of resistance in some of the institutions is the concern that environmental work could take resources away from other areas of programming, and that requests for more attention to environmental matters are not accompanied by increased and dedicated budget allocations;
- progress in mainstreaming is also constrained by the fact that there is a high turn-over at senior level in ministries, with advocacy and training efforts rendered ineffective when new personnel is placed in key positions.

These observations suggest a small number of lessons and implications for PEI Rwanda:

- it has undoubtedly been the right strategy to link the mainstreaming work to on-going policy, budgeting and programming processes (i.e. EDPRS, sector strategies, joint sector reviews, SWAp);
- it is critical and useful to sustain and strengthen the relationship with, and support to, MINECOFIN;
- the introduction of specific instruments that link environment, poverty reduction and economics, such as the payment for environmental services currently being explored by PEI and other agencies, is a good way to mobilise other actors and gain their support;
- PEI should take advantage of every opportunity to mainstream and transfer leadership of the process to other agencies;

- awareness and sensitisation must be continuous processes that cannot remain dependent on project funding, and there is therefore a need to ensure that REMA can continue to play that role on an on-going basis.

The experience of PEI Rwanda in this area of policy reform also provides some valuable lessons for other poverty-environment mainstreaming processes and for the agencies that support them:

- it is critical to base programme design on a good understanding and analysis of the national policy context and on an identification of policy processes underway or planned in the country;
- it is critical to embed interventions in this processes, even if this appears more time- and resource-consuming than other approaches;
- one must accept that achievements in poverty-environment mainstreaming will be constrained when the policy environment is not favourable, and agencies involved should tailor their expectations to local realities;
- whenever possible, poverty-environment processes should be advocates of policy reform, even in areas that are not directly linked to poverty-environment mainstreaming, in order to encourage and generate favourable policy conditions.

#### 4.2. Improved capacity for poverty-environment mainstreaming

Section 3.3 proposes that one of the outcomes of PEI Rwanda has been a marked improvement in the capacity of key institutions to mainstream environment in poverty reduction policies, strategies, programmes and investments. If so, how has this been done, and what are the specific achievements of the project that have contributed to building such capacity?

The approach of PEI Rwanda has been to use a range of methods and approaches in support of its capacity-building efforts, including:

- short-term training activities on poverty-environment mainstreaming for staff of the various ministries and the local government agencies;
- field visits, including visits organised as part of a sensitisation programme for the benefit of Parliamentarians;
- placement of a short-term consultant at MINECOFIN to provide technical assistance in budgeting, including in-house training, support to the preparation of the BCC and its Annex 17, support to individual ministries in handling response to the BCC with respect to the environmental dimension, and identification of gaps and opportunities for mainstreaming in all sectors;
- placement of interns in various ministries, as a way to add human capacity, with an exclusive focus on environment mainstreaming, but also as a way to reveal the need and create a more explicit demand for such expertise;
- the formulation and dissemination of guidelines for environmental mainstreaming (PEI 2007), and their subsequent use in training programmes,

as well as the preparation and publication of a framework for environmental mainstreaming (Twesigye-Bakwatsa 2009);

- formal and informal sharing of information, ideas and recommendations in meetings (including those related to EDPRS and sector strategy formulations, joint sector reviews, and SWAp negotiations for the environment and natural resource sector);
- conduct of studies aimed at informing policy analysis and formulation, notably the Public Environmental Expenditure Review (PEER) released in 2010, and the report on environmental fiscal reform;
- preparation and dissemination of five policy briefs;
- preparation of a proposal for the operationalisation of FONERWA, with policy level engagement to support the eventual approval of the bill;
- implementation of a demonstration project, as a testing ground and a source of evidence on the linkages between environment and poverty reduction and on the ways these linkages can be enhanced;
- facilitation and mobilisation of partnerships in the demonstration project, as an illustration of the benefits to be gained from collaboration and synergies<sup>10</sup>.

There have been a number of positive factors that have contributed to this capacity-building process, including:

- the existence of a development vision that is explicitly formulated ('Vision 2020', EDPRS, seven-year programme) and that is shared by all public agencies;
- a clarity of mission among these agencies, and well-functioning governmental institutions;
- committed and motivated civil servants;
- an effective decentralisation process, with a devolution of authority to local institutions and with advanced systems for programming and accountability at local level.

There have however been some challenges and constraints encountered in these capacity-building activities<sup>11</sup>, notably:

- the fact that documents and publications produced by PEI have not been sufficiently disseminated, with a number among these that have not been

---

<sup>10</sup> For example, in the demonstration project, MINAGRI has contributed water pumping systems to facilitate irrigation and MINALOC is increasingly taking ownership of the integrated development concept and plans and is keen to disseminate them at national levels. The EU has invested in soil erosion and improved agricultural production through the construction of terraces, while CARE International has supported the establishment of a nursery and day care centre for the children of the Umudugudu.

<sup>11</sup> It has not been possible for this evaluation to assess uptake of skills and practices as a result of PEI's training activities, as this would necessarily require more time in interviews with beneficiaries and observation of behaviour.

finalised and placed in the public domain, including the various training modules;

- the fact that little has been done for the benefit of civil society and the private sector. Indeed, it appears that civil society organisations are less involved in PEI at the moment that they were during Phase I, and some observers feel that EDPRS implementation would be more effective if civil society organisations and other non-State actors were more directly involved.

The key lessons that can be extracted from the experience of PEI Rwanda with respect to capacity-building are that ‘capacity-building’ is much more than training, and that training requires more than workshops and short courses. As noted earlier, the capacity of any institution will be defined by its vision, its mission, its organisational culture, its legal mandate, the skills of its staff and service providers, the information and knowledge at its disposal, its financial resources, its management systems, its partnerships, and the legitimacy it has among the various categories of stakeholders. Capacity-building is therefore necessarily a long-term, multi-dimensional investment, with changes needed simultaneously at various levels.

#### 4.3. Evidence in support of policy and capacity

“Rwanda is data-driven”, says a member of the project team, who also feels that “there is much happening here, so the policy recommendations that are clear, solution-oriented and evidence-based are most likely to be taken up”. PEI Rwanda has taken good account of this reality, by producing evidence of the close relationship that exists between environment and poverty, and of the environmental, economic and social benefits that can be derived from good environmental management.

The main sources of such evidence have been:

- the economic analysis of environmental degradation (UNEP/UNDP 2006);
- the integrated ecosystem assessment conducted in the Bugesera region (UNEP/UNDP/GOR 2007), and the environmental management activities that have been carried out there since by a number of organisations, with documented positive impacts on livelihoods and natural resources;
- the demonstration project in Rubaya, Gicumbi District, where there have been a number of coordinated interventions in human settlements, erosion control, land management, water management and energy production, with PEI playing a lead role in supporting activities linking environment, social services and economic development at community level;
- the exercise in data collection and management carried out in the Karongi District, linking locally relevant data with development plans, and with the validation of the system having been carried out in collaboration with the African Environmental Information Network (AEIN).

The main lessons from this work are that the policies, programmes and investments needed for the integration of environment and poverty reduction must be informed by local realities and experience, and that policy change will not happen without tangible evidence of the benefits to be gained from such change. The role of a PEI project is basically a catalytic role, where ‘evidence’ is the primary catalyst.

In support of the mainstreaming process, PEI Rwanda has generated new, valuable knowledge, as illustrated by the number and scope of documents listed in Appendix 2.

### **5. Main strengths and weaknesses in project design and management**

The main features of project design and management that can be considered relevant to this stock-taking exercise are the following.

#### Strengths:

- the two phases of PEI Rwanda have been well designed, with good project documents based on a good understanding of local needs and realities;
- project implementation has benefited from strong leadership and good guidance from REMA;
- project implementation has been rigorous, in spite of human resource constraints and resulting delays. As expressed by a senior civil servant who has been associated with PEI for a number of years, “PEI has been very systematic in its approach and in educating on the link between environment and development, that’s where they have added value, because they have been systematic”;
- the project has benefited from its flexibility and its ability to adapt to challenges and changing conditions. This is due to a number of positive factors, including the attitude and approach of the PEI Africa Team, its proximity and commitment to the project, and the sensitivity of the Rwanda PEI Team (including senior management at REMA) to local needs and conditions;
- more generally, the project has been well served by a good working relationship between the PEI Rwanda Team and the regional PEI Africa Team based in Nairobi, which has been a very valuable source of technical support;
- in project implementation, the PEI Rwanda Team has also benefited from good and loyal partnerships with a small number of key organisations and colleagues.

#### Weaknesses

- the project has suffered from human resource issues, notably with the vacancy of the position of Coordinator for most of 2008, and with the constant difficulty to identify suitable short-term consultants;
- the project has encountered significant delays in disbursements from UNDP and in the procurement of services, and the UNDP Country Office (CO) has not been sufficiently involved in resource mobilisation;
- primarily for these two reasons, there have been delays in the implementation of a number of project activities;

- the project has not done well in reporting on and communicating its achievements. The reports submitted by the project team do not make a clear distinction between activities, outputs and outcomes. They give a good account – albeit sometimes repetitive – of what has been done, but not of the results obtained, and the project would have benefited from the production of shorter, more analytical reports;
- while the Project Team has good and frequent working relationships with some members of the Task Team, the bodies that have been constituted to provide guidance and oversight to the project, especially the Project Steering Committee, do not function very effectively, mainly because the representatives (Permanent Secretaries in the case of Project Steering Committee) do not normally attend meetings, and members of the Task Team do not always create the required linkages within their own institutions;
- while it has worked well with its primary partners, the project has not been very effective in linking with and engaging academic and scientific institutions, the private sector, and civil society. As expressed by a local expert, “PEI could have achieved much more, if it had used its approach to orient other actors”;
- similarly, the project has not been very visible in the eyes of a number of donors, in part because of the good linkages and high visibility of REMA, and in part because of the insufficient engagement of the UNDP Country Office. This may have weakened the ability of the project to mobilise additional resources and influence a wider range of development partners.

## **6. Capitalising on achievements, sustaining impacts and securing the legacy**

### **6.1. General considerations**

This section of the report is based on the assumption that:

- there remains some flexibility in the design and implementation of PEI project activities until the end of the current phase (December 2011);
- UNDP and UNEP may be prepared to consider providing support to PEI Rwanda beyond 2011, but it is likely that such support would be on a smaller scale than what has been provided during Phases I and II, and it would constitute a final phase, with no opportunity for further extension.

It is also based on the conclusion that the achievements of the project cannot be considered sustainable, in the sense that they have not yet been fully integrated into the culture, systems and operations of other institutions. Indeed, several key policy measures, such as the issuance of the BCC, or capacity-building initiatives, such as the placement of interns, are very recent and have not yet yielded tangible results. A premature interruption of these processes would be detrimental to the poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda in Rwanda and would deprive PEI Africa from a potentially valuable case where very significant advances would have been made in the realisation of that agenda.

Any decision regarding the future of PEI Rwanda should take into account the place of this project within the overall Poverty – Environment Initiative, in Africa and other regions. As one of the main actors in PEI puts it, “if it can’t be done in Rwanda, it

can't be done anywhere", implying that the conditions for effective mainstreaming are more favourable in this country than in most others. It is therefore in the interest of all those who are committed to this mainstreaming agenda, including PEI's donors, to ensure that the process that was initiated in Rwanda in 2005 is successfully completed.

In the evaluation of the PEI partnership with Norway that was submitted in June 2009, IIED noted that "the full integration of poverty reduction and environmental objectives in-country is a long-term (10-20 years) institutional change process". It is indeed a lesson of PEI Rwanda that the goals of environment-poverty mainstreaming cannot be achieved over a short-term period, even when policy, institutional and financing conditions are as favourable as they are in Rwanda at the moment.

*Against this background, it is recommended that an eventual PEI Phase III should not be conceived and perceived as a mere extension of PEI II, but as a final phase that is clearly intended to consolidate and capitalise on all achievements (even if the level of funding is substantially reduced in comparison to current Phase II). It is also proposed that this could not be realised without a sufficiently long time frame, because some of the most critical mainstreaming processes and arrangements supported by PEI will require at least another two years to become integrated into the structures and plans of national and local institutions. It would also be highly beneficial to Rwanda if the PEI project could accompany the implementation of EDPRS II, monitor impacts and draw lessons. It is therefore recommended that this third and final phase of PEI Rwanda be implemented over a period of four years (2012 – 2015)<sup>12</sup>, with the understanding that the second half of this phase (2014 – 2015) would be devoted almost exclusively to M&E, documentation and focused technical assistance.<sup>13</sup>*

It is further recommended that PEI activities due to be carried out in 2011 and during this eventual Phase III be guided by a number of principles:

- the critical importance of linking environmental management and poverty reduction is now recognised by most actors in Rwanda, thanks in large part to the work of PEI. Consequently, there is little need to advocate the concept of poverty-environment mainstreaming, but there are clear needs and opportunities to ensure that such mainstreaming actually takes place, with concrete policies, systems and investments;
- every effort should be made to ensure that the processes, systems, skills and capacities developed or enhanced by PEI during the past six years are integrated into institutions and sustained beyond the life of the project;
- the lessons learned and the tools and methods developed by the project should be well documented and widely disseminated, on the basis of a critical analysis of approaches and experiences that have proven effective;
- all activities should focus very strongly, perhaps exclusively, on the linkages between poverty and environment, as this is the area where PEI adds clear

---

<sup>12</sup> This would give the project a total implementation period of 10 years, as Phase I was initiated in December 2005. It would also allow the project's end to coincide with the 2015 target date for the MDGs.

<sup>13</sup> In this scenario, the project would most likely not require a full implementation team during that second half of Phase III, but could rely on one full-time resource person, technical support from PEI Africa, and short-term consultants for specific tasks.

value. As noted earlier, PEI activities to date have been varied, with a number of actions that have been concerned with aspects of environmental management that may not be directly relevant to the poverty reduction agenda. With the remarkable progress made in the past few years in environmental awareness and management, and while it is acknowledged that the management of the environment is a key to the good performance and sustainability of all economic sectors (and thus a critical factor in poverty reduction) there is no need for PEI to spend time and resources on activities and processes that are not resolutely focused on the poverty-environment nexus.

There is a prevailing view among people closely associated with PEI in Rwanda that “environmental management as is practiced in Rwanda inevitably interfaces with poverty”, and this view is justified. It should however be recognised that the challenge of retaining a focus on the linkages between environment and poverty, as opposed to environment *per se*, will become greater as the country diversifies its economy and develops new sectors and activities, especially in energy, industry, tourism and information technologies. In a sector based primarily on the use of natural resources, such as agriculture, and taking into account the conditions that prevail in Rwanda (high population density, dominance of the agricultural sector, erosion), good environmental management (e.g. terracing, erosion control, integrated water management) is almost automatically good for poverty reduction, but the link will be less obvious in other sectors, and there will be need for vigilance to ensure that environmental mainstreaming (starting with the sectors selected in the most recent budget call, including energy, and trade and industry) is decisively pro-poor<sup>14</sup>. This could be achieved by ensuring that environment-poverty linkages are well covered in all PEI-supported training programmes, and that issues such as access to resources, distribution of benefits, equity and community empowerment are adequately considered in planning, implementation and monitoring.

In its future approaches, PEI will also have to negotiate carefully its relationship with, and positioning in relation to, other initiatives that are likely to receive more national and international consideration because of the global attention currently given to some issues and approaches (especially climate change and green economy). For PEI, this presents a challenge, because its mission and activities (i.e. mainstreaming environment into the core processes and instruments of national development planning and budgeting) are essential, but they can easily be overshadowed by other – albeit related – agendas. In this context, PEI should definitely retain its course, and donors should be advised to sustain their support for this work.

## 6.2. Desired outcomes

A weakness in the design of PEI Rwanda is that its project documents do not give a sufficiently clear statement of the outcomes against which results could be measured. If it is to embark on a final phase, this project should spell out its desired outcomes, and develop a logical framework that clearly describes how these outcomes will be achieved. On the basis of this brief review, it can be suggested that the desired situation at the end of the PEI project – a ‘post-PEI vision’ – should include the following elements (final outcomes to be formulated and negotiated as part of the process of designing the eventual Phase III):

---

<sup>14</sup> It should still be kept in mind that environmental management can easily have perverse, negative social and economic impacts, even in the agriculture sector and in rural areas, and that such negative impacts cannot be avoided without awareness and care.

- a comprehensive policy framework, with a good integration of environment in all major policy statements and instruments that are relevant to poverty reduction;
- a permanent capacity within REMA to act as a ‘champion’ of poverty-environment integration<sup>15</sup>;
- a MINECOFIN that has a strong ownership of, and assumes full leadership in, the mainstreaming process, also acting as a ‘champion’ of poverty-environment integration;
- planning, programming, budgeting, implementing and monitoring capacity within the sector Ministries that are the most directly concerned with the poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda;
- significant progress towards the financial sustainability of poverty-environment mainstreaming processes and activities;
- a widespread availability (and use) of methods, tools and approaches developed or advocated by PEI over the past six years;
- support from and involvement of other sectors (especially research and academic institutions, the private sector, and civil society).

It could be useful for PEI to develop its Phase III project document around such desired outcomes, and then make the strategic and tactical choices that will allow for optimal results, considering that a Phase III may not be able to do all that is desirable or possible.

### *6.3. Improving the policy framework*

In order to sustain and complete its work in support of a comprehensive policy framework that ensures full integration of environment and poverty reduction, there are a number of very clear directions that the PEI Team has already identified and that should be pursued. These could provide the core elements of PEI Rwanda’s policy work during the remainder of 2011 and during an eventual Phase III:

- collaborate with MINECOFIN and other partners in assessing and documenting the implementation and performance of the EDPRS in implementing the policies and actions that had been identified, as well as the actual impacts of the EDPRS on poverty and environment;
- on the basis of this assessment, contribute, in collaboration with MINECOFIN and other partners, in the formulation of EDPRS II, a process which is about to start and is expected to be completed by September 2012, according to a roadmap prepared by MINECOFIN and recently discussed with all relevant actors, including development partners;

---

<sup>15</sup> Many of the achievements of PEI can be attributed to REMA’s participation in activities led by other organisations, e.g. the joint sector review for the ENRSS or the SWAp process for the environment and natural resource sector, and it is clear that these achievements were possible only because there is qualified expertise dedicated to poverty-environment mainstreaming within REMA, but also because that expertise has been directed towards encouraging and supporting mainstreaming in other organisations. Without a ‘champion’, the mainstreaming agenda could become diluted over time.

- contribute to the review of Vision 2020 and the identification of new targets, with participation in technical committees and pillar workshops whenever possible and appropriate, taking into account the fact that the environment will be treated as a cross-cutting issue and will also be considered by the Economic Steering Committee of the EDPRS II process;
- consolidate the framework for monitoring and evaluating the impacts and outcomes of poverty-environment linkages, and ensure that this M&E framework is integrated and applied in the formulation of EDPRS II;
- participate in on-going periodic reviews of sector strategies and joint sector review processes to ensure effective environment and poverty mainstreaming into national planning and budgeting schedules;
- link with other important national processes, e.g. the Project to Develop a Rwandan National Strategy on Climate Change and Low Carbon Development<sup>16</sup> and any green economy process, but without losing focus on the core elements of the poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda;
- gather and integrate lessons from other initiatives and processes, including those supported by UN agencies, such as the GEF UNDP Small Grants Programme.

Another important opportunity for PEI Rwanda is to extract and disseminate the lessons that have been learned on the ground. While the focus of this work should be the demonstration project in Rubaya, where PEI has worked and is currently working in close collaboration with the Ministry of Local Government and other actors, it would be highly desirable to confront this experience with other field-based projects and experiences in the country, and to identify the policy implications that emerge from a range of initiatives<sup>17</sup>.

In support of policy reform and improvements, PEI Rwanda should continue its advocacy and communication work, with three directions emerging:

- since its launch in late 2005, PEI Rwanda has produced a number of extremely valuable documents, yet only four PEI 'products' are available on REMA's website at this moment, and discussions held during the course of this evaluation suggest that the documents produced by PEI are not as well known and as frequently used as they should be. It would therefore be useful for PEI to consolidate information and 'products' on that website and make them available through various networks. This would have the additional advantage of providing a basis for further work on the formulation of a research agenda (see below). In order to assist with this process, this

---

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.smithschool.ox.ac.uk/research-centres/climate-and-development/rwandan-national-strategy/>

<sup>17</sup> The PEI Rwanda Team indicates that the key focus for PEI is to document experiences and lessons from the demonstration project and package them for uptake by the Ministry of Local Government for dissemination and scale up at the national levels, with the packaging of results, planning and engagement exercise to be conducted in 2011 and limited support to training and sharing of lessons in the first two quarters of 2012. As presented in section 6.6, this evaluation recommends that this documentation exercise should involve several experiences and a range of institutions, as opposed to focusing solely on the project in Rubaya.

evaluation has attempted to compile a full bibliography of project 'products', which is presented in Appendix 2;

- there is both a need and an opportunity for PEI Rwanda to develop closer links with the academic community and to encourage research institutions to conduct more work on issues relevant to the poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda. This should be achieved through informal dialogue with selected researchers and institutions, and through the dissemination of the documents and bibliography mentioned above. It is also recommended that PEI consider the possibility of hosting, in late 2011 or early 2012, a seminar on the main lessons learned from PEI and on the definition of a research agenda for poverty-environment mainstreaming in the country. Such an event (which could have a regional dimension) could be used to mobilise national expertise and build consensus around poverty-environment indicators. It would further allow the PEI Team and project to disengage from direct research activities in Phase III, except perhaps from encouraging research and academic institutions in their uptake of that research agenda;
- in the short term, there is a clear demand and a good opportunity for research on the environmental and livelihood impacts of fertilisers, as the basis for a policy review. Discussions are currently taking place between PEI Rwanda and PEI Africa on this matter, and it is hoped that this study will materialise during the second half of 2011, with the possible involvement and contribution of development partners involved in the natural resource and agriculture sectors, such as the European Union.

#### 6.4. Consolidating capacity-building initiatives

Section 4.2 has outlined the main elements of capacity required in any given organisation, from vision, mission and mandate to skills, resources and systems. Considering the importance and quality of the investments made over the years by PEI Rwanda in the area of capacity-building, it would be useful, towards the end of 2011, for the PEI project to facilitate a participatory capacity analysis (focusing on poverty-environment mainstreaming) within the seven main participating institutions (MINECOFIN, REMA and the five sector ministries with which PEI collaborates more directly). Such an exercise would help these agencies to focus on other areas of capacity needs (in addition to the acquisition of skills, which has been the focus of capacity-building efforts) and it would involve a wider range of actors in the process. These analyses could be designed and implemented in collaboration with and with support from the strategic capacity-building initiative implemented by the Public Sector Capacity-Building Secretariat attached to MINECOFIN. On the basis of these analyses, strategic planning, institutional strengthening, training and other capacity-building activities would be identified by each institution, some of which could receive technical support from PEI (although it can be assumed that most of these activities would become part of the normal capacity-building plan of each agency and would not require much external support, except for the provision of advice and expertise).

With regards to its collaboration with and provision of support to MINECOFIN, the PEI project has identified the need and opportunity for the placement of a technical assistant within the ministry, with a primary role of supporting EDPRS implementation and review and the budgeting process. Building on the support provided by PEI to MINECOFIN in integrating poverty-environment into budgeting for three pilot sectors (agriculture, energy, and trade and industry), there is a need for continued technical and financial support to monitor and support implementation and extend the process to other sectors. This technical support will result in the full integration of poverty-

environment linkages into development planning, and the PEI Team rightfully considers this as a cornerstone of its capacity-building strategy.

PEI's collaboration with and support to the other ministries also needs to be sustained in order to optimise the impacts of investments made and consolidate the results obtained so far. In addition to the budgeting process now piloted in three sectors, PEI Rwanda sees the placement of interns as its main strategy to build capacity in poverty-environment mainstreaming in these agencies. It is too early to assess the impact of this arrangement, but all indications are encouraging, with colleagues in ministries highlighting the value of having someone dedicated to the poverty-environment mainstreaming agenda, and the quality of the support by the interns to date. It is therefore recommended that this arrangement be continued until the end of 2012, with the following provisions:

- that an evaluation be carried out at the end of 2011 (ideally as part of the participatory capacity analysis recommended above) to examine the impact of the presence of the interns in the various ministries, and that the original terms of reference be then revised if required;
- that agreements be negotiated with the ministries concerned regarding the creation of permanent positions to fulfil the functions presently assumed by the interns, beyond 2012;
- that consideration be given to the replacement of the term "intern" by "technical assistant", or something similar, in order to strengthen their position and enhance their influence.

In local government agencies, there is a clear demand for further training of personnel at the various levels. While the needs are many, it does not appear possible or desirable for the PEI project to take on too many responsibilities in this domain. The best approach would therefore probably be to utilise the channels and systems that already exist, especially within MINALOC, and to organise, on the basis of the results of the participatory capacity analysis mentioned above, a training-the-trainers programme. It is also clear that the intern/technical assistant assigned to MINALOC already plays a useful role in in-house training, and that this should be the main function of that position (with the possibility of providing the current intern with additional short-term training on approaches and methods of organisational development and capacity-building).

PEI's role has also been to sensitise development partners, and its participation in the SWAp process and the joint sector reviews will provide continued opportunities for doing so, with the understanding that this role will eventually remain REMA's role, without the need for a specific project to support it. In their relationships with donors, and through their participation in or collaboration with the Environment and Natural Resources Sector Working Group and other donor Working Groups, REMA and PEI can encourage increased collaboration and communication among development partners on environment as a cross-cutting issue. Discussions with Sweden, the current chair of the Environment and Natural Resources Sector Working Group, could help define a more specific action plan in this regard.

With respect to civil society organisations, their main needs appear to be access to funding and organisational strengthening. FONERWA, when operational, could become an important instrument to support these organisations and enhance their effectiveness. Training activities could also beneficially be arranged by PEI for the

benefit of the non-governmental sector, but preferably conceived as mutual learning, see section 6.6.

#### 6.5. Promoting increased and improved investments

It is, and it should remain, an objective of the PEI project to improve national funding levels and investments. This improvement should be quantitative, but it should also be qualitative, by ensuring that all investments in environmental sustainability take the poverty dimension into account.

Over the remainder of Phase II and during an eventual Phase III, the objective of increasing and enhancing investments could be achieved by:

- pursuing the policy formulation, budgeting and capacity-building processes identified above in relation to MINECOFIN and the other agencies, since the primary instrument of resource mobilisation is the national programming and budgeting process, and significant advances have already been made in this respect;
- completing the establishment of FONERWA. What appears needed at this stage, once a bill has been passed by Parliament, is a full strategic planning process that would result in: (a) a very clear vision and mission statement that embraces the poverty reduction objective, (b) a shared ownership of the Fund by a range of organisations, including representatives of intended beneficiaries, (c) an organ of governance that includes diverse disciplines, sectors and perspectives, (d) systems and procedures for operations and grant-making, (e) a resource mobilisation strategy that does not focus on the environment *per se*, but is explicitly geared towards the relationship between environment, livelihoods, poverty reduction and growth, and (f) an organisational framework, with internal rules and procedures;
- continuing advocacy with MINECOFIN to ensure that adequate resources are allocated to FONERWA;
- disseminating and advocating with donors to promote mobilisation of resources for FONERWA.

PEI also plays an important role in encouraging development partners to support poverty-environment mainstreaming. In light of the division of labour agreed between the Government of Rwanda and the development partners, there is a particular need to advocate for environment through other sectors, and not only those, such as agriculture, where the link with natural resources is obvious.

One area where PEI has not yet had much impact is the private sector, yet it is a sector that can play a key role in investments. A particular opportunity exists with the current process to formulate a Private Sector Development Strategy, which is being piloted by the Ministry of Trade and Industry. While some of the debate and initiatives related to the environment currently focus on environmental impact assessment, it would be interesting and useful for PEI to assist in an exercise aimed at identifying innovative ways to generate private sector investment in pro-poor environmental activities.

#### 6.6. Documenting and disseminating tools and experience

“Documentation is a weakness”, says a senior civil servant closely associated with PEI Rwanda, “we have many valuable experiences in this country but we do not have a systematic way to learn from them”. In order to remedy this and ensure that the products and lessons from the PEI project are made available and used, several opportunities exist:

- the compilation of existing documents (see Appendix 2) and their placement, when appropriate, on REMA’s website, as recommended in section 6.3 above, on the PEI global website and on other relevant sites;
- a structured process of analysis of lessons learned (see below) and a more systematic exploration and use of dissemination opportunities, including presentations at meetings, articles in newsletters and journals, and provision of information to media houses;
- a compilation of all the training modules developed and used by PEI Rwanda, with proper editing and formatting to allow for dissemination and use by other institutions;
- the preparation of a case study of the demonstration project at Rubaya, with a critical analysis of processes used, impacts realised and lessons to be learned. The case study should then be published in print and audio-visual formats;
- the commissioning of a small number of other case studies of experiences in linking poverty reduction and environmental management at local level, looking at the work of organisations such as the Community Development Fund (CDF), the District administrations, and community-based civil society organisations;
- a comparative analysis of these various experiences and the formulation of a strategy for replication and sharing of experiences;
- the dissemination of these case studies and lessons learned through a variety of channels such as regular meetings of local leaders and local government agencies, local community radio stations, field visits with leaders, training sessions with local associations and the regular planning sessions organised by MINALOC at local level.

Towards the end of an eventual Phase III, PEI should also undertake a comprehensive evaluation and lessons learning exercise, looking in particular at the processes that are too recent and incomplete to assess at the moment, such as the budgeting process, cross-sectoral linkages and their effectiveness, and changes in capacity within selected organisations.

#### 6.7. Broadening the partnerships and engaging new sectors

In an eventual final phase, PEI Rwanda should aim at engaging other sectors more decisively, and this is considered critical for a number of reasons:

- while it is the responsibility of ministries to formulate and implement public policy and public sector programmes, these policies and programmes will be

more effective and sustainable if they are supported by actors in civil society, the private sector and academia, and especially if these actors feel a sense of ownership and commitment;

- there are organisations in civil society in Rwanda that have valuable experience and expertise in issues, disciplines and interventions that are very directly relevant to poverty-environment mainstreaming, and whose perspectives could be useful to policy formulation and programming, but many of these organisations are not presently engaged in PEI Rwanda;
- there is a clear need for PEI Rwanda to strengthen its relationship with donors who are active in the country, firstly because the continuation and expansion of the processes and activities initiated by PEI will require additional support in an eventual Phase III, secondly because development partners can play a crucial role in supporting mainstreaming, and thirdly because development partners have a critical role to play in encouraging multi-stakeholder approaches and in facilitating the participation of non-State actors, in ways that are consistent with public policy and national priorities. This is particularly important in light of the agreed division of labour among development partners, with only one bi-lateral agency (Sweden) specifically involved in the environment sector (but with other donors involved in various natural resource sectors, including water, agriculture and forestry);
- academic and scientific institutions should play the lead role in future research on poverty-linkages, but several stakeholders indicate that these institutions are less connected to PEI at the moment than they were during Phase I. The sustainability of many of the processes initiated by PEI requires that these institutions be engaged and given an opportunity to contribute.

There are a number of practical ways in which PEI Rwanda could achieve these objectives during 2011 and in an eventual Phase III:

- for 2011, PEI Rwanda proposes to conduct a training activity for civil society organisations. When designing and implementing this activity, the PEI Team should take into account the fact that civil society organisations already have valuable experience in linking environment, natural resource management and poverty reduction. The training activity should therefore be fully participatory in nature and format, allowing civil society participants to share their experience and the PEI Team as well as its partners to benefit from that experience;
- one interesting option would be to turn this proposed activity into a “mutual learning activity” that would examine the case studies of the demonstration project and other experiences, as proposed in section 6.6, and use them for a participatory identification of lessons learned and policy implications;
- in its Phase III, PEI could also develop a monitoring and research agenda, in collaboration with other stakeholders, and in support of existing and proposed national systems and frameworks. This would bring the additional benefit of strengthening the link with research and academic institutions;
- PEI could also consider a major “stock-taking event”, in late 2011, for the purpose of disseminating results, mobilising further support, and launching a

final Phase with the increased engagement of other sectors (academia/research, private sector, civil society).

#### 6.8. Making project implementation as efficient and effective as possible

The evaluation of the UNDP-UNEP PEI partnership with Norway carried out by IIED in 2009 and the various progress reports from the PEI Rwanda Team have identified a number of implementation challenges. While this study did not revisit these issues in any detail, it has revealed that several critical matters have been resolved in the past two years, following a difficult period in 2008. Two key challenges however remain:

- the UNDP Country Office is not providing PEI Rwanda with the type and level of support needed for effective and efficient project implementation. This and other projects have suffered from substantial delays in disbursements and procurements, and it appears that the CO does not have a resource mobilisation strategy for PEI, largely because PEI is not properly integrated into the Country Programme and Action Plan<sup>18</sup>, which would be needed to ensure that PEI is able to conceive and implement a Phase III. It is urgent and critical that these questions be properly negotiated and settled in advance of an eventual Phase III. It is therefore recommended that the CO conduct an immediate and in-depth review of its role in and support to PEI Rwanda, identify and address issues that may have prevented it from playing the role expected of it, and put in place the resources, systems and procedures needed for effective support to PEI Rwanda and engagement in its activities. The CO should also collaborate with PEI Rwanda and PEI Africa to develop a proposal and fundraising plan for an eventual Phase III, along the lines presented in this report;
- PEI has encountered much difficulty in securing adequate human resources, an issue which is not unique to Rwanda, and which is due in part to the novelty of poverty-environment mainstreaming and the fact that there are few people with specific skills and experience in relevant fields. While there is no immediate solution to this issue, it can be assumed that the partnerships and linkages recommended in section 6.7 above could result in the identification and mobilisation of additional resources.

---

<sup>18</sup> In the project document for Phase II, it is explicitly stated that “UNEP and UNDP will enhance resource mobilisation and improve effectiveness of donor supported efforts in the integration of environment into national planning processes”.

## **Appendix 1: Main project activities and benchmarks, 2005 – 2010**

*Phase I – November 2005 to May 2007 [total budget USD 610,000]:*

- Active engagement with the EDPRS process, contributing to the formal adoption, in September 2007, of a document that gives ample treatment to the environment, both as a sector and as a cross-cutting issue.
- Following the adoption of the EDPRS, collaboration with relevant agencies in the formulation of sector strategies.
- Provision of support to District development plans
- Provision of support to UNDAF and Country Programme Document (CPD)
- Conduct of studies that have contributed to improved understanding of the relationship between poverty and environment [economic analysis of the costs of environmental degradation, poverty-energy linkages, pilot integrated ecosystem assessment, assessment of the impact of ecosystem services on the livelihoods of people in selected ecosystems of Bugesera region]
- Preparation of advocacy papers.
- Preparation of guidelines/checklists and key performance indicators.
- Provision of training to officials in central and local government. Workshop on integrated ecosystem assessment, poverty-environment indicator development, and general issues related to poverty-environment mainstreaming
- Media events and products ( Radio, TV, newspapers)

*Phase 2 – May 2007 to present [this phase scheduled to end December 2011, total budget USD 2,470.000]:*

- Recruitment, orientation, training, and placement of interns in six ministries, with on-going support
- Attachment of a Technical Advisor to MINECOFIN: provision of training to staff of ministries and local government agencies
- Provision of technical assistance to MINECOFIN in inclusion of environment in BCC, with three pilot sectors selected
- Preparation and dissemination of five policy briefs
- Design of harmonised M&E framework
- Continuation of media events and products ( Radio, TV, newspapers)
- Development of communication strategy
- Sensitisation of Parliamentarians (workshop)
- Production of documentary on Rubaya demonstration project
- Contribution to the formulation of the Environment and Natural Resource Sector Strategy and provision to support to other mainstreaming opportunities
- Conduct of PERR
- Provision of training to government technicians, officials of local government agencies and other stakeholders.
- Provision of technical assistance to environmental planning at district level
- Development of environmental data monitoring framework for Karongi District, validation in workshop, and dissemination
- Design and implementation of the demonstration project at Rubaya
- Design of FONERWA
- Research and technical assistance on other economic instruments
- Support to post conflict assessment conducted by UNEP

## **Appendix 2: Bibliography**

This bibliography provides a complete listing of all documents published by, or with support from, the PEI project in Rwanda<sup>19</sup>. It does not include technical and financial reports, internal administrative documents and project planning materials.

### Technical studies and reports

Garadi, Ahmed and Charles Twesigye-Bakwatsa. 2005. Pilot Project on Poverty-Environment Mapping (Phase II): Poverty-Environment Indicators and Policy Options for Possible Intervention under the PRSP. Republic of Rwanda and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 81p.

Government of the Republic of Uganda. 2008. NEMA/UNEP Study Visit to Rwanda 28 -29th January 2008. Study Visit Report, Learning from Rwanda's Experience in Integrating Environmental Sustainability Concerns into their Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS). Mimeo, 18p.

Mahundaza, Justice. 2009. Monitoring and Evaluation System of Environment in Rwanda. Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Draft report, 143p.

PEI. 2007. Guidelines for Mainstreaming Environment in the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy. Government of Rwanda Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Kigali. 86p.

PEI. 2010. Poverty-Environmental Mainstreaming in Rwanda, Gap Analysis. Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI), Kigali. Draft of July 2010, 61p.

PEI. No date. Environmental Sustainability in Rwanda's Economic Development and Poverty Eradication Strategies: Towards Mainstreaming Environment in the EDPRS. 35p.<sup>20</sup>

PEI/REMA. 2010. Public Environmental Expenditure Review to Support Poverty Environment Initiative in Rwanda. Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI), Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Kigali. 106p. + separate annexes (spreadsheets).

PEI/REMA. No date. Economic Analysis of Natural Resource Management in Rwanda. Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) and Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA), Kigali. 60p

REMA. 2010. A Review of Existing and Potential Environmental Fiscal Reforms and Other Economic Instruments in Rwanda. Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA) supported by Poverty and Environment Initiative. Kigali, 88p.

---

<sup>19</sup> The list may not yet be completed, and PEI colleagues are asked to review this draft carefully and identify all errors and omissions, to ensure that the bibliography included in the final version of this report is indeed exhaustive.

<sup>20</sup> This was actually produced in 2006, but never finalised. It is currently being updated, and the new version should be released as a final, published document.

REMA. 2010. Operationalisation of National Fund for Environment (FONERWA) in Rwanda. Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA) supported by Poverty and Environment Initiative. Kigali, 20p.

REMA. 2010. Parliamentary Workshop on the National State of the Environment for Rwanda and Environment Financing: Proceedings, Resolutions and Action Plan. The Parliament, Republic of Rwanda and Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA), Kigali. 25p + annexes.

Sustainable Energy Africa. 2006. Mainstreaming environment in energy strategies to address poverty in Rwanda: concept note. Commissioned by Poverty Environment Initiative, Rwanda. 12p.

Sustainable Energy Africa. No date. Policy Brief: Poverty-Environment-Energy Linkages in Rwanda. Mimeo, 21p.

Twesigye-Bakwatsa, Charles and Innocent Ntabana 2007. Poverty-Environment indicators and strategy for monitoring them within the framework of the EDPRS, Final Report. Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA), Kigali. 50p.

Twesigye-Bakwatsa, Charles. 2009. Mainstreaming environment in key development sectors, Progress, challenges and Prospects: a framework for effective and sustainable mainstreaming. Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI)/Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA), Kigali. 58p.

UNDP/UNEP. 2006. Environment and Poverty Reduction in Rwanda: an Assessment. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), draft version of March 2006, 24p.<sup>21</sup>

UNEP/ UNDP/ GOR. 2007. Pilot Integrated Ecosystem Assessment of Busegera. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) – United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – Government of Rwanda Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) Project, Kigali. 93p.

### Policy Briefings

All published by REMA in collaboration with MINECOFIN, no date of publication on documents (actually published in 2010), series entitled Environmental Mainstreaming in Rwanda, each document 2 pages:

- Policy Briefing 1: Decreasing Vulnerability
- Policy Briefing 2: Agriculture and Development
- Policy Briefing 3: Environment and the Economy
- Policy Briefing 4: Economy and Energy
- Policy Briefing 5: Environment and Water Resources

### Unpublished technical documents

Environment Mainstreaming into the SIP 2011/2012, Practical guidelines. Mimeo, 8p.  
UNEP/ UNDP/ GOR. 2009. Communication Plan 2009: Enhancing and popularising environmental issues among key stakeholders in Rwanda through the Poverty Environment Initiative (PEI). United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) –

---

<sup>21</sup> It is understood that there is a final version of this document, but this evaluation has not yet been able to locate it.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – Government of Rwanda Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) Project, Kigali.

Mitchell. E, and M. Kabutura: 2006. Sector Matrices and Key Note Papers on Mainstreaming Environment. UNDP-UNEP- Government of Rwanda.

### Training modules

The project has prepared a number of training modules that are not yet in the public domain. It is recommended (see section 6.6) that all these be finalised, edited and published in electronic versions to allow for their use by other agencies.

### Audio-visual materials

Movie produced for and presented at OECD meeting.

Movie produced and aired for World Environment Day 2010.

### **Appendix 3: List of people interviewed**

#### Rwanda Environmental Management Agency (REMA)

- Rose MUKANKOMEJE, Director General, dgrema@gmail.com
- Denis RUGEGE, Environmental Assessments Advisor, denis.rugege@undp.org
- Cornelius KAZOORA, Consultant, sdc@infocom.co.ug
- Charles TWESIGYE-BAKWATSA, Consultant, craconsult@yahoo.com

#### Poverty Environment Initiative project team (at REMA)

- Fred SABITI, Project Coordinator
- Alex MULISA, Consultant

#### Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning:

- Maximilien USENGUMUREMY, Planning Officer in Charge of Cross-Cutting Issues, Development Planning Unit, maximilien.usengumuremy@minecofin.go.rw
- James TUMWINE, EDPRS Coordinator, james.tumwine@minecofin.gov.rw

#### Ministry of Environment and Lands

- Kellen MUBERARUGO, Intern

#### Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources

- Madeleine USABYIMBABAZI, Intern, madousa2020@yahoo.fr

#### Ministry of Infrastructure

- Silas RUZIGANA, Energy Expert in charge of Biomass and Alternatives, Member of National Steering Committee on Climate Change, ruziganasi@gmail.com
- Jean Bosco HAGWIRINEZA, Intern

#### Ministry of Local Government

- Egide RUGAMBA, Director General in charge of Planning and Monitoring & Evaluation, rugamba@minaloc.gov.rw
- Jackson MUGISHA, Intern

#### Ministry of Trade and Industry

- Christian TWAHIRWA, Planning and Budgeting Expert, twahirwachristian@gmail.com

#### United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

- John MUSEMAKWERI, Head, Environmental Unit, john.musemakweri@undp.org

- Yuko SUZUKI NAAB, Aid Effectiveness Specialist, Office of the UNDP Resident Coordinator and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, yuko.suzuki@undp.org

#### Delegation of the European Union in Rwanda

- Olivier MACHIELS, Attaché, Rural Economy, Food Security and Environment, Olivier.machiels@ec.europa.eu
- Diego ZURDO, Rural Economy, Food Security and Environment, diego.zurdo@eeas.europa.eu

#### Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA):

- Janvier NTALINDWA, Program Officer, Environment and Natural Resources, Embassy of Sweden, janvier.ntalindwa@sida.se

#### Nile Basin Initiative:

- Innocent KABENGA, Assistant Regional Project Manager, NELSAP/Kagera River Basin Management Project, ikabenga@nilebasin.org

#### Civil society organisations:

- Charles B. GAHIRE, National Coordinator, Rwanda Environment Awareness Services Organization Network (REASON), reasonrwanda@yahoo.co.uk
- Annie KAIRABA, Director, Rwanda Initiative for Sustainable Development, risd@rwanda1.com
- Johnson NKUSI, Executive Director, Rwanda Bamboo Society and Chairperson, Rwanda Environmental Non-Governmental Organisation Forum (RENGOF), umumkurwc@yahoo.com
- Oscar NZABONIMPA, Coordinateur, Action pour la Protection de l'Environnement et la Promotion des Filières Agricoles (APEFA), apefa2007@yahoo.fr

In addition to these interviews, the consultant received very useful guidance, information and recommendations from colleagues at the PEI Africa Regional Support Programme team, before, during and after his mission to Rwanda.