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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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| DRG | Development Results Group |
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| IPG | Inclusive Participation in Governance |
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| NIM | National Implementation Modality |
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| OHCHR | Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights |
| PFM | Public Financial Management |
| PSGG | Program for Strengthening Good Governance |
| RBA | Rwanda Broadcasting Agency |
| RBM | Results Based Management |
| RGB | Rwanda Governance Board |
| RGS | Rwanda Governance Score Card |
| RMB | Rwanda Media Barometer |
| RMC | Rwanda Media Council |
| Sida | Swedish International Development Agency |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UNCT | UN country Team |
| UNDAP | United Nations Development Assistance Plan |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| UNEG | United Nations Evaluation Group |
| UNV | United Nations Volunteers |
| UPR | Universal Periodic Review |
| YPLA | Youth Political Leadership Academy |

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

***Introduction***

The One UN and the Government of Rwanda (GoR) launched the Deepening Democracy Through strengthening Citizen participation and Accountable Governance programme (DDAG) in September 2013. The DDAG is a follow-up programme to the 2007 – 2011 Programme for Strengthening Good Governance (PSGG) and 2012 – 2013 Inclusive Participation in Governance (IPG) bridging programme.

The mid-term evaluation of the DDAG focuses on the period September 2013 to March 2016 and is forward looking. The evaluation aims to assess and document the achieved results, draw lessons learnt, identify challenges and make recommendations for the second half of the Programme.

***Approach and Methodology***

The mid-term evaluation was conducted from May to July 2016 through a majorly consultative process conducted in four phases. The first phase included planning with UNDP and focal points of implementing partners (IPs). The second stage involved data collection through desktop review of relevant literature, key informant interviews and group discussions. A total of 47 individuals were consulted during this process. The findings presented are mainly based on information gathered from these sources.

***Key Findings***

The evaluation finds the overall results rating for the DDAG program to be Satisfactory. The three main criteria of the Results rating - Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency received “Satisfactory,” “Marginally Satisfactory” and “satisfactory” ratings respectively. The table below provides a summary of the DDAG ratings from this evaluation.

| Criterion | Rating |
| --- | --- |
| Programme Relevance |  |
| Programme concept and rational | Satisfactory |
| Programme Risk and Assumptions analysis | Satisfactory |
| Programme Effectiveness |  |
| Key Stakeholders’ participation | Marginally Satisfactory |
| Programme implementation arrangements | Satisfactory |
| Programme Efficiency |  |
| Financial planning and management | Marginally Satisfactory |
| Programme Planning | Highly Satisfactory |
| Programme Monitoring and evaluation | Satisfactory |
| Programme Results |  |
| Output 1: *National and local institutions have improved capacity for research, generation and utilization of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence-based legislation, policy and programme formulation and evaluation at all levels.* | Satisfactory |
| Output 2: *Central, decentralized entities and communities strengthened to promote community-driven development processes.* | Satisfactory |
| Output 3: *National oversight institutions strengthened to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels.* | Satisfactory |
| Output 4: *Citizens, communities and media have better capacity to participate in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels.* | Satisfactory |
| Output 5: *Implementing partners have a better capacity to manage the programme* | Highly Satisfactory |
| Sustainability |  |
| Sustainability of Results and actions | Moderately likely |

***Lessons learnt***

The key lessons learnt from the evaluation highlighted in this report describe both shortcomings and best practices that should be considered in the design, planning and implementation of the remaining half of the Program.

The main lessons learnt include:

* Not all information in the governance monitoring tools are adequately disaggregated to ensure their utility especially at decentralised levels and there is still limited dissemination and follow-up of the usage of these governance tools in influencing policy and decision-making.
* The local government monitoring system (LGMS) has been developed but there is limited evidence of its awareness or usage at district or central levels.
* Various feasibility studies have been conducted and strategies developed but there are limited resources within the IPs to implement them without external financing or technical assistance.
* Volunteers’ support to civic education and election process has proved invaluable however there are various unresolved issues in for example civic and voter education and management of volunteers’ welfare that pose risks to their effective operations and sustenance.
* Political organisations have been empowered especially at grass roots but they still lack strong membership bases and the human and financial resources to implement some of the required actions to ensure their strengths are realised.
* The programme has supported women’s participation in politics in Rwanda but barriers ranging from societal norms to individual responsibilities limit them from further engagement in political affairs and leadership roles.
* Implementation of programme activities at parliament in quarter two of FY2015 was affected by national events such as the concluded referendum that superseded planned program actions.
* Media reforms have created a satisfactory legal and regulatory framework for the media industry but media organisations still face challenges with respect to financial and capacity building challenges. They need to be strengthened for effective delivery of their mandates.
* The programme’s managing agent has fulfilled most of its capacity strengthening commitments to its implementing partners, but other participating agents (UNV, UN Women and OHCHR) are yet to meet many of their technical assistance and financial commitments as all of them have been adversely affected by the recent budget cuts experienced by the One UN. However these partners have still indirectly contributed to the broader outcomes of the DDAG through for example the National Gender Machinery, of which UN women is a key member.

***Recommendations***

Below is a summary of only key recommendations of the Mid-term evaluation

1. Develop comprehensive communication strategies for the findings of governance monitoring tools and package them in more user-friendly formats and languages.
2. Provide more disaggregation of findings of the governance monitoring tools, focusing mainly on gender and geographical distribution to enhance relevance.
3. Engage more national stakeholders in the management and ownership of the LGMS.
4. Assess feasibility and pilot usage of ICTs in the implementation of MSGs to address the high cost and replication needs of the intervention.
5. Contemplate orienting focus of the final stages of the DDAG to emphasise civic and voter education and public sensitisation to demonstrate the programme’s cognizance of the upcoming presidential elections.
6. Conduct an impact assessment of the programme capacity building interventions at NEC, NFPO and MHC to identify best practices for replication, assess their effectiveness and need for re-design.
7. Re-strategize to realise implementation of the media digital resources centre to provide the lacking infrastructure in the media industry.
8. Conduct research on the evolving nature of media that seeks to devise mechanisms of how to address the free media and journalism growing irrepressibly through social media and other ICT platforms.
9. Develop mechanisms to increase private sector investment in media industry, focusing on key gaps such as content development.
10. Assess the possibility of revising the programme budget approval system from quarterly to biannual to address delays in approval of work plans and disbursements.
11. Earmark resources for design and implementation of resource mobilization strategies in the second half of the programme.
12. Organise an annual review session post the mid-term evaluation to conduct a critical reflection on how to re-focus DDAG actions based on the current One UN financial capacity and emerging priorities.
13. Conduct gender-mainstreaming training in governance for the implementing partners.
14. Review the programme results frameworks to adopt more traceable and trackable outputs such as those proposed by the IPs during their last RBM training.

# Introduction

The One UN and the Government of Rwanda (GoR) launched the Deepening Democracy Through strengthening citizen participation and Accountable governance programme (DDAG) in September 2013. The DDAG was established as a follow-up programme to the 2007 – 2011 Programme for Strengthening Good Governance (PSGG) and 2012 – 2013 Inclusive Participation in Governance (IPG) bridging programme. The DDAG that is to be implemented from 2013 – 2018 has reached its mid point of implementation and requires a mid-term evaluation as per the programme’s design.

The mid-term evaluation of the DDAG is forward looking. The evaluation aims to assess and document the achieved results, draw lessons learnt, identify challenges and make recommendations for the second half of the Programme. The evaluation assesses the DDAG design, scope, implementation status and the capacity to achieve the programme objectives. It collates and analyses lessons learnt, challenges faced and best practices obtained during implementation of the first 31 months of the DDAG and uses the findings to propose appropriate actions for the second half of the programme and later phases, if any.

## Scope of the mid-term evaluation

The mid-term evaluation of the DDAG covering the period September 2013 to March 2016[[1]](#endnote-2) assesses the effectiveness of the implementation strategy including the implementation modalities, co- financing, One UN and GoR roles and responsibilities, coordination, partnership arrangements, institutional arrangements, beneficiary participation, replication and sustainability of the programme. The evaluation reviews programme design, risks and assumptions made at the beginning of the programme development process. It gauges the extent to which the programme results have been achieved thus far, partnerships established, capacities built, and cross cutting issues of gender and human rights addressed. It also assesses whether the programme implementation strategy has been optimum and recommends areas for improvement and learning.

## Approach and methodology

The mid-term evaluation of the DDAG was conducted from May to July 2016. The evaluation process used a consultative approach and was conducted in four phases. The first phase involved basic data gathering and evaluation design planning. This planning was conducted in consultation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the five DDAG implementing partners[[2]](#footnote-2) (IPs). It also involved a review of relevant background documents including the DDAG programme document, Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) II 2013 - 2018, and the United Nations Development Assistance Program (UNDAP) 2013 - 2018. Following the document review and consultations, an inception report was produced and reviewed by the programmes’ implementing partners. The final inception report described the mid-term evaluation design, implementation schedule and draft report format.

The second phase of the mid-term evaluation process focused on primary data collection. This was conducted through key informant interviews (KII), in-depth individual and group interviews, primary literature review, focus group discussions (FGDs) and observations made during field visits. A total of 47 individuals were consulted during the data collection process.

The evaluator was provided with an initial list of documents in the Terms of Reference (ToR). Further guidance on relevant documents, was provided by the Democratic Governance and Peace Consolidation Unit management at UNDP and implementing partners’ focal points consulted during the planning phase. References to documentation are noted, in most cases, in footnotes and the full list of documents cited by the evaluator is annexed to this report. Using purposive sampling at least 47 individuals were identified and interviewed. All individuals identified for mainly the KIIs were selected during the inception phase through consultations with UNDP and the IPs focal persons. The respondents ranged from key implementing partners to central and local Government officials, programme activities’ beneficiaries at district and sector levels. Also Program beneficiaries in different associations, women and youth were consulted mainly through FGDs and group interviews.

The evaluation gathered data from respondents in Kigali city (Gasabo, Kicukiro and Nyarugenge districts), Eastern province (Rwamagana district) and Northern Province (Gicumbi district). Locations were selected based on the sites of implementation of the DDAG programme activities. The face-to-face and focus group interviews followed the same pattern, namely, a brief introduction on the purpose of the mission followed by identification of the interaction individuals have with the DDAG or its activities, and their views on the programme activities. Particular emphasis was placed on whether the person being interviewed had achieved their objectives, whether they had done this effectively, and whether the programme’s products and benefits were likely to be sustainable. A full list of persons consulted is in the annex of this report.

## Evaluation criteria

The ToR requires specific aspects of the DDAG programme cited in the scope of the evaluation to be addressed by the mid-term evaluation and a commentary, analysis provided for each. The evaluation uses the following evaluation criteria[[3]](#endnote-3) as the basis upon which the required DDAG aspects are assessed.

***Relevance of the Program***: This criterion reviews the programme design, assumptions made at the inception of the DDAG, extent to which the programme results are contributing to the relevant EDPRS II targets and UNDAP results areas, appropriateness of the partnership strategy, necessity of the One UN support and continued relevance to the GoR Priorities.

***Effectiveness of the management processes***: This criterion of the evaluation assesses the programmes’ implementation modalities, co-financing strategies, One UN-GoR roles and responsibilities, effectiveness of coordination and partnership arrangements, levels of institutional strengthening, beneficiary participation and opportunities for replication and extent of delivery against programme targets.

***Efficiency of Program implementation***: The mid-term evaluation reviews the extent to which the DDAG implementation strategy has been optimum. It explores the degree to which resources are being used to produce the intended outputs and how resources could be used more efficiently to achieve the intended results. This includes the allocation of all the One UN support (all projects and technical assistance) towards the specified outcomes, analysis of delivery and funding, the reasons some initiatives are implemented faster than others and how the partnerships have influenced efficiency through cost-sharing measures and complementary activities.

***Sustainability of the Program***: This criterion examines the sustainability of the programme using a checklist developed during the inception stage. The checklist assesses the likelihood of continuation of the DDAG outcomes and to a certain extent key actions following phasing out of support form the One UN. This assessment also provides recommendations around key factors that will require attention in order to improve sustainability of the programme results.

To arrive at precise means of measuring progress of the DDAG programme at this stage and for the final evaluation, this mid-term evaluation uses the UNDP six-point rating scale[[4]](#endnote-4) to assess the above four evaluation criteria with respect to the scope of evaluation aspects. Each of the aspects is rated separately with brief justifications based on findings. In addition, the programme results are rated, as has the program as a whole. The UNDP six-point rating scale includes;

Table 1: The Six-Point Performance Rating Scale

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***6*** | ***Highly Satisfactory (HS)*** | The project has no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency |
| ***5*** | ***Satisfactory (S)*** | The project has minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency |
| ***4*** | ***Marginally Satisfactory (MS)*** | The project has moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency |
| ***3*** | ***Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)*** | The project has significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency |
| ***2*** | ***Unsatisfactory (U)*** | The project has major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency |
| ***1*** | ***Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):*** | The project has severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency |

In addition to the above rating criteria each of the programme outcomes is rated in relation to sustainability using the following 4 point-scale:

***Likely (L):*** There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability,

***Moderately Likely (ML):*** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability,

***Moderately Unlikely (MU):*** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability,

***Unlikely (U):*** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

## Limitations of the evaluation

The mid-term evaluation encountered various constraints during execution that limit the depth and breadth possible within the time and resources allocated to the evaluation process. Below is a description of significant limitations of this mid-term evaluation of the DDAG.

***Limited availability of interviewees:*** The DDAG program includes implementing partners such as the national Parliament and the Rwanda Governance Board whose leadership and management are actively engaged in various national level activities. This limited their availability for most of the consultations during the evaluation and subsequently stretched the time frame over which the data collection process was planned to be conducted.

***Limited awareness of the DDAG programme and the One UN support:*** Many of the individuals consulted, other than those who are in direct planning and implementation of the DDAG, exhibit limited knowledge or awareness of the DDAG or the funding entities. However, most if not all of the consulted respondents are aware of the activities being implemented or supported by the programme. This limits most of the assessment to issues of specific actions and less about the broader programme structure, design and approach from the perspective of beneficiaries.

***Context of implementation of the DDAG***: Many of the programme actions target to mainly bring about change at higher levels of the results chain rather than through direct influence on beneficiaries. For example media reforms, influencing policy through generating evidence on governance and improving oversight role of national institutions and their key actions with broad outcomes that beneficiaries are not able to easily attribute to one actor. This made sampling of beneficiaries especially at district levels difficult. This limits the extent to which the outcomes of the DDAG can be generalised to the entire Rwandan population. It is for reason of this context that the mid-term evaluation uses purposive sampling to ensure respondents consulted are familiar with mainly key actions and outcomes of the programme rather than implementers or funders of the DDAG.

## Structure of the mid-term evaluation report

The mid-term evaluation report has been kept brief, succinct and easy to understand. It is made up of four substantive parts. Following the executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the full report, the first part provides the introduction and background to the assignment. It starts with a brief introduction to the DDAG and it then explains the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used.

The next part is the main substantive part of this report and comprises four inter-related sections. It first presents a contextual description of the DDAG’s implementation socio-political environment. It then presents the programme profile, design, implementation approach and strategies.

The third part presents the key findings of the mid-term evaluation in terms of the basic programme concept and design, its implementation, administration and management, its achievements, progress and the potential for sustainability of the products and services that it has produced thus far. The findings are based on factual evidence obtained by the evaluator through document reviews and consultations with implementers and beneficiaries.

The last part includes the lessons learnt during the evaluation which are general observations about the programme and context relevant to its implementation. This section in turn leads to the final section comprising the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation. The conclusions section summarises the ratings given and conclusions that have been reached throughout the rest of the report and augments them to create a cohesive ending arising from the enquiry process.

# Project description and development context

## Country context

Despite its tragic history Rwanda continues to be recognised as one of Africa’s success stories. Boosted by an average annual economic growth rate of more than 10% in the decade after 1995, this momentum has been sustained culminating in a developmental "hat trick" of sustained economic growth (8% average), poverty reduction (12% points) and a reduction in income inequality[[5]](#endnote-5). Remarkable socio-economic progress has been made over the last two decades demonstrated by a 312% increase in per capita GDP from $206 in 2002 to $644 in 2012 while resisting any inflationary pressure, majorly attributed to the GoR’s successful management of the economy[[6]](#endnote-6).

In the area of governance, Rwanda has made significant advances in national reconciliation, law and order, accountability as well as in rebuilding and strengthening of national capacities for good governance, particularly through home-grown initiatives. Notable advances have also been made in public sector reforms and decentralisation as well as in anticorruption measures. Despite this progress, certain areas of governance and inclusive participation present challenges and opportunities for further improvement.

***Inclusive participation:*** The GoR, specifically the NEC, has made commendable progress in the area of elections. A needs assessment mission in January 2013 of the electoral environment in Rwanda revealed NEC’s technical competence and called for continued support and technical assistance to the institution. Furthermore, in the 2014 RGS, universal adult suffrage for all citizens scored 98.8%, while the overall quality of democracy improved to 84.4% from 81% in 2012 RGS. However, the overall score of vibrancy of non-state actors in engaging in political decisions and policy processes dropped to 59.7%. Further still, political parties were only represented at national level, and availability of operational political parties’ bureaus at district level remained at 30%. There is also low participation of civil society organisations (CSOs) in governance processes, where only 72.3% of CSOs influence public policy, while CSOs holding state and private corporations accountable is at 48% and political parties’ registration and operation at 75.83%[[7]](#endnote-7). In the area of gender empowerment, women participation in decision-making at central and local government levels is at 73.30 % and 62.20% respectively and 78.91 % of the citizen expressed satisfaction with gender parity in leadership[[8]](#endnote-8). These statistics reveal gaps in areas of political participation through political parties at lower levels, gender mainstreaming and weaknesses in CSOs’ engagement with the GoR.

***Institutions of accountability:*** The Prime Minister’s report (2014) indicates significant improvements with over 80% of Parliamentary recommendations implemented and the UN has continuously supported select committees of the parliament to engage directly with citizens. However, monitoring implementation of recommendations still requires some improvements8. In addition, the 2008/9 Joint Governance Assessment (JGA) recommended an institutional capacity audit of parliament to inform committees’ capacity strengthening and planning in order to fulfil their oversight role effectively[[9]](#endnote-9). Regarding the media as an instrument of accountability, there are still challenges in accessing information from public institutions. RGS 2014, rates access to public information at 76.5%. However, various legal reforms have been realised in the media sector, most importantly with regard to access to information and functioning of regulatory bodies. Given the nascent nature of Rwanda’s media industry, ample technical support is required to facilitate application of the laws while support is still needed in building capacity, establishing professional infrastructure and ensuring sustenance of the media industry.

***Evidence based governance***: RGB has been supported by the UN in building capacity and implementing generation of political, social and economic data for evidence-based policy-making and planning. However, in-depth analysis and utilisation of existing information for policy making, planning and monitoring and evaluation remains a challenge especially at local government levels. Therefore there is need to not only further disaggregate the data into more useable information but also enhance dialogue between state, civil society and citizens on the findings of these evidence tools.

***Capacity building***: Rwanda is a rapidly developing country where institutions continue to emerge as legal frameworks evolve. Over the last ten years, Rwanda Governance Advisory Council was transformed into RGB, the MHC evolved from having a media sector regulatory mandate to a solely capacity building role, the ARJ was created to advocate for journalists while the RMC has taken on the media self-regulatory role. Some of these nascent institutions such as the RMC are just in the process of establishing their organisation structures and institutional prerequisites. Similarly parliamentary committees continue to arise and comprise of new members[[10]](#endnote-10). This dynamic context requires continued support in building and sustaining the capacity required to ensure these institutions fulfil their mandates in contributing to sustainable democratic and accountable governance in Rwanda.

## The DDAG Programme profile

The purpose of the joint programme is to deepen democracy and strengthen citizen participation and accountability in governance. It addresses the challenges in democratic governance especially in reinforcing inclusive participation and strengthening political accountability by addressing the issues of political participation, media-sector reforms and use of evidence based governance and planning.

This joint programme is aligned to the programming cycle of the GoR and the One UN through the EDPRS II (2013-2018) and the UNDAP (2013-2018). The DDAG is intended to efficiently respond to the national priorities as expressed in the EDPRS II and the UNDAP for the period 2013-2018. The programme specifically contributes to achievement of Result 2, Outcome 1 of the UNDAP which is “*Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision making process at all levels*.” It lays special focus on women and youth in their increased participation in decision-making and development processes. The DDAG is structured for implementation through four key components8.

### Programme objectives and outputs

The DDAG programme has four main components being implemented through five implementing partner and the One UN to deliver five outputs presented in table two below.

Table 2: DDAG Programme Components and outputs

|  | Component | IPs | Outputs | Key Actions |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | **Availing Evidence for Governance** | RGB | ***Output 1:******National and local institutions have improved capacity for research, generation and utilization of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence-based legislation, policy and programme formulation and evaluation at all levels.*** | * RGS * JGA * Policy Dialogues |
| 2 | **Facilitating Participation and Dialogue** | RGB  RGB | ***Output 2: Central, decentralized entities and communities strengthened to promote community-driven development processes****.*  ***Output 4:******Citizens, communities and media have better capacity to participate in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels.*** | * CRC * LGMS * HGIs Support * Disseminate research findings * MSG |
| NEC | * Volunteerism study * Review Electoral Law * Volunteers training * BRIDGE Training * Political parties & Media elections training * Voter education TNA and training * Media monitoring * Media code of conduct |
| NFPO | * Youth Political Leadership Academy * Women’s political parties wings * Research in topical issues * Update political parties manifestos * Annual national conference * Research in women leadership |
| 3 | **Strengthening Mechanism for Accountability** | Parliament | ***Output 3: National oversight institutions strengthened to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels****.* | * MPs induction * Citizen engagement * Feedback M&E framework * Article 9 & 54 progress assessment |
| MHC | * Media trainings * Media Resource Centre * Engendering media * Media Dialogues * Research in media |
| RGB | * RMB * Annual Development Journalism Awards * Support RMC, ARJ, RBA |
| 4 | **Capacity Strengthening** | UNDP | ***Output 5: Implementing partners have a better capacity to manage the programme*** | * IPs capacity needs assessment * IPs Capacity building strategy * Staff RGB programme team * Provide qualified UN volunteer * Support through full PMU |

### Programme approach and strategy

The direct beneficiaries of the DDAG are institutions involved in its implementation, as they will have their capacities built. These include: Rwanda Governance Board (RGB), Media High Council (MHC), and National Forum for Political Organisations (NFPO), Rwandan Parliament, National Electoral Commission (NEC), as well as the relevant media institutions including Association of Rwanda Journalists (ARJ) and Rwanda Media Commission (RMC) supported through RGB. Furthermore, other Government institutions will benefit through data, reports and assessments produced by the programme. The media fraternity will have its capacity built in order to engage in self-regulation and more professional journalistic practices. The citizens of Rwanda are the primary beneficiaries of the programme as the expected outcomes will deepen democracy, open up platforms for dialogue and engagement as well as ensure free flow of information that will enhance citizen capacity to make decisions. It will also provide a mechanism for constantly giving feedback on government performance at all levels.

This joint programme is currently funded through a pool fund mechanism of the One UN Fund sourced from the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) and UNDP Core funds, whereas the programme document also foresees funding from UN Women. The UN partners in the DDAG include UNDP, UN Women, United Nations Volunteers (UNV) and the Office of the United Nations High commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). These agencies and programmes contribute their core resources and/or technical expertise to the programme. In addition, funds are mobilised bilaterally through the One UN mechanism within the framework of the UNDAP. UNDP is the managing agent of the pooled funds of the joint programme and coordination is effected through a programme steering committee8.

### Justification of DDAG intervention areas

The outcomes of the programme are that citizens will be able to access more public information and policy makers will use evidence based information for decision making as well as for planning their own development; that services to citizens will be delivered in a timely manner and of high quality at all levels and there will be gender parity in leadership at all levels. This will eventually result into a more peaceful and democratic society, where freedoms and human rights are fully protected and respected and management of public affairs, including resources is conducted in a more effective, accountable and transparent manner at national and decentralized levels.

### DDAG Programme Stakeholders

The Joint programme has five primary stakeholders who form the implementing partners of the DDAG. The IPs are responsible for specific aspects of the programme as demonstrated in table three below.

Table 3: DDAG Programme key stakeholders

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Primary Stakeholders | Intervention areas |
| 1 | Rwanda Governance Board (RGB) | Generating evidence based research, assessment and media reform activities |
| 2 | Media High Council (MHC) | Media capacity building activities |
| 3 | Rwanda Parliament | Legislative and oversight activities |
| 4 | National Forum for Political Organisations (NFPO) | Strengthening political engagement and dialogue among youth and women |
| 5 | National Electoral Commission (NEC) | Delivery of free, fair and credible parliamentary, local and Presidential elections |
| 6 | One UN (UNDP, UNV, UNWOMEN, OHCHR) | Programme funding, coordination and technical assistance |

# KEY FINDINGS

# Analysis of programme design

## Analysis of the DDAG Rationale

A results chain is an open set of tools for programme design and management. Its purpose is to provide a clear, rational framework for planning envisioned activities and determining how to measure a programme’s success, while taking external factors into account.

The DDAG programme utilised a results framework to guide the design and implementation of the four components in order to reach its goals. Below we analyse the extent of use and logic of the results chain in the design, implementation and evaluation of the programme.

*Improved accountability and citizen participation in sustainable development and decision-making process at all levels*.

**Component 4:**

Strengthened individual, organizational and institutional capacities

**Component 3:**

Accountability Mechanisms strengthened

**Component 2:**

Participation and dialogue facilitated

**Component 1:**

Evidence for accountable governance availed

**Output 4:**

Citizens, communities and media have better capacity to participate in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels.

**Output 3:**

National oversight institutions strengthened to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels.

**Output 5:** Implementing partners have a better capacity to manage the programme

**Output 3:**

National oversight institutions strengthened to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels.
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Figure 1: DDAG Programme Results Chain

Using the results chain in figure one above the mid-term evaluation analyses the logical flow of the intended programme results with regard to the DDAG overall outcome/goal. Firstly, the DDAG goal aims to contribute to sustainable peace and development in Rwanda by enhancing accountable governance through increasing citizen participation in decision making at all levels of governance. This overarching result is assessed as a direct catalyst and contributor to the overarching goal of the EDPRS II, accountable governance thematic area which is to *“Enhance accountable governance by promoting citizen participation and mobilisation for delivery of development, strengthening public accountability and improving service delivery”*. Ultimately the programme contributes to achievement of the following EDPRS II targets for 2018: 90% Citizens satisfied with decentralization and participation, 81% Citizens satisfied with gender parity in leadership, 80% Citizens satisfied with access to public information and 85% Citizens satisfied with (timeliness and quality of) service delivery at the local level.

The first levels of outcomes of the programme are derived by this evaluation as the results of the four components of the DDAG. They are gauged as the equivalent of specific objectives of the four components, these include; Evidence for accountable governance availed; Participation and dialogue facilitated; Accountability Mechanisms strengthened; Strengthened individual, organisational and institutional capacities of key implementing entities. All these outcomes are appraised as of direct relevance to the accountable governance in Rwanda.

In terms of alignment to national priorities and strategies, there are coherent linkages between DDAG programme outputs and the five outcomes of the accountable governance thematic area of the EDPRS II demonstrated below;

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DDAG Programme outputs** | | **EDPRS II Accountable governance Outcomes** |
| **Output 1:** National and local institutions have improved capacity for research, generation and utilization of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence-based legislation, policy and programme formulation and evaluation at all levels. | **Output 5:** Implementing partners have a better capacity to manage the programme | **Outcome 2.1:** Improved citizens’ scores on the provision of services  **Outcome 2.2:** Improved awareness of service delivery standards and rights |
| **Output 2:** Central, decentralized entities and communities strengthened to promote community-driven development processes. | **Outcome 1.1:** Increased citizen participation in planning processes and solving their own problems |
| **Output 4:** Citizens, communities and media have better capacity to participate in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels. | **Outcome 1.2:** Enhanced information flows and participation of the population through established and new channels |
| **Output 3:** National oversight institutions strengthened to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels. | **Outcome 1.3:** Strengthened accountability |

Figure 2: Alignment of DDAG Outputs and EDPRS II Accountable governance outcomes

There are clear linkages between the DDAG outputs and the EDPRS II accountable governance outcomes whereby delivery of all four key outputs enabled by the realisation of output five will inherently contribute to the key outcomes that primarily focus on citizen participation and quality service delivery. For example through availing socio-economic evidence such as performance in service delivery through the DDAG output one, citizens are instinctively made aware of the service delivery standards, as applies to the other outputs.

There are only **two arising issues** in the programme logic that relate both to design and implementation.

In the first instance as illustrated in the programme results chain many of the outputs contribute to more than one component outcome, for example output four contributes to component two and three, while key actions allocated to single outputs also contribute to various outputs. For example facilitation of policy dialogues will contribute to outputs one and two, while election education for media will feed into outputs four and three. However during consultations with different implementing partners, majority emphasise how they focus and are accountable for one or two outputs at the most, which based on the results chain is not ideally the case. This focus on delivery against one output is identified in this evaluation as a major contributor to the insufficient synergy among IPs during implementation which will be assessed further under efficiencies of implementation of this MTE report.

The other arising issue is not dire but has implications on the monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems of the programme. As illustrated in figure two above, DDAG outputs are at the same level in the hierarchy of results as the outcomes of the EDPRS II. This makes it rather challenging to programme managers given that monitoring in basic project management is conducted at the output level of results. This has contributed to the gaps, later identified in the programme reports, that are mainly attributed to the requirement to report on results which is inversely affected by the formulation of outputs that can in most instances only be realistically attained in the medium or long-term rather than as immediate deliverables.

**Overall assessment of program logic**: The DDAG Programme results chain is coherent and strategically aligned to Rwanda’s broader strategic policies and programs, in particular EDPRS II and more specifically, the accountable governance thematic area. All outputs and outcomes make clear contributions to the overall goal of the programme.

The only emerging issue is the seemingly static alignment of activities to single outputs despite the clear interlinkages between key actions and need for synergy in implementation. The other issue is the placement of outputs for the programme at a level of the results chain that the evaluation posits would be more suitable at a higher more medium-term outcome level rather immediate results or deliverables of such a medium-term programme.

Overall the rationale of the DDAG is evaluated as **Satisfactory.**

## Risks and assumptions analysis

In table four below we analyse the Programmes’ assumptions based on the DDAG risk management matrix.

Table 4:DDAG Programme risks and assumptions analysis

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identified Risk8 | Probability8  *High, Medium, Low* | Mitigation Measures8  Evaluation Analysis |
| 1.0 Withdrawal of Government’s Political support to Governance | Low | **Mitigation Measures:**  *Need for continued dialogue to ensure that this commitment remains central to the agenda.* |
| **Analysis:**  GoR has demonstrated continued support to governance and maintained good relations with the One UN throughout the first half of the DDAG. Continued use of evidence provided through for example the RGS in dialogue, implemented through the DDAG evidences this support. |
| 2.0 Financial commitment by Government of Rwanda to commissions, organisations and institutions of good governance dwindles | Medium | **Mitigation Measures:**  *The partnership that underpins this project (including the shared vision) needs to be part of ongoing dialogue.* |
| **Analysis:**  There have not been any new significant cutbacks to GoR funding by donors and the GoR has met all its financial commitments during the first half of the DDAG. Instead there has been increased allocation through for instance the newly created RMC that receives part financing from the GoR. |
| 3.0 Country becomes politically unstable through external/regional shocks | Low | **Mitigation Measures:**  *Review and assess regional developments systematically* |
| **Analysis:**  No significant external shocks have affected Rwanda, except for the instability in neighbouring Burundi. This has not had any significant effect on Rwanda socio-economy or the programme. However, the suggested mitigation measure is assessed as weak because it does not provide a remedial strategy but rather an open ill-defined statement of actions. |
| 4.0 Funding will not reach intended recipients or will be used for purposes other than intended due to corruption | Low | **Mitigation Measures:**  *Disbursement subject to UNDP audit processes, and progress/impact assessment part of M&E process* |
| **Analysis:**  Appropriate mitigation measures and rating were devised for this risk and have been implemented through tools such as the FACE[[11]](#footnote-3) forms and compliance with PFM regulations. |
| 5.0 Impact of project impeded by high staff turn-over (particularly amongst key personnel) in supported organisations | Medium | **Mitigation Measures:**  *Profile of organizations of good governance will rise through project, incentivizing working with them.* |
| **Analysis:**  The DDAG has mainly incentivised programme relevant staff though individual capacity building actions, but has still suffered from moderate impediments directly from departure of key personnel both at the managing agent and IP focal point levels. Overall the probability rating is assessed as inappropriate as it should be high given Rwanda’s competitive labour market context and the mitigation measure needs to be redesigned to provide actionable remedial strategies that can plausibly address the risk if encountered. |

*Source: Deepening democracy through strengthening citizen participation and accountable governance (UNDP, GoR, 2013)*

Generally the DDAG risk assessment was adequately undertaken and appropriate mitigation measures designed. There are no substantial gaps in the risk matrix and the only notable weaknesses are risk 3.0 where the mitigation measure is not realistically an actionable remedial measure that could sufficiently address the potential consequences associated with the presumed risk of political instability. The other weakness is in Risk 5.0 to do with relevant programme staff-turn over. The probability is assessed as medium which does not take into the context of Rwanda’s competitive labour market and the mitigation measure is assessed as insufficient to address the assumable risk. The revised risk matrix would need to upgrade the risk probability to High and suggest more feasible remedial strategies to address the risk of especially core staff turnover.

**Overall assessment of risk assessment and management**: Overall the mid-term assessment established that the risk assessment for the programme was adequately done and well documented in the risk and mitigation matrix of the DDAG programme document.

The gaps identified in the risk assessment are minor including the weak formulation of mitigation measures for the political instability and staff turnover risks and the need for reformulation of an adequate risk mitigation strategy for critical staff turnover that has been encountered during this first half of the program.

Overall the risk assessment is evaluated as **Satisfactory**

## Assessment of stakeholder participation

Table five below analyses the roles and contributions of each of the key stakeholders of the DDAG partners at different stages of the first half of the programme. Specifically, the MTE reviews different stakeholder’s contributions in the planning, implementation and evaluation phases of the programme.

Table 5:DDAG Programme key stakeholder participation review

| Stakeholder | Project Phase and Participation | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Planning** | **Implementation** | **Evaluation** |
| UNDP | * Undertook a detailed situation analysis in collaboration with all IPs and in consultation with all relevant GoR entities. * Elaborated and published the DDAG programme document | * Co-chairs the steering committee * Coordination and consolidation of IPs works plans and progress reports * Disbursement of funds as per financing agreement * Capacity building, advisory, administrative and technical support to implementing partners. | * Review of Monthly financial and Quarterly activity progress reports * Procurement and Coordination of the mid-term evaluation |
| UN Women | * Participating agent * Review and guidance on planned women empowerment key actions | * Direct support to forum for women parliamentarians * Direct support to Women’s empowerment programmes at NFPO   ***Gaps***   * Not met financial commitment of USD 403,600 but the agency has partly contributed to DDAG outputs through another Joint Programme (NGM) | * Participation in mid-term evaluation consultation process   ***Gaps***   * No indication of active participation in joint programme monitoring |
| UNV | * Participating agent | * Supported development of the National Volunteerism Policy   ***Gaps***   * Experienced a gap year 2013-2014 * Not met commitment to provide a qualified volunteer to the programme | * Participation in mid-term evaluation consultation process * Participated in the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) |
| OHCHR | * Participating agent | * None-Specified   ***Gaps***   * No Support provided to output 2 | * Participated in the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) |
| RGB | * Preparation of RGB key actions for the DDAG programme plan of implementation * Sensitisation of RGB senior management of the DDAG programme support | * Chairs the steering committee * Implementation of RGB activities as per programme work plans * Integrated and managed support to ARJ and RMC through its management operations * Coordination, monitoring and reporting of implementation of DDAG supported activities * Financial accountability of DDAG funds | * Internal review and documentation of programme achievements * Coordination and participation in the mid-term evaluation |
| Parliament | * Preparation of key actions for the DDAG programme plan of implementation * Sensitisation of select committees of DDAG’s support. | * Implementation of parliament activities as per DDAG work plans * Coordination, monitoring and reporting of implementation of DDAG supported activities * Financial accountability of DDAG funds | * Internal review and documentation of programme achievements * Coordination and participation in the mid-term evaluation |
| NFPO | * Preparation of NFPO key actions for the DDAG programme plan of implementation | * Implementation of NFPO’s activities as per DDAG work plans * Coordination, monitoring and reporting of implementation of DDAG supported activities * Financial accountability of DDAG funds | * Internal review and documentation of programme achievements * Coordination and participation in the mid-term evaluation |
| NEC | * Preparation of NEC key actions for the DDAG programme plan of implementation | * Implementation of NEC activities as per DDAG work plans * Coordination, monitoring and reporting of implementation of DDAG supported activities * Financial accountability of DDAG funds | * Internal review and documentation of programme achievements * Coordination and participation in the mid-term evaluation |
| MHC | * Preparation of MHC key actions for the DDAG programme plan of implementation | * Implementation of MHC activities as per DDAG work plans * Coordination, monitoring and reporting of implementation of DDAG supported activities * Financial accountability of DDAG funds | * Internal review and documentation of programme achievements * Coordination and participation in the mid-term evaluation |

The overall assessment is that majority of the key stakeholders of the DDAG programme have been actively engaged in the design, implementation and evaluation of the programme in the first half of the programme. Stakeholders with the most exceptional participation include UNDP as the managing agent and all five IPs.

The gaps in participation are identified mainly amongst the One UN participating agencies including UNWOMEN, UNV and OHCHR. UNWOMEN has however mainly been directly involved in Women’s empowerment activities such as supporting of capacity building of women representatives from political organisation. The only emerging issue is that despite the arrangement for funding of such programme activities to be done through the pooled funding mechanism, the activities were funded directly from UNWOMEN’s through the National Gender Machinery Joint Programme to NFPO. Also the programme document indicates that UNWOMEN is supposed to contribute USD 403,600 to the programme pooled funds, however the participating agent has not yet met this commitment due to financial constraints resulting from overall budget cuts to the One UN.

UNV is supposed to contribute technical expertise regarding community participation and engagement, in particular under output two, as well as provide technical assistance through recruitment of a qualified UN volunteers to support coordination of the joint programme and capacity building of partners in the area of citizen and community participation. The participating agent has not yet met this commitment.

According to the DDAG programme document the OHCHR is planned to be involved in output two specifically working with the oversight institutions (parliament and media). However the mid-term evaluation finds no substantial evidence that the OHCHR has participated in any active role with these oversight institutions through the auspices of the DDAG. Worse still review of the programme results framework indicated no planned actions with direct involvement of the parliament or media under output two; “*Central, decentralized entities and communities strengthened to promote community-driven development processes*”. Therefore apart from the OHCHR not being an active participant in the planning or implementation of the DDAG, the organisation’s limited participation is partly attributed to the lack of a clear definition of its expected role or contribution to the DDAG programme.

**Overall assessment of partner’s participation**: Overall the mid-term assessment established that the UNDP, RGB, NFPO, Parliament, MHC and NEC have been actively involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the DDAG. Meanwhile there has been limited participation of the participating agents - UNV, UNWOMEN and OHCHR throughout the first half of the programme.

The overall participation of the partners of the DDAG is assessed as **Marginally Satisfactory**

## Programme management and coordination

### Programme implementation arrangements

The DDAG joint programme is supported by the One UN through joint work plans of the managing agent (UNDP) and participating UN agencies and entities (UNWOMEN, UNV and OHCHR). All initiatives under this programme are coordinated by efforts under the Development Results Group II (DRG 2) that in turn reports to the UN country Team (UNCT). UNDP as the managing agent of the joint programme and lead UN agency in governance, participates in donor coordination groups (not clear) and development partner meetings where it represents the DDAG as the governance country support programme to Rwanda. In addition UNDP collaborates with RGB, NFPO, NEC, MHC, and Parliament

The DDAG coordination and implementation arrangements are structured in the four levels illustrated in figure three below. At the helm of the structure is the steering committee comprised of the Heads of the implementing partner institutions and Heads of participating UN agencies and the ministry of finance and economic planning (MINECOFIN). The steering committee is responsible for oversight, review of programme progress, ensuring implementation resonates with required procedures and work plans and making recommendations for strengthening implementation.

UNDP as the lead managing agent of the DDAG provides leadership in terms of overall coordination, joint planning, monitoring and reporting. Throughout the first half of the programme there has been a programme manager responsible for the day-today project management documentation, consolidation of reports, work plans, implementation strategies and funds management. However by the time of the mid-term evaluation, this staff had left the programme and the recruitment process of a replacement was on-going.

The third level of coordination and implementation of the DDAG is the technical committee. This constitutes of technical staff from the participating UN agencies and relevant technical staff from implementing partners. The technical committee meets quarterly always before the steering committee to assess progress on project implementation, discuss bottlenecks and propose way forward to be presented to the Steering Committee for guidance.

The last level of implementation, not documented in the programme document is the technical staff and individuals directly involved in implementation of key actions within the implementing partners’ organisations.

Figure 3: DDAG Programme Management, Coordination and Implementation Structure

The roles and responsibilities of the key stakeholders involved in the DDAG are briefly described in the programme document. As indicated in the above management and implementation structure, several personnel in the different institutions conduct actual implementation of programme activities. However the programme document only specifies the high level administration for the program and describes general roles of these positions. The rational was that negotiation and signing took place at senior management level and after the final agreement, every IP would appoint a focal point, which was adequately done. The assessment shows that most of the focal points for the programme in the IPs are the same individuals who served under the same function of the IPG bridging phase of the programme and some have worked with the programme since the initial PSGG. This has provided them with a sound background in both programme management and acquaintance with the One UN funded programmes management and administrative requirements, which is one of the identified strengths of the DDAG.

Also, in some institutions that did not have the required staff or have considerably increased workloads due to implementation plans of the DDAG, the One UN went ahead to support the recruitment and remuneration of some staff and operations in the institutions. This is evidenced in parliament that has a full-time UNDP programmes coordinator managing the DDAG, in RGB a full programme management team comprising of a programme coordinator, governance specialist, media and M&E specialist, finance manager and assistant as well as a driver have been provided. Also through RGB the programme is supporting the nascent ARJ and RMC by funding some of their staff such as the director of finance and administration, administrative assistant, officer support staff and operations costs such as transportation and office rent. This has ensured the DDAG is adequately staffed for the period of implementation.

In addition, at the start of the programme all of the IPs underwent a Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) assessment to establish institutional and organisational capacities to manage and administer One UN support. Furthermore, through the firm KPMG a capacity needs assessment was conducted and is the basis for capacity building and technical assistance that has been provided to the managers of this programme throughout the first half of the programme.

Despite this adequate national implementation modality and capacity strengthening of the programme counterparts, functions and operations within the management and coordination structure have been slightly affected during this phase of the programme. As part of support to the media the reforms, the DDAG programme supports ARJ and RMC through the RGB. There has been some institutional restructuring after implementation of the HACT, such as the creation of the RMC as the media self-regulating body that was not part of the original programme design but is essential in meeting the programmes’ objectives. Therefore the organisation had to be brought on board regardless of existing or non-existent capacity. Similarly ARJ is considered to be under-staffed given its mandate and planned actions and does not have clearly documented administrative and procedures manuals and no strategic plan which all limits the organisations ability to operate, mobilise resources and plan adequately.

The management and coordination of the programme have also been affected by moderate staff turnovers within this period. This churn has contributed to certain loss of institutional memory as well as some elements of capacity built during implementation of the programme. Some of the notable losses of the programme include the programme manager at UNDP, the planning monitoring and evaluation officer at the MHC who was the focal point of the DDAG and the programme coordinator at RGB. By the time of this mid-term evaluation the MHC and RGB focal points had been replaced with pre-existing staff and the recruitment of a replacement of the programme manager at UNDP was ongoing. The programme coordinator at RGB has previously worked with UNDP and UN funded projects so is adequately skilled to manage the DDAG programme at RGB. However the new focal point at MHC is a media practitioner with limited skills or knowledge in programme or project management and has received no induction training. Most of his actions are informed by personal research and own initiative.

**Overall assessment of implementation arrangements**: The mid-term evaluation assesses that the management and coordination structure of the DDAG was planned adequately and is being implemented through majorly a national implementation modality which is considered as a sustainable approach to programme management as well as ensures capacities are built within existing national institutions.

The only gaps identified are that there is still need to further define the terms of reference for individuals directly involved with the programme to avoid duplication, overlap and/or overload of tasks during implementation as well as to ensure appropriate staff in institutions are allocated to the programme. And the programme has suffered from the effects of moderate staff turnover.

Therefore the overall implementation arrangements of the DDAG is assessed as **Satisfactory**

### Financial planning and management

The DDAG programme uses a pool fund management mechanism to ensure well-coordinated and efficient implementation of the programme. UNDP is the managing agent while UNWOMEN, OHCHR and UNV (with UNDP as its administrative agent) pool funds managed by UNDP, the lead governance agency. This process was formalised by a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on fund management between the agencies. UNDP is accountable for timely disbursement of funds and consolidated financial reporting to the joint programme coordination mechanism. The main donor of the DDAG is the Swedish international development agency.

The total estimated budget of the DDAG was USD 13,183,503 and by the start of the programme only USD 9,642,303 was the funded budget. As of April 2016 the programme had expenditures equivalent to USD 6,611,722 out of a total budget of USD 8,151,648[[12]](#endnote-11), putting the DDAG a disbursement rate at 81% of its allocated budget for the first half of the programme. As shown in figure four below the programmes highest expenditures are realised in outputs four, three and five, respectively while the least expenditure is observed in outputs two and one.

Figure 4: DDAG Programme total budget and total expenditure, Sep 2013 - April 2016

Implementing partners prepare annual and quarterly work plans based on the five-year implementation plan in the DDAG programme document. These plans are reviewed by the technical committee, consolidated by the UNDP programme manager and approved by the steering committee. Following approval of quarterly plans and budgets by the steering committee, funds are disbursed by the managing agent to the IPs in line with the HACT. All requests for disbursement are made by IPs using a Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE) form. All expenditure and reporting is made by the national implementing partners to the managing agent by the 15th day of the month after the quarter. All income and expenses are accounted for by UNDP in accordance with its financial regulations.

Within the implementing partners advance disbursements are used to fund quarterly activities after which accountability is done through FACE forms, cashbooks and bank reconciliations. Also adoption of the GoR’s Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS) to account for programme funds along side ordinary budget funds has eased the financial management and accounting processes in the IPs. Following accountability of expenditures at the end of one quarter, in case of any remaining balances, UNDP disburses funds for the next quarter, minus balances from the previous quarter.

Regarding procurement, all IPs that passed the HACT assessment conducted their procurement in line with work plans approved by the steering committee. All procurement conducted by IPs was done using national procurement rules and regulations. In very exceptional cases where procurement was conducted through UNDP, UNDP procurement regulations were followed.

The programme has not encountered any severe financial planning or management challenges as all IPs have qualified finance managers and having worked with the UN for the first two programmes. UNDP has equipped them with the skills and knowledge required to efficiently budget and report as required.

Apart from the one qualified audit report in 2013/14 audits and 17 issues identified in audits, that have since been resolved, there have only been two major shortcomings in the area of financial management in the programme. The first and most adversely impacting constraint has been that of budget cuts during implementation. Following the financial crisis in European countries that fund almost 80% of the UN operations globally, there has been a substantial cut in external aid financing globally. These factors have together contributed to a significant budget cut to the DDAG programme funding which has led to a scaling down of most of the programme activities and only a few costly activities have been cancelled.

The second issue in financial management and planning for the DDAG has been delayed disbursement of funds from the managing agent, which has affected implementation of work plans. Various reasons are identified for the delayed disbursement including the uncertainty and/ or unavailability of donor funds to support programme activities. Also some IPs elaborate how delayed approval of the submitted quarterly work plans by the steering committee due to delayed convening of steering committee meetings has also been a major contributor to delayed disbursements. While from the side of the managing agent, delayed and erroneous fiscal and progress reporting by IPs also contributes to delayed approval of disbursements.

**Overall assessment of financial management and planning**: The mid-term evaluation assesses that the DDAG has adequate financial management mechanisms and procedures. Use of the pooled funding mechanisms is ensuring efficiency in fund management by avoiding duplication, cutting costs of fund management by separate entities and adhering to the delivering as one (DaO) concept thus making use of the One UN comparative advantage. Additionally IPs have the necessary human and institutional capacities supported by GoR systems such as the IFMIS to ensure efficient accountability and reporting of programme finances.

The major gaps in the financial management and planning aspect of the DDAG has been the significant cuts in funding to the programme which adversely affect planning of activities and the delayed disbursements which in turn negatively affect timely implementation of scheduled activities. Therefore the overall financial management and planning of the DDAG is assessed as **Marginally Satisfactory**

### Programme planning

The DDAG progamme budget in the programme document provides overall guidance to the IPs when planning either annually or quarterly. The initial plan and budget was developed by the managing agent during the design of the DDAG in consultation with all the key programme stakeholders. However the mid-term evaluation during consultations with the IPs identifies that almost every IP has a different approach to developing annual and quarterly work plans as described in the ensuing paragraphs. Firstly within the UNDP, planning has been informed by the Organisation’s knowledge of the Country’s priorities by virtue of being an active member of the relevant accountable governance sector working groups and forums. Therefore, UNDP base on this knowledge when consolidating IPs plans. Also being the lead implementer on the fifth output of the DDAG, UNDP bases most of its capacity building support plans on the KPMG internal capacity needs assessment findings.

Within the MHC those consulted in the planning department also mention how since majority of the organisation’s capacity building activities are funded by the DDAG, they allocate most of their activities to the programme work plan. The activities they propose quarterly are mainly derived from the training needs assessment conducted for the media sector in 2014.

In RGB most of the support provided by the DDAG is based on the institution’s core activities such as funding annual or biannual research studies and surveys as well as supporting policy dialogue events and conferences. Therefore RGB makes annual and quarterly plans based on these clearly planned actions supported by the programmes and makes requests based on their scheduled implementation. It is only for new activities such as the support to the Home Grown Initiatives (HGIs) and support to media reform initiatives that RGB make consultations with departments to identify funding gaps, which are then presented by the programme coordinator to the RGB senior management for approval and final integration into the DDAG annual and quarterly plans.

In Parliament the programme implementation plans are developed by extracting activities from the institution’s action plan that fit with the DDAG focus areas and submitting these as the planned actions for the year or quarter. The programme coordinator plays a key role in guiding the planning officers and clerks of the relevant committees on what qualifies to be supported by the DDAG and its objectives.

In the NEC activities included in the programme implementation plan are drawn from the organisations 5-year strategic plan priorities. However most of these were included in the DDAG programme document at the start of the programme so there are not many deviations from the initial NEC plans.

The NFPO bases most of its actions on the key issues identified within political organisations especially towards the active periods of the electoral cycles. These same issues are what are used to inform the NFPO strategic plans as well, so the organisation ensures it is able to source funding for key activities in both documents through the DDAG.

Following development of the IPs’ plans, the technical committee reviews them and identifies any areas of duplication, unnecessary repetition, low priority depending on current country contexts and then agrees to the final quarterly plans of action. The UNDP PMU that presents the plans to the steering committee for approval consolidates these plans. The Steering committee reviews the plans to ensure they are coherent, well aligned to the DDAG strategic outcomes and are reflective of the IPs roles and mandates in the programme and broader Rwanda accountable governance context.

The mid-term evaluation finds no significant gaps in the programme planning approach of the DDAG. The different approaches seem to suit both the nature of the implementing partners as well as the requirements of the broader DDAG programme budget and action plan framework.

**Overall assessment of programme planning**: The mid-term evaluation assesses programme-planning aspect as adequate for the context of the DDAG. Despite all the IPs having different approaches to planning, all the methods seem to suit the nature of key actions expected from them to deliver under their respective outputs. The planning review and approval structures are adequate and annual and quarterly work plans are delivered on time to the managing agent.

Therefore the overall programme planning of the DDAG is assessed as **Highly Satisfactory**.

### Programme monitoring and evaluation

To assess DDAG programme’s use of the results framework, the MTE first reviewed the programme design’s monitoring, evaluation and quality control arrangements as per the programme document. The MTE then reviews the actual implementation of these arrangements over the first half of the programme.

The IPs annual work plans provide the first basis of the monitoring of the programme which consist of clear milestones (targets). This information is supposed to be entered into the UN’s di Monitoring (DevInfo) web-based data management platform to facilitate regular and real time results-based monitoring of the programme. All key stakeholders were to participate in M&E and contribute to the annual reviews. A jointly prepared annual monitoring plan would be used to focus on key results and indicators that would be tracked throughout implementation of the programme.

Monitoring would be implemented through quarterly structured joint field visits with each of the IPs, formal and informal meetings with IPs and attending of IPs activities and interactions with beneficiaries. Also annual reviews would be conducted to report progress against outputs and outcomes, annual targets and take stock of lessons learned. Which would all be documented in the programmes annual report.

Evaluation of the programme would be implemented through the mid-term and final evaluations by external evaluators through ToR agreed among the stakeholders. The objective of the MTE is to inform and strengthen ongoing implementation and the final evaluation will inform the next programming cycle.

Reporting would be done using the UNDP standard progress report format. Reports will be prepared quarterly and presented to the steering committee and every two months to the DRG coordination and technical meetings. UN agencies will be expected to make their input to the reports as well. The quarterly reports will also be used to provide a basis of managing outputs vs. expenditure. Annual reports will be prepared and shared with all partners

The mid-term review assessed that the programme has undertaken almost all these planned M&E arrangements during this period. The technical committee which reports to the steering committee on projects’ physical and financial progress and related issues manages the overall M&E function of the DDAG. Three project monitoring mechanisms were instituted including field monitoring missions, formal and informal meetings and audits. There is anecdotal evidence from implementing partners as to how staff from the UN participating agencies have been actively engaged in field mission to observe and provide feedback to IPs on how to address some of the observed challenges as well as providing context to the managing agent on the outputs reported by the implementers.

However most of the gaps identified are mainly in regard to the technical features of the M&E aspects of the DDAG. Firstly the five outputs of the programme elaborated in the DDAG results matrix are assessed as more of medium and long-term results, which would ideally qualify them as outcomes. IPs have been expected to report quarterly progress against these output statements. This has affected the quality of reporting as most IPs have been reporting narratives of activities (what was done) to reflect their inputs into delivery of outputs under which they are expected to report. The programme management and implementers acknowledge this shortcoming and have organised trainings in Results Based Management (RBM) during this first half of the programme. During this training the implementers identified some of their weaknesses including difficulty in designing SMART indicators and differentiating outcomes from outputs. Following the completion of the training there was indication of increased knowledge of RBM, demonstrated through the development of proposals of revised M&E frameworks for the programme. However the persistent shortcoming is that despite the efforts to revise the M&E frameworks by the implementers, the MTE found no evidence of revision, adoption or rejection of these proposed changes that IPs consider a potential solution to the M&E weaknesses of the DDAG. Table 6 below summarises the output statements from the RBM training and M&E review process.

The programme’s ongoing monitoring is mainly about following-up planned actions and not necessarily about tracking results. There are exceptions specific to particular activities such as the governance month that has deliberate monitoring arrangements that involve following-up numbers of issues resolved after the MSG activities. The DDAG programme still faces gaps in its ability to monitor the outputs of key actions especially under the second component of the programme that deals with facilitation of policy dialogue. For example it is not yet clear how international conferences contribute directly or produce tangible results that relate directly or can be attributed to with realisation of the programme outcomes.

Table 6:DDAG Revised outputs from RBM training

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Existing DDAG Programme outputs | Proposed revised DDAG Programme outputs |
| Output 1: National and local institutions have improved capacity for research, generation and utilization of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence-based legislation, policy and programme formulation and evaluation at all levels. | **Output 1:** National and local institutions have improved capacity for research |
| Output 2: Central, decentralized entities and communities strengthened to promote community-driven development processes. | **Output 2:** Central, decentralized entities and communities have strong capacity to promote community-driven development processes |
| Output 3: National oversight institutions strengthened to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels. | **Output 3:** National oversight institutions have better capacity to promote and demand accountability and transparency |
| Output 4: Citizens, communities and media have better capacity to participate in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels. | **Output 4:** Citizen, communities, media have improved capacity to participate in decision making and demand accountability |

Further still consultations with implementing partners indicate that they solely focus on only their assigned results indicators, for example NFPO focusing on only output 4, Parliament on output 3 and others. However from the results reviewed it is evident that certain programmes contribute to outputs of the programme to which they are not necessarily directly allocated. For example gender mainstreaming activities in political affairs is crosscutting and some of the effected other activities implemented under output 4 and under other joint programmes have the capacity to directly or indirectly contribute to results under output 3. Consequently it is recommended to enhance synergy among the IPs to not only augment implementation of key actions but to also support joint monitoring and follow up of activities such as training activities, for example follow up of voter and civic education can be combined with follow up of training YPLA graduates.

Overall the programme monitoring and evaluation arrangements are assessed as appropriate given that they encourage participation of all key stakeholders ensure adequate flow of information between IPs and participating agencies and provides forums for addressing arising issues promptly. The only shortcoming is the weakness in monitoring and reporting which are still heavily activities based, but is attributed to mainly the lagging review of the M&E framework components.

**Overall assessment of programme monitoring and evaluation**: The mid-term evaluation assess the programme M&E arrangement as appropriate because they are fully engaging and create mechanisms for prompt action and feedback from the required channels and stakeholder.

The shortcomings are in the design of programme outputs and performance indicators that are more of long-term results and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which negatively affect quality of quarterly monitoring that is mainly activity based. There is also limited synergy between IPs in monitoring KPIs which leaves some results attributable to the programme untracked.

Therefore the overall programme planning of the DDAG is assessed as **Satisfactory**

# Programme Results

## Programme achievements

The DDAG has various accomplishments from the first half of the programme which are documented in the programme’s annual report and IPs quarterly reports. The Mid-term evaluation only provides as a summary of the notable achievements in the following narrative section and a summary of performance in the results matrix. The achievements are presented under the four components of the DDAG[[13]](#endnote-12).

### Availing evidence for governance

The Citizen Report Card (CRC) is an annual publication of RGB which is produced to ascertain the levels of community satisfaction with regard to services rendered. Its purpose is to provide public agencies and policy makers with feedback from users on the quality and adequacy of public services delivered to citizens. The CRCs for 2013, 2014 and 2015 have been produced. Also since 2013 ranking of districts performance is partly based on the CRC with 10% of the Imihigo (performance contracts) evaluation derived from the CRC.

The Rwanda Media Barometer (RMB) was established with the central goal of setting up a comprehensive framework of media development to be used for regular monitoring and assessment of the state of media in Rwanda. During this period the 2013 RMB was completed and came up with key recommendations focusing on improving availability and access to media information for citizens, need for urgent media development, professional capacity building and supporting institutions underpinning media freedom.

Other governance evidence creation related studies conducted during this phase of the DDAG include the 2014 Rwanda Governance Scorecard (RGS) that was produced and disseminated to all relevant stakeholders. And an impact assessment was conducted on home grown initiatives; Ubudehe, Girinka and Umuganda and a policy paper on this published by the HGI unit of the RGB.

### Facilitating participation and dialogue

To support citizen participation in policy formulation, the programme organised six policy dialogues at national and regional levels including a national dialogue on Imihigo as a home-grown initiative and a regional dialogue on CEPGL: foreseeing CEPGL at 50. Key recommendations from this dialogue were adopted during countries’ council of ministers meeting in February 2014.

The second international conference on Democratic Governance In Africa, Asia And Middles East: The Accountability And Youth Engagement For Sustainable Development, was jointly organised by the RGB and Cheyney University of Pennsylvania through support of the DDAG. The conference provided a forum for scholars, practitioners, policy-makers and youth to share insights on democracy, good governance and development

The 5th National Dialogue On Media Development: Media Sustainability in Rwanda was held in 2014 to enhance stakeholder participation in development of the media industry. Recommendations adopted from this dialogue included the need to support print and community-based media to operate online.

Governance Clinics are a problem solving sessions between leaders and citizens. The main purpose of governance clinics entails mobilisation of citizens and sensitizing them on their rights and obligations, empower them to participate in governance and encourage them to find solutions to issues raised by the fellow citizens. They are part of the governance month launched by RGB in 2011 that also include the Mobile schools of governance (MSG). During the 2013/14 period the MSGs supported by the DDAG received 4,470 cases and solved 3,419 and engaged at least 34 institutions in the process in all 30 districts.

The NFPO continued to implement the Youth Political Leaders Academy that has so far engaged over 476 youths (49% female). During the consultations the mid-term evaluation was able to identify two youth participants who have since the start of this programme joined parliament and one who was a former journalist but has become a governance advisor in Burera district. Also a new training programme titled the Intermediate Political Leadership Training (IPLT) that targets citizens of any age with no minimum education qualifications was started by the NFPO to further advance political activism.

Furthermore, at least 1,311 political party leaders at grassroots levels were trained in communication, political philosophy, ideology and mobilisation. This is expected to increase political parties visibility at local levels and reinforce their activities and leadership at the grassroots. For instance 81% of political parties now have officials at lower local levels though only 30% have officials at district level.

A training programme was developed and conducted to enhance women’s participation in political parties. Following this training out of the 11 political parties in Rwanda, nine have been able to establish Women’s political wings at provincial level and these are all functional.

A case study on volunteerism in election processes was completed and shared with both local and international stakeholders of election processes. The study was used to demonstrate the use of national volunteers as polling staff as a best practice of home-grown initiatives in Rwanda. It further documented how the use of volunteers in Rwanda reduced the costs of elections to $1.2 per voter compared to the international standard average of $4. From the recommendations of the case study, NEC has designed a long-term strategy to improve the capacity of volunteers.

To further enhance citizen participation in electoral processes, the 2007 civic and voter education strategy was reviewed and updated and a policy and guidelines on election volunteering were developed. Furthermore, civic and voter education committees have been established at district levels and these include CSOs and civic and voter education monitoring committees were established at district level

To further enhance the use of ICT in elections, a feasibility study on the use of ICT in Elections was completed and an ICT in Election strategy developed. Also an on-line backups voter register was developed and a database of election volunteers updated.

48 NEC staffs have been trained in the Building Resources in Democracy Governance and Election (BRIDGE) methodology. Subsequently 13 NEC staff are now fully accredited as workshop facilitators while 35 are semi accredited. Also coupled with a sound elections sensitisation campaign, there was a 98.9% voter turn out in the 2013 parliamentary election during which the programme supported 600 Rwanda Civil Society Elections Observation Mission (CSEOM) observers to observe and assess the election process. Following the observers’ recommendations to enhance political organisations capacity to utilise available media airtime, NEC organised BRIDGE training for 25 members of political parties and media.

### Strengthening mechanisms for accountability

As part of the support to the media reforms process the programme, through RGB, has provided financial and technical assistance in the establishment and operations of ARJ mandated to advocate for the welfare of media practitioners and the RMC responsible to the media-self regulation function in Rwanda. The GoR has reviewed and validated the 2011 media policy in consultation with journalists and adopted the new code of Ethics to guide operations of the media fraternity which is monitored and under the custody of the RMC. So far 86 cases have been filed to RMC and only two have been appealed.

Also to further strengthen the media sector, the Annual Development Journalists Awards have been organised by ARJ and RGB and supported by the programme to award the best performing journalists in Rwanda, to date at least 89 journalists have been awarded between 2013 and 2015. The programme through support to the organisation and implementation of the World Press Freedom days from 2014 – 2015 has further enhanced recognition of the media sector.

With regard to media capacity building a curriculum and content for print and broadcast media was developed and seven priority areas for journalistic training identified. One of the priority areas so far further developed is the mainstreaming of gender in media organisations through sensitisation actions, whose notable achievements include the appointment of 143 gender focal points in various media houses. To follow up on the needs assessment, 60 editors have been trained in editing skills and other journalists in investigative journalism, HIV/AIDS and child protection reporting.

In parliament the programme funded the induction training of the newly elected deputies and 30 new members of parliament of the September 2013 elections. The induction training building capacities in legal drafting, policy and budget analysis as well as gender mainstreaming in budgeting and analysis. Subsequently the new parliament passed over 58 laws in the six month following their training and consulted citizens in the all 30 districts before enacting the laws. Furthermore, with support of the programme a study conducted by the senate on the constant quest for solutions through dialogue and consensus in Rwanda was also completed in 2013 and recommendations shared with relevant organs.

In addition parliament has continued to be supported in its public outreach for citizens input into draft legislation, for example this has contributed to the full revision of the draft law on matrimonial regimes, family donations and successions. A consultative meeting on integration of youth into national development programmes was held and its recommendations are being adopted through activities such as Ingando and Itorero programmes.

### Programme capacity strengthening

As part of ongoing capacity strengthening the DDAG implementing partners along with other programme partners of the DRG II group have been trained in results based management by Research Moguls Ltd. and The Center of International Development of the University of Wolverhampton. IPs also received training in gender and human rights mainstreaming, Project planning and management, and finance management.

From the narrative of programme results it is evident that more than half of the key actions planned for implementation in the first half of the DDAG programme have been implemented or are under going implementation. A review of the programme budget in the programme document indicates that out of the 42 planned actions under all five outputs of the programme 34 have been implemented and completed successfully or are ongoing and functional.

The eight actions that have not yet been completed are listed in the last column of the table below

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DDAG outputs | Planned Key actions | Ongoing and Implemented actions | Implementation Rate | Not Yet Completed actions |
| Output 1 | 6 | 4 | 67% | * Rwanda Media Barometer – In draft * Joint Governance Assessment |
| Output 2 | 5 | 4 | 80% | * Local Governance Monitoring System (LGMS) - Ongoing |
| Output 3 | 10 | 8 | 80% | * Establishment and implementation of digital resource Centre * Support Media reform Initiatives including Rwanda Broadcasting Agency |
| Output 4 | 17 | 14 | 82% | * Conference on Political Philosophy and National Consciousness * Conduct a Research on capacity gaps of rural women leaders in decision making positions * Provide technical support to elected women to develop advocacy strategies and tools for gender equality and women empowerment at all district level |
| Output 5 | 4 | 4 | 100% | * None |
| Total | **42** | **34** | **81%** | **8** |

Overall the highest performance is realised in output five were all capacity strengthening activities have been implemented. However the only arising issues is some of the staff trained have left the programme and their replacements have not undergone equivalent capacity building.

Outputs two and three have implementation rates of 80% of the actions having been delivered. Gaps exist in implementation of for example the LGMS were a system has been developed but there is no evidence of its usage at district level. However re-design of the system is ongoing. Under output one the RMB is ongoing and the report was in draft stage by the time of this evaluation. The JGA review has not been conducted however no clear explanation is obtained as its implementation relies on various stakeholders and not only the RGB and UNDP.

In output 3 there is no evidence of support to RBA and the digital resource centre has not been established. However support to media reforms has been realised from the programmes support to RMC and ARJ through RGB. Output four has the most outstanding policy actions with most of the work to do with women’s training and research has not been delivered and training of media and political organisations in elections engagement is an ongoing process.

The overall performance of the programme with regards to the outputs is rated as **Satisfactory.**

## Programme results framework

|  | Results Hierarchy | Indicator | | Baseline | Target | | Progress attained |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National Priority (V2020) | Good Governance and Capable State | | | | | |  |
| UNDAP Result Area 2 | Accountable Governance | | | | | |  |
| UNDAP Outcome 2.1: | Citizen Participation And Empowerment: Accountability And Citizen Participation In Sustainable Development And Decision-Making Processes At All Levels Improved | | | | | |  |
| DDAG Output 1 | National and local institutions have improved capacity for research, generation and utilization of disaggregated data for participatory and evidence-based legislation, policy and programme formulation and evaluation at all levels. | Number of thematic reports  Generated  Number of districts using sex disaggregated data for planning | 2 RGS  2 CRC  2 RMB  1 JGA  0 | | | 5 RGS  5 CRC  3 RMB  1 JGA  30 | 3 RGS – 2014 completed, 2015 preparation ongoing  5 CRC – 2013, 2014, 2015 completed, 2016 ongoing  2 RMB – 2016 Ongoing  1 JGA  TBD |
| DDAG Output 2 | Central, decentralized entities and communities strengthened to promote community-driven development processes. | Number of district development plans implemented in consultation with the community achieving over 80% under Imihigo  Number of community driven best practices documented, shared and replicated. | 20  0 | | | 30  0 | TBD  TBD |
| DDAG Output 3 | National oversight institutions strengthened to promote and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels. | Media self-regulatory mechanism developed and implemented.  % Of recommendations of oversight institutions implemented | 0  82% NP  40% GMO | | | 1 | 1 – RMC created  TBD  TBD |
| DDAG Output 4 | Citizens, communities and media have better capacity to participate in decision making and demand for accountability and transparency at all levels. | % Of women in key decision making positions (Central Government, Parliament, District Councils  % Of citizen satisfied with their participation in decision making. | 41.7% CG  36.5% LG  74% | | | 50%  50%  90% | TBD  TBD  TBD |
| DDAG Output 5 | Implementing partners have a better capacity to manage the programme | Improved delivery rate of the programme  Timely and quality reporting | 100%  100% timely | | |  | 81%  TBD |

## Sustainability assessment

The evaluation assesses the sustainability of the DDAG programme results and key activities to reach a judgment on the extent of sustainability within the programme’s intervention areas. Using a sustainability checklist the evaluation gauges results stakeholders consider beneficial and worth continuing without external assistance, existing mechanisms to fund the activities, ownership and capacity to manage the results and activities. The findings from this assessment established the following mechanism among those contributing to the sustainability of the programmes results as well as threats to continuity.

### Sustainability mechanisms

***Focusing on capacity building*** has been one of the key elements of the DDAG. The capacity has not only been on individual levels but also organisational and institutional. For example reforms in the media sector supported by the programme have led to the development of a sustainable legal and regulatory framework as well supporting institutions such as the RMC that will go ahead to sustain continuity in the access to information and development of the media industry in the long-term. Similarly support to political organisations through development of their manifestos and structures at grassroots levels have the inherent capacity to solidify provided they continually implement lessons learnt. Within the NEC creation of a remarkable number of accredited BRIDGE trainers within the institution and in Rwanda as a whole not only provides the in-house capacity to implement the required functions of the institution but also provides opportunity for cost-cutting in conducting similar trainings in the future by using locally available training capacity.

***Advocacy for engagement in governance*** is being done by the One UN and development partners like Sida. Through different development partners’ coordination forums, the One UN has been actively sensitising and lobbying among other donors and partners to venture into accountable governance, by demonstrating that sustainable peace and good governance are the foundation of all social and economic development interventions the partners are currently supporting. In addition, some of the IPs such as RGB and MHC have gone ahead to lobby among these same development partners for financial and technical support in the areas identified in the DDAG as requiring continued support. The advocacy and resource mobilisation efforts have so far yielded some results with the RGB having been able to acquire support from the German Technical Cooperation (GIZ) and the Belgium Technical Cooperation (BTC) in the implementation of the 2016 CRC. Meanwhile the MHC has managed to partner with UNICEF to support the children’s rights journalism activities

***Integration of accountable governance*** in most of the GoR priority areas is also indication that good governance is starting to be adopted as a national culture rather than a one of event. For example in recent public sector reforms at local government levels, the position of a directorate of good governance has been created at district level and equipped with four staff and a director. This provides indication of the full support of the GoR in the continuation of certain activities such as governance clinics which are similar to the dedication of every Wednesday morning at districts to solving citizens’ problems at district offices in an open forum.

***Resource mobilisation for sustainability*** of programme activities within some of the IPs has become a priority in the recent years. There is a general consensus that dependence on donor aid is not a sustainable approach to implementation of organisations priority actions. To address this assertion some of the implementing partners like RGB through their Home-Grown Initiatives unit are venturing into developing a governance centre of excellence that will provide products and services (consulting, field visits, training) at a fee that would in-turn create a revenue stream for some activities of the organisation. The department has developed a strategic plan for this vision and is in the process of mobilisation resources for its implementation. Also, the NFPO has developed a strategic plan 2016-2021 along with a resource mobilisation strategy that has three high ranking official in its general assembly supporting the assessment and identification of potential sources of revenue and funding for the organisation[[14]](#endnote-13).

### Threats to sustainability

***Considerable staff-turn over rates*** have affected institutional memory and capacity building retention which in turn adversely affects planning and implementation. This has severely affected projects like the LGMS in districts were almost all ICT and statisticians who were trained during the pilot phase have since left their jobs contributing to close to no implementation of the project. Also during the IPG bridging programme webmasters and political organisations executive members were trained in different communication skills including how to manage their political parties’ websites. However most of these Webmasters have since left the organisations, websites of most parties are not updated regularly and there is indication of need to rerun this training programme during the remaining half of the DDAG.

***Continued reliance on donor funding*** for certain elements of the programme presents a high risk to continuity of especially programme activities. For example some organisations have staff fully paid by DDAG, there is no clear roadmap on what will happen after the phasing out of UN support. The DDAG team at RGB, the UNDP programme coordinator at parliament, ARJ and RMC staff, through RGB, all have no reliable source of revenue and the later are envisioned to for instance depend on media sector players who show limited evidence of financial growth to support such organisations. Meanwhile expecting to rely on government funding would be inherently erroneous for such an organisation as they are to remain autonomous. Meanwhile in other organisations like MHC and NFPO GoR budget funding has been covering mainly staff salaries and operating expenses, while almost all critical activities of the organisations solely depend on One UN funding.

***Restoration of bilateral cooperation and funding*** between the GoR and its donors such as the Swedish Government presents the risk of reduced donor funding to the One UN. Major donors such as the Swedish Government have been funding the UN multilaterally through the New York head quarters. With the restoration of bilateral relations and alteration of funding modalities to more earmarked areas such as environment and gender, there is a high risk of considerable budget cuts to the One UN and worse still the DDAG.

Generally, levels of sustainability vary considerably from one implementing partner to another. For example activities in the NEC and Parliament whose operations and functions are over 95% funded by the GoR ordinary budget and are majorly focused on capacity strengthening of these institutions are likely to continue in absence of donor support. Inversely, what has been done with NFPO, MHC, RGB would still require substantial external support, both technical and financial, in order to continue, at least at the scale on which they have been being implemented.

Overall assessment of programme results and actions sustainability: the mid-term evaluation assess that the sustainability of activities and results varies across IPs because they differently implemented varying sustainability mechanisms. Ownership has been enhanced through direct implementation by existing GoR structures and use of the ordinary budget for some project activities.

However the overall assessment is that the DDAG has not developed a comprehensive sustainability strategy that caters for uniform sustenance of the programme outputs and activities in the absence of One UN funding.

The overall rating is **moderately likely.**

# Lessons and actions for follow up

## Lessons learnt

### Availing evidence for governance

There is still limited evidence of gender mainstreaming in many of the accountable governance activities. This has been attributed to the low levels of gender disaggregation in most of the findings of the governance, service delivery and other monitoring tools produced with support of the programmes. This limits the extent to which planners, especially at decentralised levels can utilise the tools to address observable gender disparities in their areas because of the lack of the robust evidence. However gender disaggregation has been addressed to an appreciable extent in the 2015 CRC[[15]](#endnote-14) but only at national and not at district levels. Other tools such as the RGS and RMB do not address the disaggregation issues yet.

To enhance the credibility of the evidence for governance monitoring tools, the implementers have been using internationally acclaimed and recognised researchers, academics and governance experts to review some of the studies. For instance, such external reviewers before publication have appraised the RGS, Rwanda’s gauge of good governance that provides an opportunity for comparison with other international governance findings. To ensure validity and reliability of the information the external reviewers have reviewed both the methodologies used as well as the overall findings of the tools. In addition in the last phase, internationally recognised Gallup, Inc[[16]](#footnote-4). has been involved to use their indices and data in the triangulation of the RGS findings.

The Rwanda Media Barometer (RMB) is a biannual tool used to assess progress of the media sector in Rwanda[[17]](#endnote-15). To ensure the barometer’s credibility and validity RGB uses various techniques including expert surveys, qualitative and quantitative methods and the assessment is conducted by external consultants to reduce any bias. The most significant progress demonstrated by this tool has been the revision and introduction of new structures in the sector and creation of necessary laws that have provided a comprehensive legal and regulatory framework for the media sector. However stakeholder consulted in the media industry express concern over the limited use of the RMB findings in the design and implementation of programmes aimed at strengthening the media industry in Rwanda, especially programs run by the MHC.

HGI unit benefited from DDAG support and enabled the unit to achieve significant results within various programs. Nine HGIs have been documented (Gacaca, Abunzi, Imihigo, Ubudehe, Girinka, Itorero/Ingando, Umuganda, Umwiherero, Umushyikirano) and impact assessments have been conducted on eight HGIs (Abunzi, Imihigo, Ubudehe, Girinka, Umuganda, Umwiherero, Umushyikirano, Abajyanama b’Ubuzima). In addition, six HGIs (Umuganda, Ndi Umunyarwanda, Abunzi, Gacaca, Imihigo, Ubudehe) have been registered and protected as Rwanda’s intellectual properties. HGI and DDAG staff collaborated to identify and document HGI sites in the Eastern Province during the F/Y 2014/2015 and facilitated International study tours (at least 400 international delegates per year coming to learn from Rwanda’s HGIs). The HGI unit needs to strengthen the above activities and has as priority to implement an effective publication and dissemination platform for HGS knowledge and experience sharing.

The Local Government Monitoring System (LGMS), one of the key activities of the DDAG remains incomplete year on year the case study below demonstrates some of the inherent issues of the system.

**Case study of the LGMS**

The LGMS was developed to address issues of capturing inconsistent and difficult to report information at district level in 2013. Rulindo district was included as a pilot district for the system. The ICT officer and District statistician were trained with support of the RGB. The system was used for about two years. During this period the district executive secretary used consolidated data provided by the district statisticians in the development of district development plans and other high level district documents and not so much for regular reporting. The information was usually submitted to the district planning officers from sectors in paper format, via email and phone text and consolidated by the district statistician. However after two years the district staff that had been trained left the district and the project collapsed.

### Facilitating Participation and Dialogue

The Mobile school of governance program (MSG) has registered a number of achievements especially in promoting citizens’ awareness on Government programs and empowering them to work together with their leaders in finding solutions to their concerns. The Governance Month initiative for example has empowered local leaders as well as citizens in establishing a solution providing mechanism referred to governance clinics. The governance clinics provide a partnership forum where the Central government and local governments reach out to citizens and listen to their concerns in an attempt to providing sustainable solutions to their complaints.

A feasibility study of ICT in election activities is seen as a necessary element for the future of the election management system in Rwanda. The system is anticipated to have a mapping functionality that would be used to locate polling stations. This would be of special importance to election observers and voters to know where they need to go to vote. Also the local leaders register would be online and would help the electoral management identify areas that have or do not have local leaders, thus enabling better planning for elections.

There have been isolated cases of delayed and rushed communication of instructions regarding elections to election volunteers. This contributes to limiting the amount of time available to comprehend the instructions and seek clarifications from NEC authorities and between volunteers to ensure effective implementation of voting activities at especially grassroots levels. Consequently there have been some cases where volunteers have different understanding regarding the instructions and fail to administer the required supervision and support during the election process contributing to errors observed during the voting processes.

Despite the remarkable contributions of volunteers to civic education and voting processes[[18]](#endnote-16), those consulted reiterate several hardships that constrain their ability to deliver, especially during the active phases of the election cycle such as the first quarter of 2016. Delays in receiving per diem often caused by changes in payment methods is identified by the volunteers as one major constrain. This hinders volunteers in carrying out their activities, as they at times end up not having all the necessary resources to carryout their responsibilities. Worse still there have been several instances where volunteers receive their communication allowances after the voting processes which limits their ability to coordinate activities and conduct the necessary voter mobilisation.

Isolated cases of conducting elections without sufficient prior training of volunteers as planned have been observed and are criticised by the volunteers who claim this creates the risk of not supporting elections effectively.

Governance departments have been created at district levels but the budget allocation to accountable governance activities in districts is still substantially insufficient. This means the governance department is not able to provide the necessary follow-up and capacity building to the lower levels as required, since priority is continually placed on infrastructure, education projects and other socio-economic programmes.

Regarding engagement of political organisations several issues still exist that limit the active participation of political parties in the politics of Rwanda. Most political parties do not have the financial or human resources necessary to invest in communication, so they are not able to satisfactorily communicate their agenda to the citizens, however effective it might be. In addition, many lack the capacity to release professionally authored communiqués or reports. Membership in many political parties is still very low, with only 30% having fully functional district offices with permanent staff[[19]](#endnote-17).

YPLA participants acknowledge that the trainings as very beneficial mainly because many consider youth as very susceptible to negative behavioural change and can either be destructive or productive to the society and economy. Testimonies from participants consulted indicate that the YPLA has helped shape their awareness and reduced their negative attitude towards political organisations. Generally, it is observed that the YPLA training is gradually fulfilling its objective of preparing youth in political parties for their leadership roles and equipping them with the necessary skills and knowledge to meaningfully participate in national governance and development.

Regarding women’s engagement in political organisation and affairs, the women who participated in different empowerment activities organised by NFPO identify various barriers that need to be addressed by the programme at later stages. Some of the barriers identified include: cultural barriers especially at local government levels, women’s mobility is hindered by mainly family responsibilities such as child care and limited self-confidence especially among marginalised and rural groups. Thus programmes aiming to empower women for more active participation in politics need to take caution of these complexities, be more strategic and opt for more targeted rather than generic approaches in empowerment activities

### Strengthening Mechanism for Accountability

Implementation of programme-supported activities in Parliament is highly dependent on the national events. For instance the 2015 constitutional revisions and referendum affected achievement of certain targets planned for the last quarter of 2015 mainly because the concerned committees and programme focal points were deeply engaged in other priority duties that lay directly under the Parliament’s mandate. However most of the activities have been implemented since completion of the events.

Budget constraints led to several activities in the programme document not being implemented during the first half of the DDAG, especially under this third component of the programme. For instance, in Parliament a capacity assessment was conducted and a support strategy developed but none of the planned activities have been implemented and there is no indication of plans to implement the strategy. Meanwhile at MHC the planned media digital resources centre that would support growth of the media industry has not been implemented, as well as the media performance rankings study. This has led to the institutions improvising activities that are not necessarily priorities but are affordable to the programme.

There is indication of continued limited awareness of the reforms in the media sectors, especially with regard to access to information reforms. The general consensus is that most of the awareness and knowledge of these reforms has been restricted to urban areas, especially Kigali city and not many practitioners or local leaders are aware of these changes. Those consulted attribute the inadequate access to media and information in rural areas to the lack of awareness of such reforms and limited engagement of media practitioners from rural areas in programme supported capacity building activities.

There is a dire lack of specialised journalists in Rwanda, most media practitioners are generic reporters. This has made it difficult for MHC to conduct several of the planned specialised trainings, for example the IP organised to provide a training for at least 30 News reporters, but was unable to mobilise the required number due to the lack of the professionals or journalists specialising in News reporting in Rwanda’s media industry. Additionally, MHC has no record of the full details of all media personalities and their qualifications in Rwanda. This is not helped by the lack of minimum qualifications for one to operate as a journalist in Rwanda, which in turn has made it difficult to develop standards of journalism and media as a whole in Rwanda.

Feedback from participants in MHC trainings indicates that most trainings are short and rushed and need to be made more practical rather than theoretical workshop-based trainings. Also use of university lecturers as trainers has created the general perception that they are more theoretical and there would be more value added to the trainings through the use of seasoned professionals in the media sector to deliver more practical solutions during trainings to media practitioners. In addition, trainings are not entirely focused on single types of media, for instance many of the trainings included bloggers, talk show hosts and print media journalists and yet most practitioners consulted assert how each of these journalists have different capacity needs which should be addressed in later trainings.

Many registered media houses do not have all the human capacities and equipment mentioned at the time of setting up or receiving authorisation. A recent assessment showed that over 50% of print media establishments are owned and run by individuals, rather than pooled resources and capacities. Thus growth in the sector is still limited, for example generation of appropriate media content remains a key barrier to media development in Rwanda. The business development element in media houses is still nascent with majority relying almost entirely on advertising as their sole source of revenues. Worse still because of this limited capacity, the media industry is not yet in a position to support its self-regulating body – RMC.

Lastly despite being a nascent sector, media in Rwanda is evolving at a considerable rate away from its core mandate of promoting accountable governance through for example investigative journalism to more of business interest in for example edutainment. Generally the business interests of the media sector posts risks of overriding the accountable governance responsibility of media.

### Capacity Strengthening

Despite UNV’s wealth of resources especially in terms of technical expertise, the participating agency has not been fully or actively engaged in the programme. Worse still there is limited evidence of any follow up on any issues raised with regard to the UNV, for example no funding or no volunteer to support the programme. Also as an UN agency the UNV has implemented activities relevant to the DDAG such as its contribution to the revision of the national volunteerism policy, but this has not been taken account of in the plans or achievements of the DDAG. There is need to reassess the collaboration and contribution of UNV in the second half of the programme to ensure the full potential of the organisation is leveraged by the DDAG programme.

Some activities for which feasibility studies have been conducted are out of scope and budget of joint programme. Meanwhile IPs responsible for their implementation at in most cases lack the resources to implement the recommendations of these studies. Subsequently these activities remain unimplemented with no clear road maps, for example the electronic election management systems at NEC and the capacity building plan at Parliament. This has created the issue of projects being implemented, outputs delivered but no clarity of how intended outcomes will be achieved.

Some donors consulted expressed reservations about channelling funds through RGB to RMC. In their view, given that RMC should be an autonomous media self-regulating body, providing financial support to the entity through a government agency could potentially undermine press freedom.

There is limited evidence of systematic follow-up of specific programme activities, especially with regard to capacity building interventions. This is especially in the media sector and training of participants of political organisations trainings. This renders it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the capacity building activities.

There is a general perception among some of the IPs that the One UN majorly focuses on activities and implementation and rarely addresses the personnel elements of the programme. For instance the pre-existing and new work loads of focal points, un-systematic selection and appointment of focal points, which in turn affects motivation and participation of some focal points in organisations, especially those who are not leads. Worse still some programme functions are entirely reliant on one individual, for example the report writing is entirely the duty of the focal point while the DAF does the financial reporting. This presents risks associated with turnover and absence of focal points.

## SWOT analysis

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strengths | Weaknesses |
| * The programme design process was elaborated in a participatory manner. * Programme had a complete PMU, functional TC and SC, ensuring adequate oversight and technical guidance. * Proactive TC leverage skills and knowledge gained from the IPG and PSGG phases. * The One UN system is adequately flexible, UNDP adjust plans based on the changing context of the Rwandan governance climate. * Capacity building activities enhancing value for money * DDAG leverages the lessons learnt from IPG and PSGG to ensure effective delivery. * High level of engagement increases institutional ownership of the DDAG processes and results. * Harmonisation of the planning and implementation cycles of the One UN with those of the GoR * The UN approach endeavours to avoid engaging in politics but instead focusing on critical issues of governance by for example not having several conditionality’s or caveats on their support. * Timely communication, for example inform partners well in time of financial constraints * UN engages in implementation and not only funding and reporting as experienced with many other donors * Effective quality review mechanisms such as audits, capacity assessments, HACT assessments and others * Working with the most relevant IPs for the targeted outcomes | * Budget constrains at the UN significantly affected progress of all components. * Late disbursements attributed to delayed approvals by the steering committee. * Majorly activity based reporting limiting coherence of results in relation to activities * Reporting is not demonstrating gains in crosscutting implementation of actions * Programme is constrained by the limitation to short-term planning * Joint monitoring by UN agencies is still lacking, as there is limited participation by all partners. * No mitigation measures to address financial constraints * Programme does not entirely include all contributions of all partners work, for example UNV work in volunteerism policy. * Limited direct engagement of third party partners such as RMC in overall planning and management * Limited engagement of beneficiaries of programme activities in prior planning * No clear link between staffs qualifications and programme management choices * Limited synergy between IPs, almost all IPs have interlinked activities or that are complementary to each other but they rarely engage each other in implementation. |
| Opportunities | **Threats** |
| * The Government gives high priority to accountable governance evidenced through inclusion of the Accountable governance pillar in the EDPRS II, existence of the RGB solely focused on good governance and introduction of the governance departments in all district offices. * The DDAG is intervening in areas of governance not many development partners or civil society organisations dare to intervene. Creating a lot of room for substantial impact as well as for organisational lesson learning for the UN, IPs and eventually development partners. * Detailed national strategies and policies such as the national gender strategy which guides the DDAG IPs on where they fit in this strategy * One UNs credibility and mandate makes it a preferred option for donor financing, for example the Government of Sweden released a directive to support the One UN effort. | * The UN is expected to work up-stream and within existing structures, so efforts of support are not easily recognised externally * Support is channelled through IPs, not much can be done to enhance One UN visibility * Highly prone to government institutional restructuring * Delicateness of issues addressed by the programme limits the extent of detailed or depth of interaction, minimising prospects of innovation * Restoration of Sida and GoR bilateral funding could reduce donor funding to One UN * Financial reporting is dependent on the uptime of the MINECOFIN managed IFMIS * Resource mobilisation not only affects implementation but also confidence in planning for the future * The programme is tasked to track its performance against governance indicators in the short term. |

## recommendations

### Availing evidence for governance

The implementing partners need to develop more comprehensive communication strategies to disseminate the findings of the various studies conducted during the programme cycle. The reports need to be provided in both official languages and more user-friendly formats to increase their possibilities of being read by majority of the citizens and leaders especially at decentralised levels. More innovative and didactic formats should be considered to complement the detailed reports. Failure to improve communication findings presents the risk of the studies becoming routine events rather than informative activities.

To further enhance usability and relevance of the governance, service delivery and other monitoring tools measured need to be adopted in methodology and presentation of findings to further provide more disaggregated information. The disaggregation should endeavour to capture gender aspects as well as geographical distribution of findings. This will facilitate mainly local government entities to address issues specific to their areas and particular genders, thus enhancing the probability of the tools influencing policy and decision-making processes.

To increase the usage and uptake of the revised LGMS, there is need to increase the system’s ownership and stakeholder participation in design and implementation. For instance less involved institutions such as the National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (NISR), Ministry of Health (MoH), Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) and any other agencies with stake in the information managed in the system need to be engaged to enhance both recognition of the importance as well as ownership and sustainable management of the system

### Facilitating Participation and Dialogue

To address issues of cost of conducting and replicating MSGs, the implementing partners ought to consider the use of various Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) in piloting and implementing some of the activities. In the recent years all districts have been availed with video conferencing facilities that have been used for mainly official interaction and interfacing with central government. This technology should be assessed in terms of how it can be made better use of through government-citizen interaction, and piloting of governance clinics creates an opportunity for such an assessment.

Also as part of governance capacity building at district level, there is need to demystify and redefine the role of the good governance department at district level. Directors consulted explain how the department is now seen as a problem solving unit, leaving departments with direct relevance to issues identified unaccountable or less involved in solving specific problems.

More still there is need to advocate within relevant government institutions such as Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC) and MINECOFIN to increase resources allocation to governance capacity building at local government levels as well as to monitoring of issues such as resolution of issues identified during MSGs to ensure they do not recur. This should go hand in hand with adequate planning time to avoid rushing through the MSG process resulting in superficial analysis of problems and solutions.

The DDAG program needs to further demonstrate its consciousness of the August 2017 presidential, 2018 lower house and 2019 upper house elections. Acknowledging the tasks ahead and reorienting focus of the programme efforts can demonstrate this consciousness by the programme increasing its focus on peaceful elections through strategic emphasis of civic and voter education. This would require some slight deviation from implementing the programme through a “business as usual approach” but still ensuring the programme targets for 2018 are met.

A lot of programme resources have been used in capacity building efforts for election volunteers, staff at NEC as well as civic and voter education. There is need to conduct a detailed impact assessment of all these training efforts to obtain lessons of best practice, establish how effective the trainings have been and what needs to be adjusted to improved results and delivery of the trainings.

The civic and voter education has mainly been provided to the general population and to a lesser extent specific groups such as media, political organisations, public servants, private institutions and others. These have comprised only 0.17% of the target groups reached in the last year. There are suggestions to enhance synergy between the IPs, more specifically, NEC, RGB, MHC and NFPO to develop a systematic strategy through which civic and voter education can be delivered to their different target groups in a harmonised approach that would ensure efficiency in delivery and prove effective through joint planning and implementation.

To complement the feasibility studies undertaken, such at the study on the application of ICT in elections, the programme ought to consider organising field studies for relevant implementers such as the NEC to countries where such systems are being used successfully as well as cases where systems have failed. For example a field visit to the Electoral Commission of Kenya to understand how and why the electronic voting system failed during the 2013 presidential elections would help the IPs to learn how to assess and mitigate such risks.

Some IPs like NFPO and MHC are majorly involved in various capacity building activities for specialised groups but have limited resources to follow-up, monitor and evaluate the effectiveness and results of these trainings. Therefore the programme needs to create special budget lines for such activities or institutions to follow-up for example cohorts of YPLA training graduates and journalists to establish effects of the trainings that can be attributed directly to the interventions of the programme.

When planning and implementing capacity building interventions, the IPs need to develop a culture of improvising more creative approaches than workshop trainings. These approaches need to be tailored to the nature of specific target groups. For instance given women politicians will not have time for active participation in full-day trainings, consider use of mentorship programmes as a cost-effective mechanism of training, use debates, and more effective innovative practices to deliver training.

### Strengthening Mechanism for Accountability

Lack of adequate physical infrastructure for media development is recognised as a major impediment to media development in Rwanda. The only programme action dedicated to addressing this issue – development of the digital resources centre, has not been realised. Therefore the programme needs to prioritise this action to not only provide a means to improve the media sectors technical capacity but also develop possible sources of revenue to run some activities and also reduce cost of some activities such as hiring studios for trainings, especially for MHC.

Increase usage of evidence-based tools such as the Rwanda media barometer in planning of capacity building interventions for the media sector. RGB needs to develop systems and mechanisms to monitor and evaluate the findings and adoption of recommendations of the RMB to ensure the tool is used in decision-making and not merely reporting status. Also to increase the credibility and acceptability of the media barometer, donors and other key actors in the media industry need to be engaged more actively in the design of the barometer and not only in data collection and report dissemination.

As the media industry evolves with the advent of ICT research into “citizen journalism” to devise mechanisms through which it can be regulated without constraining freedom of expression and access to information is indispensible. There is need to set a tone of the destructive and constructive nature of, for instance social media and how to strategically deal with it in time.

Given the funding constraints in the media industry coupled with the media development challenges, options to engage and attract private sector investment in media sector development ought to be considered and studied. The supposition is this would go beyond advertising but investment in content development and publication. Also to leverage individual efforts, there is need to sensitise media houses on strategies and approaches to pool resources to build more sound media establishments as opposed to fragmented entities with limited capacity to grow beyond their projected revenues and human resources.

Improve approach to planning and implementation of trainings. During planning ensure media practitioners are aware of the Training Needs Assessments conducted and ensure trainings are specialised to focus on specific types of practitioners and/or content. Implementation should be supported with more proactive monitoring and evaluation to assess changes in practice and provide follow-up technical assistance to the trainees as well as to devise mechanisms for scaling up and replication of lessons learnt.

### Capacity Strengthening

One of the few impediments to implementation progress during the first half of the DDAG has been the delayed approval of budgets and work plans. The mid-term evaluation therefore recommends that the programme budget approval cycle be reviewed for its feasibility to being revised from being done quarterly to biannually. The rationale behind this is that work plans and budgets are initially approved on an annual basis, therefore changes in quarterly plans are not that significant to warrant entire steering committee meetings to approve them quarterly. However with the revised strategy, quarterly approval could be left to the chair and co-chair of the steering committee, who would be faster and easier to mobilise than all steering committee members. However steering committee meetings would still be held quarterly to review progress and coherence of the programme.

Resource mobilisation has also been identified as one of the most significant challenges of the programme. Almost all IPs consulted expect for the NEC and Parliament mention the need for development of a resource mobilisation and sustainability strategy for the programme. This evaluation suggests that this is necessary but needs to be tailored to individual IPs contexts, needs and mandates. However a strategy in itself needs to be backed with enhancing the resource mobilisation capacities with in the relevant IPs, especially, MHC, NFPO and RGB. To enhance these capacities the evaluation recommends that these IPs consider creating the positions of resource mobilisation officers in their organisations or assigning the task to the appropriate staff. This should be couple with capacity building in project proposal development and grant writing skills. The capacity building is most likely to be effective if it is delivered through qualified mentors with extensive experience in grant writing and identification of potential funders, rather than through one-off training workshops.

Furthermore given the programme’s financial constraints, the programme managers need to venture into possible alternative funding for later stages of the DDAG. One identified option is through the UNV global programme fund opportunities as a possible source of funding for some programme activities. Also consider using the national volunteerism policy to access locally available human resources to fill the capacity gaps and utilise the USD 16.000 budget per annum available from UNV.

The programme needs to conduct a detailed annual review of the programme following this mid-term evaluation that would be conducted as a critical reflection process. The objective of this review would be to take stock of actions and progress and have an open and honest dialog on what needs to be done differently. The review would then establish what the DDAG needs to strengthen realistically and what needs to be withdrawn from the programme based on evidence available and capacity of the programme to deliver.

Undertake advanced capacity building in the area of gender mainstreaming in accountable governance. Other than activities done by NFPO and MHC there is limited evidence of systematic approaches to gender mainstreaming in the programme activities. However this plausibly stems from the implementers limited knowledge and awareness of how to mainstream gender in their activities and operations. Therefore a tailored gender-mainstreaming programme in governance would be useful to the programme.

To enhance the reporting quality and enhance the M&E function of the DDAG, the programme needs to review the revised programme results matrices and consider adoption of outputs and indicators proposed by the IPs that will provide the necessary information required to institute adequate results based management in the programme.

# Conclusions

The programme remains relevant to Rwanda’s democratic and accountable governance context especially in the remaining half of the programme as it will be implemented during the run up to and through the 2017 presidential elections. More still the programme results chain is well aligned to the EDPRS II accountable governance thematic areas with only a minor weaknesses in the placement of programme outputs at outcome levels of the results chain. The overall rationale, relevance and coherence of the DDAG programme is assessed as satisfactory.

Programme planning and risk assessment were effectively done at the start of the programme. Assumptions made were appropriate and mitigation measures prescribed and utilised during the programme adequate. The only risk not well elaborated is that of critical staff turnover that has been encountered during implementation and the mitigation measure assigned to this risk was not well defined in the programme risk matrix. Subsequently the programme has been subjected to some slight losses of institutional memory and built capacities. It is suggested that the programme introduce a more proactive induction training process and a more sound and systematic hand-over procedure be initiated in the programme. The DDAG risk assessment and management is assessed as satisfactory.

Regarding key stakeholders’ participation in the programme, all implementing partners have delivered on their roles and responsibilities especially in terms of implementation and reporting as required by the programme. The managing agent has also systematically fulfilled their programme management, funds management and coordination role with no major shortcomings. The only substantial gaps are evidenced in UNV’s inability to provide the technical support expected during the first half of the program, UNWOMEN did not meet all its financial obligations and there is no evidence of tangible technical assistance provided to the programme by OHCHR. The DDAG stakeholder’s participation is assessed as marginally satisfactory.

The programme management and coordination structure is appropriately structured for implementation through a national implementation modality which is considered as a sustainable approach to programme management as well as ensures capacities are built within existing national institutions and structures. The major gaps identified are in the lack of clear ToR for the individuals involved in the direct management of the programme at IP levels, partner institutions such as ARJ and RMC still lacking some of the organisational capacities, as well as gaps in the staffing structures attributed to staff turnover and delayed recruitment. The implementation arrangement of the DDAG is assessed as satisfactory.

The programme has adequate financial planning and management systems and procedures. Other than one qualified audit report there have not been any major issues with the financial management in the programme. And use of the pooled funding mechanism is ensuring efficient utilisation and allocation of financial resources. The only gap has been the substantial budget cuts to the programme that have adversely affected the programme plans and implementation and could have long-term effects if not addressed in later stages of the programme. The financial management and planning of the DDAG is assessed as marginally satisfactory.

The programme planning aspect is appropriate for the context of the DDAG. All IPs have different approaches to planning and all the methods suit the nature of key actions expected from them to deliver under their respective outputs. The planning review and approval structures are adequate and annual and quarterly work plans are delivered on time to the managing agent. The programme planning of the DDAG is assessed as highly satisfactory

The programme M&E arrangements are appropriate because they are fully engaging and create mechanisms for prompt action and feedback from the required channels and stakeholder. The shortcomings are in the design of programme outputs and performance indicators that are more of long-term results and KPIs. This has adversely affected the quality of quarterly monitoring that is mainly activity based. There is also limited synergy between IPs in monitoring KPIs which leaves some results attributable to the programme untracked. The overall M&E of the DDAG is assessed as satisfactory.

With regard to programme performance against the outputs and key actions, there is significant progress under all four components of the programme. The achievements both in terms of implementation of key actions and delivery of outputs are remarkable with sufficient evidence of potential impact of actions. Overall at least 80% of all the planned activities in the DDAG have been implemented in the first half of the programme, though not necessarily to the initially planned scales. The remaining 19% can be achieved before the end of the programme provided the DDAG and its IPs are able to mobilise the financial resources required to implement the key actions. Overall the most significant progress is under output 5 followed by outputs 4, 2 and 3. There are still gaps in implementation in output 5 pending realisation of mainly commitments from UNWOMEN. While in output one, once the remaining studies are completed all planned actions will be fulfilled. The DDAG performance against its outputs is rated as satisfactory.

Levels of sustainability vary considerably from one implementing partner to another. For example activities in the NEC and Parliament whose operations and functions are over 95% funded by the GoR ordinary budget and are majorly focused on capacity strengthening of these institutions are likely to continue in absence of donor support. Inversely, what has been done with NFPO, MHC, RGB would still require substantial external support, both technical and financial, in order to continue, at least at the scale on which they have been being implemented. The overall rating is moderately likely.

In conclusion the first half of the DDAG programme has been successfully implemented and the programme is well on track to meeting is targeted objectives by 2018. However in order to ensure this momentum is maintained the programme needs to refocus its emphasis in the second half on developing strategies to ensure sustainability of its results, follow-up of implemented actions to ensure skills and knowledge transferred to beneficiaries are made use of and institutional capacities built are maintained. Finally the greatest challenge of the entire programme has been financial constraints, the programme has to review its financial capacity critically and develop more systematic resources mobilisation strategies and dedicate some of its resources to implementation of some of the developed strategies.
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| 1 | Stephen Anthony Rodriques | UNDP-Country Director |
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| 4 | Schadrack Dusabe | UN WOMEN |
| 5 | Victor Che-Ngutih | UNV |
| 6 | Jean Paul Rwabuyonza | RGB-DDAG Programme Coordinator |
| 7 | Sifa Seraphina | RGB- DDAG Governance Specialist |
| 8 | Jack Niyongabo | RGB-DDAG Finance Manager |
| 9 | Gerald Mbanda | RGB- Head of Media Department |
| 10 | Sybille Kamikazi | RGB- HGI Principal Researcher |
| 11 | Justus Kangwagye | RGB- Head of Decentralisation Department |
| 12 | Felicicien Usengumukiza | RGB- Head of Research |
| 13 | Peacemaker Mburamihigo | MHC-Executive Secretary |
| 14 | Pierre Celestin Muhingabire | MHC-Focal person |
| 15 | Ingabire Asia | MHC-Planning monitoring and evaluation officer |
| 16 | Nathan Ntwari | MHC- Director media content, research and development |
| 17 | Lennart Jemt | Sida |
| 18 | Clement Kirenga | Sida |
| 19 | Burasanzwe Oswald | NFPO- Executive Secretary |
| 20 | Jijuka Zephyrin | NFPO-Program Coordinator |
| 21 | Ngarambe Jean Paul | NFPO-Communications officer |
| 22 | Kantarama K Agnes | NFPO-Dir. Administration and Finance |
| 23 | Kawera Marie Sylvie | NFPO- Dir. Communications and Community works |
| 24 | Rusanganwa Dieudonne | Parliament-Focal Person |
| 25 | Rwemangeyo Manasse | Parliament-Parliament Committee clerk |
| 26 | Kampire Martine | Parliament- Senate Committee Clerk |
| 27 | Kayiranga Rwasa Alfred | Parliament-Committee chairperson |
| 28 | Charles Munyaneza | NEC- Executive Secretary |
| 29 | Albert Tumubare | NEC- Focal person |
| 30 | Kasanga Olive | NEC- Election Management Specialist |
| 31 | Mukarumashana Lucie | NEC- Election and Civic education programme officer |
| 32 | Shema Mike | NEC- Direct of ICT |
| 33 | Irambona Liberata | NEC- BRIDGE Facilitator |
| 34 | Rutikanga Jean Bosco | NEC-Zone coordinator Kicukiro & Nyarugenge |
| 35 | Emmanuel Mugisha | RMC- Executive Secretary |
| 36 | Wibabara Jeniffer | Kicukiro District - RPF Women's Wing |
| 37 | Mukobwajana Florence | Kicukiro District - DGPR Women's Wing |
| 38 | Nyirandorimana Denyse | Kicukiro District - PSP Women's Wing |
| 39 | Uwimana Theoneste | Gicumbi District- Electoral & Civic Education Volunteer |
| 40 | Mwanafunzi Deogratius | Gicumbi District- YPLA Graduate |
| 41 | Jean Habineza | Gicumbi District- JADF Head |
| 42 | Jaques Ntezurundi | Gicumbi District- Director of Good Governance |
| 43 | Kakooza Henry | Rwamagana District- Executive Secretary |
| 44 | Ali Ngabonzima | Rwamagana District- YPLA Graduate |
| 45 | Semahoro Guy | Rwamagana District- Director of Good Governance |
| 46 | Mukarugira Kamanzi | Rwamagana District- JADF Head |
| 47 | Ildephonse Sinawubarega | Radio Ishingiro- Managing Director |
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