Evaluation of the Sida and DFID funded Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy (PPIMA) project in Rwanda

Final Report
24 August, 2012

Ali Dastgeer
André Bourque
Alexis Kimenyi
Indevelop AB in corporation with GRM

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADENYA	Association pour le Développement de Nyabimata
ADI	Association pour le Développent Integé "ADI" Terimbere asbl
ADTS	Association for Development and Social Transformation
ALAC	Advocacy and Legal Advisory Centre
AJIC	Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centre
AJPRODHO	Association de la Jeunesse pour la Promotion des Droits de l'Homme
CA	Community Animator
CCOAIB	Conseil de Concertation des Organisations d'Appui aux Initiatives de Base
CLADHO	Federation of Leagues and Associations for the Defence of Human Rights in Rwanda *or* Collectif des Ligues et Associations des Droits de l'Homme
COPORWA	The Community of Potters of Rwanda
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSC	Community Score Card
DDF	District Dialogue Forum
DFO	District Field Officer
DFC	District Field Coordinator
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
EMG	Evaluation Management Group
HRBAP	Human Rights Based Approach to Programming
IMBARAGA	Rwanda Farmer's Federation
JADF	Joint Action Development Forum
KAP	Knowledge, Attitude and Practice
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
Minecofin	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MTR	Mid Term Review
NPA	Norwegian Peoples' Aid
NUDOR	National Union of Disabilities Organizations of Rwanda
PPIMA	Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy
PRO-FEMMES	Pro-Femmes Twese Hamwe
RCSP	Rwanda Civil Society Platform
RGB	Rwanda Governance Board

RWN	Rwanda Women's Network
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TA	Tubibe Amahoro
TIR	Transparency International Rwanda
TOR	Terms of Reference
TSU	Technical Support Unit

Executive Summary

This evaluation of the Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy (PPIMA) project was carried out in July 2012. Its purpose is to evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programme up until May/June 2012. The evaluation would serve as an important input to the DFID's and Sida's assessment of a possible second phase of support to PPIMA.

The Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy (PPIMA) project is a civil society support project aimed at strengthening the interest among Rwandan civil society organizations (CSOs) and citizens in public policy affairs. It is coordinated by Norwegian Peoples Aid (NPA), implemented by 14 Rwandan CSOs and is funded by Sid and DFID. It has a duration of 3 ½ years: it started with an inception phase in August 2009 which lasted till February 2010 and an implementation phase from then till February 2013. Six of the project partners work at the national level with government and other stakeholders, and eight at the local level in 4 target districts: Gatsibo, Gakenke, Ngororero and Nyaruguru.

Major activities undertaken were:
- Technical and institutional support to the 14 PPIMA partners to develop key capacities and capabilities in public policy analysis and dialogue.
- Development and dissemination of popular guides on issues such as the decentralisation policies and budgetary processes.
- A Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) baseline studies to benchmark the current status of citizens' engagement with public policies.
- Establishment of a website on civil society issues managed by the Rwanda Civil Society Platform (RCSP).
- Public forums at national and local level to dialogue policy matters.
- Implementation of the Community Score Card process in all 190 target villages that involves citizens and civil society directly in demanding accountability through greater monitoring and vigilance of power holders.
- Establishment of 4 Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centres (AJICs) to receive, follow up cases, and offer legal advice to victims and witnesses of corruption.

The major conclusions of the evaluation are:
- The project is highly relevant to national priorities associated with decentralisation, improving service delivery, transparency and accountability. The key national strategies and policies lay stress on targeting these issues. However, capacities of communities to articulate their concerns were poor and mechanisms to transmit their demands to different levels of government were lacking.

- The project did well to concentrate on 4 districts and within those districts on 6 sectors each. This has increased cost efficiency and coordination.
- The 14 PPIMA partners themselves came from different backgrounds and were of different levels of maturity. NPA provided across-the-board support such as in how to undertake the scorecard process and improve advocacy abilities, as well as targeted support in the case of their improving their financial competencies. The performance of partners and their degree of commitment to the project has been mixed
- Annual workplans of partners have been revised more than once and there is little assessment made in the PPIMA documentation about why this occurs on the scale that it does. However, the evaluation has assessed that ambitious targets, lack of funding, poor commitment and capacity of some partners, and unavailability of government staff play important roles.
- The Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centres (AJICs) are too young for a proper assessment of their performance to be made however, they serve a need, their coordinators are being mentored and the youth clubs are showing signs of being able to play a positive role.
- The Community Score Card is proving to be successful in terms of community empowerment and engagement with local authorities. It is a very thorough process, which takes several months to complete, and as the steps go by, communities plan priorities for their development needs, engage with service providers and monitor improvement in service delivery. Needs are separately assessed for marginalised groups within the villages while in the whole process, a cadre of community animators is developed. Only the rollout of the first domain has been done: in 28 villages the rollout is complete while 52 are still following up the implementation of the agreed workplan after the 1st interface dialogue between service providers and the communities for the first domain.
- Both reported and observed socio-economic developments in communities because of the response of government to the community score card process have included improved access to agricultural inputs, i.e. seeds and fertilisers, better service provision in health centres, improved availability of drinking water and the landless getting lands.
- The M&E system of PPIMA can be deemed as satisfactory. A great deal of useful information is housed in it. The documentation of stories of significant change and case studies highlighting successes or achievements is quite rudimentary and needs to be improved
- In terms of sustainability, the cadre of community animators is already meeting together in the form of informal groups but sustainability of these groups could be enhanced with more structure given to them.
- The sustainability of CSOs and the skills they have acquired due to their association with PPIMA presents a mixed picture. In some cases, nearly all the technical skill enhancement has been of 1 or 2 individuals. In other cases the institution itself has matured and improved. Both national and district Government has been satisfied in its engagement with PPIMA and the partners, but it is unlikely that currently the activities under PPIMA will continue without external funding – one reason being that PPIMA has still to prove itself at a replicable scale.

- PPIMA is very young and not currently sustainable if external support were removed. Even within a short time frame, it has shown extremely promising results. Local and national government have embraced it and communities are beginning to feel a sense of empowerment and improvement in their lives. CSOs have been equipped with better skills in advocacy and community engagement.

The key recommendations of the evaluation are:

Overall
- For the full effect of the programme to be realised and for it to gain prominent impact as a model to be adopted and replicated, it needs further donor support and this is strongly recommended.

Strategy Development and Planning for Second Phase
- The development of a logical framework matrix or results framework for the next phase should be initiated in time for it to be ready for the Inception Phase.
- Following on from the risks identified in the last column of the logical framework matrix after the process mentioned above, a risk analysis and risk mitigation strategy will need to be elaborated.
- The next phase should be preceded by an assessment of the performance of the current PPIMA partners, the commitments they have shown, the improvements in capacity they have demonstrated and the type of skill sets required of CSOs for the future. This will assist in shortlisting those CSOs with which a renewed partnership should be forged. It will also serve both as a planning tool and as a benchmark to measure performance of the CSOs towards in the middle or towards the end of the 2nd phase.
- The temptation to expand geographically should be avoided as spreading itself more thinly will diffuse the impact PPIMA could potentially make. For the near term, PPIMA should continue to concentrate on the sectors and districts it is functioning in, until a viable model of some scale is created and observable.
- A KAP baseline survey will need to be initiated in preparation for the next phase.

NPA's Coordination Role
- PPIMA needs to exploit the presence of 14 different skill sets within its fold more vigorously than currently occurring. Strategy development and work planning prior to the next phase needs to ensure that both PPIMA and its partners are able to reinforce each others' efforts to achieve the partners' own goals and the goals of PPIMA.
- The Quarterly Review Meetings need to be revamped to bring out their coordination, discussion and information sharing ability.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Regularly updated information on progress against targets needs to be used as a monitoring tool. It needs to clearly show any revisions in original targets.
- Trainings form an important component of PPIMA work and measuring their effectiveness is required. Systems will have to be put in place to measure the 'before' and 'after' change in knowledge because of attendance at a training.
- PPIMA and CSOs need to be trained in documenting case studies/stories of change.
- A strategy for regular monitoring of the community score card after the first rollout needs to be developed.

Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centres
- The AJIC model needs to be reassessed and necessary amendments to it made before funding the centres in a follow-on phase.

Other activities
- The regularity of national level dialogues fed by the now abundant information emanating from the field level, particularly the issues identified in the CSCs, needs to be increased.
- Exposure visits can prove invaluable in assisting community animators in sharing ideas and learning how things can be done better.
- In the next phase, adequate financial resources need to be allocated for capacity building in M&E capacities.

1 Introduction

This is the evaluation report of the Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy (PPIMA) project. The evaluation was carried out in July 2012 by a three-member evaluation team fielded by Indevelop. The report will begin with a brief background to the PPIMA project and the methodology used to undertake the evaluation. It will then go on to discuss the progress of the project under the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability and end with a summary of key observations and recommendations.

1.1 BACKGROUND TO PPMIA

The Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy (PPIMA) project is a civil society support project aimed at strengthening the interest among Rwandan civil society organizations (CSOs) and citizens in public policy affairs. It supports them in their efforts to self-organize and acquire the skills they need to engage effectively in national and local level processes of policy formulation and implementation, to ensure that policies work to deliver improved services, especially for poor Rwandans.

PPIMA is coordinated by Norwegian Peoples Aid (NPA) and is funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the British Department for International Development (DFID). It has a duration of 3 ½ years: it started with an inception phase in August 2009 which lasted till February 2010 and an implementation phase from then till February 2013. The project works at both the national level with government and other stakeholders, and at the local level in 4 target districts: Gatsibo District in Eastern Province, Gakenke District in Northern Province, Ngororero District in Western Province, and Nyaruguru District in Southern Province. Rwanda itself consists of 30 districts. Annex 1 displays the location of the target districts.

PPIMA's goal is that Rwanda government policies and plans deliver improved public services for poor Rwandans. The project purpose as stated in the current elaboration of its Results Framework is that Rwandan civil society and citizens in target districts are actively participating in and influencing national and local level policies and plans for poverty reduction. This will be achieved through 3 key outputs or results:

> *Result 1:* 14 PPIMA partners have the capacity to influence Government public policies and plans.
> *Result 2:* 14 PPIMA partners are organized to influence public policies and plans.
> *Result 3:* Citizens and 14 CSOs involved in PPIMA activities are engaged in public policies.

The 14 PPIMA partners mentioned above refer to the 14 Rwandan CSOs that the project implements its activities through. Thus NPA's role in PPIMA is more of undertaking coordination and monitoring. Of the 14 partners, 6 work at the national level within the project. These are RCSP, CCOAIB, CLADHO, Profemme Twese Hamwe, Transparency International (Rwanda Chapter), and NUDOR.

The other eight organizations that work at the district level are; AJPRODHO JIJU-KIRWA and Rwanda Women's Network in Gatsibo District of Eastern Province, ADTS and URUGAGA IMBARAGA in Gakenke District, TUBIBE AMAHORO and ADI-TERIMBERE in Ngororero District, and COPORWA and ADENYA in Nyaruguru District. Thus there are two CSOs per district. In each district, both CSOs are expected to implement their activities in 3 sectors each, 2 cells in each sector and 4 villages in each cell. Thus making a total of:

> 2 CSOs per district x 4 districts x 3 sectors per CSO = 24 sectors
> 24 sectors x 2 cells in each sector = 48 cells
> 48 cells x 4 villages in each cell = 192 villages[1]

Key activities which were expected to be undertaken under PPIMA include:
- Technical and institutional support to Rwandan civil society (specifically the 14 PPIMA partners) to develop key capacities and capabilities in public policy analysis and dialogue. Also planned was the establishment of a Civil Society Policy Monitoring Group as a resource to assist the sector to participate effectively in public policy dialogue.

- Development and dissemination of popular guides to key public policies, policy processes and laws, among them the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS), the National Decentralisation Framework, and national and local budgets and budget processes.

- Execution, dissemination and public dialogue of surveys on key public policy issues. This was to include Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) baseline studies to benchmark the current status of citizens' engagement with public policies, budgets and expenditures at national and local level, an annual Rwanda bribery index, an annual Rwanda Open Budget Survey, and other client satisfaction surveys.

---

[1] Though the actual number currently stands at 190 villages, as one of the CSOs works in two less villages i.e. 22, not 24.

- Establishment of an Information System, including an interactive website to enable civil society organizations and citizens to access and share key resources on public policy affairs.

- Public forums at national and local level to dialogue wide-ranging policy matters of interest to the public.

- Launch of a civil society driven campaign leading towards the enactment of a law providing for the right of access to public information.

- Execution of a range of demand side accountability approaches that involve citizens and civil society directly in demanding accountability through greater monitoring and vigilance of power holders. The key envisaged tool here was the Community Score Card (CSC), to be implemented in all 4 PPIMA project Districts. Also, an annual analysis of the national budget was to be conducted and relevant advocacy activities undertaken.

- Establishment and operation of 4 Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centres (AJICs) in 4 districts and establishment with the support of Transparency International of a national Advocacy and Legal Advisory Centre (ALAC) to receive, follow up cases, and offer legal advice to victims and witnesses of corruption.

- Implementation of a multi-media strategy to increase citizens voice in public policy dialogue and in the demand for greater public accountability and the efforts to combat corruption in Rwanda.

1.2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was undertaken 3 years into the 3.5 project period of PPIMA. Its purpose as defined by the TOR was "to evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programme up until May/June 2012. The evaluation would serve as an important input to the DFID's and Sida's assessment of a possible second phase of support to PPIMA."[2] The Terms of Reference of the evaluation is attached as Annex 4.

---

[2] There is a second phase of the assignment which will take place later in the year. The original purpose of the second phase, which is given in the annexed TOR (Annex 4), has been reconsidered. It has been decided by the Evaluation Management Group (EMG) that the scope of the second phase should be broadened and serve, in addition to its original objectives, as a baseline for the upcoming phase of PPIMA. It would also be used to elaborate a first draft of a logframe for a possible PPIMA extension phase and provide support in M&E to the project. Currently, the Terms of Reference for this modified 2nd phase of the assignment are being drawn up.

The assignment began with a review of documentation relevant to the project. This included quarterly and annual progress reports of the 14 PPIMA partners, the Inception Report, half-yearly and annual progress reports submitted by NPA to its donors (Sida and DFID), the project's original proposal, the overall and annual work plans of the PPIMA partners, minutes of meetings of project management and donors and selected field visit reports. The Mid-Term reviewed conducted in August 2011, the project management's response to its recommendations and PPIMA partners' contractual agreements with NPA were also reviewed. Other data which was obtained from the project's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system included the criteria used to select sectors within districts, the profiles of the PPIMA partners, population statistics for the 4 districts and the implementation status regarding the Community Score Card. Publications and guides were also studied including the guides on decentralisation and the national budget, guides & manuals produced by the project on the CSC process, and proceedings of launch ceremonies and national public policy dialogues. The key relevant documentation studied is listed in Annex 6.

Prior to arrival in Rwanda, a draft Inception Report was submitted to the Evaluation Management Group or EMG. The EMG consists of representatives of Sida, DFID and NPA and was formed to provide oversight and quality assurance to the evaluation process. On arrival in Rwanda, a start-up meeting was held with the EMG to elaborate on the expectations regarding the outputs of the evaluation and what issues were encompassed within the criteria that were to guide the evaluation i.e. the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Based on this initial meeting a final Inception Report was drafted by the evaluation team and approved by the EMG in a follow up meeting. In the final Inception Report, the evaluation criteria were elaborated with the specific questions which needed to be answered. It is these questions which form the basis of the analysis given in the next section i.e. the findings section of this report. They are as follows:

Relevance
1. Is the project (still) relevant in the Rwandan context?

Effectiveness
2. Has the project improved partners/CSOs' ability, organisation and will to influence public policies and service delivery?
(a) Is there more use of participatory approaches?
(b) What new types of activities are they engaged in?
(c) What are some of the indicators to measure partners' performance over time?

3. Do target communities and beneficiaries experience positive difference in policies and service delivery due to the project?

4. How effective has been NPA's coordination of partners' interventions?

5. Is PPIMA's M&E system "good enough" to be a useful management tool?

Sustainability
6. Are the Government's response (local and national) to citizens/civil society an incentive for their engagement?

7. Are there manifestations of interest and/or initiatives to continue PPIMA work without funding?
- From CSOs
- From authorities

As can be observed, there are no issues to be addressed under impact. This is because it was agreed that the longer term impact of the project would not be realised within the short time frame that the project has been implemented i.e. just over two years and four months. There may be some indications of it, but it would be more appropriate to look at longer term goals or impacts after a greater length of time has passed. Currently, in the short term, it would be more appropriate to look at outcomes and these been captured under other questions, particularly question no.3, above.

The approval of the Inception Report enabled field activities to commence. One of the most fruitful engagements was attendance of the regular PPIMA Quarterly Review Meeting which lasted half a day. In it, all 14 PPIMA partners made presentations regarding the progress of implementation in the quarter April to June 2012 and progress towards results, and highlighted issues and success stories. It was attended by District Field Officers, AJIC Coordinators, District Field Coordinators, staff of the Technical Support Unit of NPA, and focal persons in and Executive Secretaries of the partners. The team visited two of the four implementing districts i.e. Gatsibo and Ngororero and thus was able to engage with 4 of the 8 PPIMA partners implementing activities at the district level. During these meetings, discussions were held with district administration including mayors and vice-mayors and service providers at the district, sector and cell levels. Discussions were also held with men and women community animators and villagers, an interface dialogue was attended, as well as site visits undertaken to agricultural land and health centres affected by the project. Two days were spent in each district.

In Kigali, meetings were held with 5 of the 6 national level partners and key government collaborating partners: Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (Minecofin) and the Rwanda Governance Board. The European Union Delegation to Rwanda was also interviewed as it is funding activities similar to PPIMA, being implemented through some of the PPIMA CSOs. A complete list of people met is given in Annex 5.

2 Findings

2.1 RELEVANCE TO NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND THE POLITICAL CONTEXT

The project, in 2012, continues to remain relevant to the priorities that the Rwandan government stresses to decentralisation, accountability and transparency. The Rwandan government initiated a process of decentralisation in 2000, emphasizing the role of citizens in governance and giving increasing powers and responsibilities to local governments in planning, budgeting and delivering government services. In that year it adopted the National Decentralisation Policy and a strategy for the implementation of this policy. After the first phase (2001 to 2005) when district level structures were established, and the second phase (2006 to 2010) which involved territorial restructuring, PPIMA is running in parallel with the third phase (2011 to 2015) which is meant to improve downward accountability linkages between grassroots level leadership and citizens including sectoral decentralisation, service delivery and fiscal decentralisation amongst other matters. The project is in line with the above policy and the Rwanda Decentralisation Strategic Framework (RDSF) adopted in August 2007 which provides the basis for furthering the decentralisation process from 2008 to 2012. In addition, both Vision 2020 and the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) are both highly supportive of the types of challenges PPIMA tries to address – of improving service delivery, involving communities in decentralised structures and promoting better dialogue between government and the citizenry.

2.2 RELEVANCE – TO THE NEEDS OF THE BENEFICIARIES AND CIVIL SOCIETY

Despite the government's strong resolve to improve the socio-economic wellbeing of ordinary Rwandans, especially the poor, and engage them actively in the development process, the latter still find it difficult to have their voices heard. Some groups feel

even more marginalised – women, the youth, the disabled and the historically marginalised community or Batwa. The mandated spaces such as the Joint Action Development Forum (JADF) and others[3] are not enough as people, especially poor people, do not have the ability or influence to articulate for their needs and rights within them, and certainly not as representatives of their communities. People are generally uninformed about the decentralisation that is happening around them or about how budgets and plans are made. There is a gap thus, between these forums and individual households which cannot be filled unless the individual households build their capacities and skills, and strengthen their collective voice. At the same time, government does not possess the manpower or resources to engage with each household and resolve their problems individually.

Civil society organisations can be useful in narrowing this gap and have mushroomed in Rwanda but they are constrained by meagre resources and poor skills especially of participatory planning and advocacy. Even amongst the more well-known CSOs, problems of retaining skilled staff and securing funds persists so they are in a constant struggle to rebuild their capacities.

Both the CSOs and communities which have engaged with PPIMA in the last two and a half years have been able to address some of the issues above, but there is still a long way to go. Considering one of the key activities that PPIMA engages in i.e. the Citizen's Score Card, of the 190 villages that PPIMA engages with, only 28 have so far completed a full roll out of their first chosen domain[4], while 52 are still following up the implementation of the agreed workplan after the 1st interface dialogue between service providers and the communities. Positive outcomes of PPIMA's work are emerging but only slowly. Given all the above, there is still a great need and relevance of PPIMA in 2012 and beyond.

2.3 RELEVANCE – QUALITY OF DESIGN OF THE PROJECT

2.3.1 Coverage
It was prudent of the project to concentrate itself on a selected number of districts and within them a few sectors and villages. By concentrating in this manner, it was able to

---

[3] Others include the the Community Development Committees, the District Development Councils, Sector Councils, Executive Committees and the Imihigo process and other local structures such as the Parent Teachers Associations, the water users associations and the health committees

[4] Agriculture, water & sanitation, health, education etc are what are called domains or service sectors.

ensure greater efficiency of its operations and economies of scale. Scattering across many districts would have diluted the impact being created and slowed down implementation. Already, it has been observed that it takes District Field Officers considerable time to travel on their motorbikes to and between villages. The evaluation has undertaken an analysis of the 24 PPIMA sectors and the coverage they have obtained within them. This analysis is presented in the table below:

District	Sector	Total population in PPIMA covered sectors	Total beneficiaries in PPIMA covered sectors	PPIMA coverage in %
Gakenke	Gashenyi	19,939	6,709	33.65%
	Janja	17,312	8,208	47.41%
	Kamubu-ga	21,110	12,187	57.73%
	Coko	15,679	7,591	48.42%
	Gakenke	21,596	11,288	52.27%
	Muyong-we	15,481	8,461	54.65%
		111,117	**54,444**	**49.00%**
Gatsibo	Gitoki	27,833	9,502	34.14%
	Rugarama	30,983	11,144	35.97%
	Rwimbo-go	27,919	19,727	70.66%
	Gasange	16,566	9,928	59.93%
	Kageyo	18,701	11,208	59.93%
	Murambi	23,702	16,008	67.54%
		145,704	**77,517**	**53.20%**
Ngorore-ro	Kabaya	31,648	12,233	38.65%
	Kavumu	25,647	8,611	33.58%
	Muhanda	26,576	9,811	36.92%
	Ndaro	22,442	8,759	39.03%
	Ngororero	32,022	9,286	29.00%
	Nyange	20,599	10,753	52.20%
		158,934	**59,453**	**37.41%**
Nyarugu-ru	Muganza	19,379	10,016	51.68%
	Nyabima-ta	17,228	7,472	43.37%
	Ruheru	23,116	10,296	44.54%
	Kibeho	17,955	10,221	56.93%
	Mata	11,923	4,484	37.61%
	Rusenge	21,043	8,039	38.20%
		110,644	**50,528**	**45.67%**
		526,399	**241,942**	**45.96%**

Within each sector, PPIMA targets 2 cells and in each cell, it targets 4 villages. Thus there is plenty of scope within the existing sectors for PPIMA to expand should it need to do so.

If the population of the 4 districts is taken as a whole, it shows that there is even greater scope for expansion in the existing districts. Even though PPIMA targets 100% of adult villagers (including youth) in its activities, particularly in the CSC process, its coverage is just under 20% broken down as under:

District	District total population	District PPIMA total beneficiaries	District PPIMA coverage in %
Gakenke	336,744	54,444	16.17%
Gatsibo	357,232	77,517	21.70%
Ngororero	314,394	59,453	18.91%
Nyaruguru	262,720	50,528	19.23%

This observation is being made because if expansion is considered an option (which this report will recommend should not be the case), for purposes of efficiency and effectiveness, **it would be desirable to concentrate in existing areas. A critical mass needs to be obtained so that a demonstration effect can be more pronounced.**

2.3.2 Partners' Activities

At least two of the partners' activities seem unclear. Two prominent activities that RCSP handles for PPIMA are the organising of national level dialogues and the hosting and operation of its website which gives information on civil society activities. Currently, the website is regularly updated and well-maintained. It is more difficult to ascertain, however, why it takes a range of activities under the project, which appear unrelated and scattered. A review of RCSP's reports for 2012 and discussions with its management indicate that PPIMA funds were partly spent on topics pertaining to land consolidation issues, training, regional integration, freedom of information, social protection, and aid effectiveness, and attending conferences for these issues. While these are all important civil society matters, how they reinforce the work of PPIMA and its other partners in achieving their goals is not clear. However, it must also be mentioned that of the 14 partners, RCSP probably has the vaguest of workplans. The issue here is whether PPIMA should be investing in partners to build their capacities, or investing in partners to build their capacities to achieve PPIMA's project purpose. The answer should be the latter – in the case of many of RCSP's activities funded by the project, it is not.

In the case of the second partner, it is not clear from project documentation and from discussions with both the Technical Support Unit and the National Union of Disabilities Organizations of Rwanda (NUDOR), what exactly NUDOR does or will do to contribute to achieve PPIMA's purpose or what its degree of engagement with other

PPIMA partners is. NUDOR is funded by two Scandinavian CSOs (which have a focus on disabled persons), by VSO and by the project. It was established in 2010. Since it started functioning in mid to late 2011, it has solely been involved in establishing itself as an organisation: acquiring building, furniture and personnel, developing administrative systems and strategic plans with the support of project funds. Meetings have been held with concerned ministries and other bodies, but when exactly it was supposed to contribute to the work of PPIMA which is ending implementation of its current phase in a few months time (and when the partnership began with NUDOR, there was no consideration being given to a follow-on phase) is not clear. The only reason it appears to have been chosen as a PPIMA partner was because of its focus on issues relating to persons with disabilities. There is no other umbrella organisation in Rwanda focussing on this issue, and when the CSO FENAPH, which was originally chosen as a PPIMA partner, was dissolved by the government there was no option left but to go with this new umbrella organisation representing the interests of disabled people. However, by the end of the current project period, NUDOR will have contributed little to furthering the project.

2.4 EFFECTIVENESS – ON CSOS CAPACITIES

2.4.1 Exploiting Different Backgrounds

At the time that the 14 CSOs began their partnership with NPA in PPIMA, they had different capacities. Some had already worked with NPA on other projects. Some like CCOAIB and ADENYA had been around since the eighties while NUDOR, an umbrella CSO was established after PPIMA was initiated in 2010 by its 8 member organisations which focus on the rights of the disabled. The Rwanda Civil Society Platform, an umbrella of umbrella organisations, has undertaken a range of projects over the years with a host of donors while Transparency Rwanda has depended a lot – at one time almost exclusively – on PPIMA for its funding.

The idea of bringing into the fold CSOs with different expertise and backgrounds was a strength of the programme and has the potential to be further maximised in the future. Not excluding other skills they may possess or other sectors they have worked in, the core focus of the partner CSOs included:

- *Transparency Rwanda: corruption, transparency in governance.*
- *RCSP (umbrella organisation): networking of CSOs and advocacy*
- *CLADHO (umbrella organisation): human rights, budget literacy, budget monitoring*
- *CCOAIB (umbrella organisation): vocational training, agriculture, rural development*
- *AJPRODHO: youth*
- *ADTS: training*
- *Tubibe Amahoro: social education/peace-building/governance*
- *COPORWA: capacity building of Batwa to or historically marginalised communities*

- *RWN (umbrella organisation): women*
- *NUDOR (umbrella organisation): disabilities*
- *Pro-Femmes (umbrella organisation): women*
- *IMBARAGA: farming*
- *ADENYA: rural development*
- *ADI: agricultural development*

It was expected that this would enable mutual learning and this has taken place to quite an extent. Mutual learning and skill sharing can also be observed to have increased over time. Notable achievements include:

- The Rwanda Civil Society Platform organising public dialogues on community based health insurance (mutuelle), an issue which arose from the CSC work of the 8 local partner CSOs.
- ADTS providing training material on human rights based approaches to other partners.
- Transparency Rwanda providing support and guidance to the 4 AJICS managed by 4 local PPIMA partners.
- CLADHO engaging other partner CSOs in pre-budget hearings and civil society's response to national budgets. It has also, with district partners, carried out sensitisation of all 380 community animators regarding the budget making process.
- Profemmes provided a 5-day training in gender awareness and mainstreaming to other PPIMA partners.

However, much more can be done, both in the transfer of skills, knowledge and evidence between local and national level partners but also amongst district level partners themselves. **PPIMA needs to exploit the presence of 14 different skill sets within its fold more vigorously.** One vital activity which has been clearly lacking is exposure visits of DFOs and CAs from one sector to another and from one district to another. **Exposure visits can prove invaluable in assisting in sharing ideas and learning how things can be done better**.

2.4.2 Intra-District Coordination

In all districts, the public dialogue forums are organised jointly by both CSOs working there. One of the better examples of good coordination, intra-district, between partners can be found in the case of Gatsibo where RWN and AJPRODHO have worked well together. The two organisations have jointly organised the holding of 3 District Dialogue Forums (DDFs), compared to one each in the other districts. In addition, the Mayor of the District requested them to jointly manage a survey to evaluate service delivery in the province, a task which has been completed. Such sound coordination also reduces pressures on NPA's Field Coordinators. It has been observed that one reason for this good collaboration is the active interest that the management of both organisations takes in the PPIMA project. They are engaged and frequently attend the DDFs, dividing tasks amongst themselves. **The management of other PPIMA partners should be encouraged by NPA to adopt a similar attitude as both can then exploit the others' comparative advantage.** As an example, in

Ngororero, the two partners are ADI, which has a background in agriculture, and TA whose origins are in peace building and governance. Land issues affect the sectors of both partners as do performance contracts but one is qualified in the former while the other maybe in the latter. Working together, they can bring their respective expertise to bear on these subjects in e.g. PPIMA sponsored radio phone-ins.

2.4.3   Viewing PPIMA merely as another Project

A number of PPIMA partners implement other projects from other donors and acquire conceptual tools and skills from their association with them. But those ideas and expertise do not always seem to filter into that part of the organisation which oversees PPIMA. In some CSOs, PPIMA is often seen as just another donor-funded project with a shelf life, with its separate budget and activities and not part of the organisation's own makeup or contributing to its strategic goals. **There should be a commitment on the part of CSOs that they will actively use the skills and expertise acquired to not only strengthen the PPIMA activities that lie within their jurisdiction but strengthen the project as a whole.** This includes, amongst other things, an active interest displayed by the senior management of the partner CSOs i.e. by their Executive Secretaries as it is they who can promote this filtering of skills and knowledge and sharing of resources, but also ensure that issues arising from PPIMA implementation can be advocated at the national level. (Most of the partner CSOs are headquartered in Kigali)

2.4.4   Partners' Capacities and Commitment

Just because a CSO has been around for longer or previously managed more projects, does not necessarily mean that any capacity that has been acquired, has been sustained, or even if it was built in the first place. Take the example of CCOAIB which was formed in 1987 and is considered one of the more established Rwandan CSOs. It was tasked with one major activity i.e. the production of an easy-to-comprehend guide for the general public on the decentralisation process in Rwanda. The activity was delayed by more than a year and half and the guide has only recently been produced when the current phase of PPIMA has only a few months to run. Not only has there not been a dedicated focal person for the PPIMA project in CCOAIB, the text was developed through hiring a consultant, thus no capacity building of CCOAIB has occurred. Recruiting short-term consultants for fulfilling very specialised tasks may sometimes be necessary but partner CSOs have been hiring them for more menial skills tasks too defeating the purpose of building their own capacities.

On the other hand is the example of Transparency International, which at the start was almost exclusively dependent upon PPIMA funding for its running costs. This dependency has been reduced as the organisation has built its capacities by undertaking projects such as the carrying out of the Corruption Index survey, publishing of its quarterly magazine the Transparent and running of its six ALACs spread across the country. It has increased its human resources manifold, again largely thanks to PPIMA funding and the outputs from it, and has been able to attract other donors for both

financial and technical support. A throng of other donors have rushed to support TIR, persuaded by its performance.

These two examples point out the range of contrast that can be observed in the performance of partner CSOs. However, it would not be appropriate for this evaluation to go through each CSO's performance and identify flaws. It is appropriate though, entering into the next Phase, to **assess the performance** of each CSO in the current phase, the seriousness with which it undertook its PPIMA-related tasks and how it used PPIMA to build its own capacity to undertake advocacy particularly in regards to service delivery. 'Its capacity' means that of the organisation, not of one individual dedicated to PPIMA. In addition, for beyond February 2013, it should be assessed what added value the organisation commits to bring to PPIMA and how to maximise the congruence between the CSO's own priorities and mission and that of PPIMA.

2.4.5 Revised and Revised Workplans

The evaluation undertook an extensive analysis of what each of the 14 partners was supposed to do undertake contained in its initial agreement with NPA, how (due to delays or other factors) the activity was revised in 2011 and then 2012 and its current implementation status. This analysis is reproduced in Annex 2 and **is the sort of data that the TSU should have available readily and which should be used as a monitoring tool.**

It can be observed in annex 2 that in the majority of cases, workplans have been revised. This has been due to one or a combination of factors, the major ones of which are:
- Ambitious targets e.g. in the case of CSCs
- Lack of funding e.g. in the case of national dialogues
- Inadequate attention devoted to activity e.g. in the case of the decentralisation guide
- Lack of staff or expertise e.g. again in the case of the decentralisation guide
- Unavailability of public officials e.g. in the case of the CSCs
- Modification of target e.g. in the case of newsletters, replaced by radio shows

We will give a more detailed analysis of the implementation of the Community Scorecards separately, but the **analysis in annex 2 should provide NPA and its donors a basis to make more informed choices for the follow-on phase.**

2.4.6 Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centres

Under PPIMA, 4 Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centres or AJICs have been established – 1 in each district. Their role is to receive, follow up cases, and offer legal advice to victims and witnesses of corruption. As their establishment is recent (1 in February, 1 in March and 2 in May of 2012), it is too early to comment on their effectiveness. However, they appear to be functioning well and the number of complaints received or legal support given has risen and will continue to rise as more people become aware of their services. Thus far, they have received 169 cases of

which 131 are closed and 38 are pending with issues of land claims topping the types of cases being received. There was apprehension in some quarters regarding whether appointing coordinators with no legal background would pose a problem. Maybe AJICs would have been more effective had they had coordinators with a legal background as TIR's ALACs do. Thus far though, this does not seem to have been a major constraint in the AJICs' functioning. In Gakenke, the AJIC coordinator currently gets regularly mentoring from the legal expert from his parent organisation ADTS which has that expertise inhouse. AJPRODHO has given its coordinator in Gatsibo 3 different trainings. On top of that, Transparency International (TIR) has also provided training and has been guiding the AJIC coordinators satisfactorily.

The formation of AJIC youth clubs appears to have had a positive effect in sensitising communities in and around the vicinity of the AJIC. Till now, though, most members of these clubs seem to reside near the AJIC, with less members originating from more distant sectors. The youth club members can act as good ambassadors for the AJICs within their sectors and districts but they are constrained due to the lack of stipends for travel or other incentives.

Transparency Rwanda provides legal advice to the AJICs and the AJIC Coordinators are constantly in touch with Transparency's Policy and Legal Department in Kigali. The AJICs are styled on the ALAC model (though the ALAC's are all headed by staff with legal background). Incidentally, the ALACs are also supported by PPIMA but have been in existence for much longer.

The concept of having an addition of internet/computers within the AJICs cannot be well explained. One explanation offered is that it will serve as an internet café and offer printing services, sustaining the AJIC in the long run. This appears unlikely to succeed given the demand and willingness to pay for such services. Another is that it enables members of the youth clubs and others to access legal advice, the Ombudsman's office, information on corruption, etc. Again, it appears unlikely that local inhabitants will devote a substantial amount of time using the internet for such sites. Such 'business centres' have not had much commercial success in other parts of the world. It may have been better to direct resources instead to building the capacity of youth club members and raising the awareness amongst the rural community of the AJICs and what they can offer. **The necessary amendments to the AJIC model will need to be made before funding them in a follow-on phase.**

Finally, it should be accepted that the AJICs will remain inaccessible for many of the poor within the district who cannot afford to travel to it. Hence, the youth clubs acquire even more importance and more resources thus should have been devoted to them.

2.5 EFFECTIVENESS – AFFECT ON TARGET COMMUNITIES

2.5.1 The Community Score Card – A PPIMA Success

The Community Scorecard has been one of the most successful and innovative tools used by PPIMA. Adapted from scorecard methodologies used elsewhere, it was originally pilot tested in one village at the end of 2010, based on which a training course for community animators was developed. The CSC is an elaborate 8-stage process incorporating sensitisation of the community, formation of sub-groups (of women, the youth, disabled, etc.), meetings with service providers, identification of indicators to measure improvement of service provision, scoring performance, monitoring of workplans, rescoring performance etc. The process takes several months. Communities themselves identify which of the domains – which are either water & sanitation, health, education, infrastructure or agriculture should be tackled first. The table below is a breakdown, sector by sector, of issues by service domain that have been mentioned by community members as those that needed PPIMA attention. It indicates how many villages chose which issue/service domain:

	Sector	Number of villages	Agricul-ture	Health	Water & sanitation	Educa-tion	Infra-structure
Gakenke	Gashenyi	8	2	0	4	1	1
	Janja	8	2	5	0	0	1
	Kamubuga	8	0	7	1	0	0
	Coko	8	6	0	1	0	1
	Gakenke	8	2	2	2	0	2
	Muyongwe	8	1	7	0	0	0
	Sub-total	**48**	**13**	**21**	**8**	**1**	**5**
Gatsibo	Gitoki	8	6	1	1	0	0
	Rugarama	8	1	1	2	1	3
	Rwimbogo	8	2	0	6	0	0
	Gasange	8	0	0	8	0	0
	Kageyo	8	0	2	5	0	1
	Murambi	8	0	1	4	0	3
	Sub-total	**48**	**9**	**5**	**26**	**1**	**7**
Ngororero	Kabaya	8	0	5	3	0	0
	Kavumu	8	8	0	0	0	0
	Muhanda	8	0	0	0	0	8
	Ndaro	8	8	0	0	0	0
	Ngororero	8	0	7	1	0	0
	Nyange	8	1	4	2	0	1
	Sub-total	**48**	**17**	**16**	**6**	**0**	**9**
Nyaruguru	Muganza	8	0	5	3	0	0

	Sector	Number of villages	Agricul-ture	Health	Water & sanitation	Educa-tion	Infra-structure
	Nyabimata	8	7	0	0	0	1
	Ruheru	8	2	1	0	0	5
	Kibeho	8	3	1	0	1	3
	Mata	6	1	2	2	1	0
	Rusenge	8	1	2	4	1	0
	Sub-total	**46**	**14**	**11**	**9**	**3**	**9**
	Aggregate	**190**	**53**	**53**	**49**	**5**	**30**

So far PPIMA has either completed or is in the process of completing the roll-out of whichever was the first domain chosen by its 190 villages. Only a handful of both first and second scorings are available at the time of the writing of this report but they show encouraging results:

- In the case of Rwikiniro cell in Rwimbogo sector of Gatsibo district, the first domain to be addressed was water. Villagers stated that clean safe drinking water was inadequate and was located at a long distance. They identified 7 indicators on which performance needed to be improved. Between the first and second interface meetings, change was observed on nearly all indicators but especially those to do with distance to source as a number of new boreholes have been dug or are in the process of being done so.

- In the case of Mpond Wa Cell in Gitoki sector again in Gatsibo district, agriculture was identified as the domain in most need of attention. Villagers ranked service provision low citing poor skills and advice, problems with obtaining seed and fertiliser and poor support for farmers with disabilities. At the 2nd interface meeting, there was improvement in scores for all 8 indicators but significantly so for the 3 pertaining to the distribution of seed and fertiliser. The number of depots distributing both inputs had been increased from 1 to 5 enabling easier and quicker access to seeds and fertiliser leading to on-time sowing and better harvests.

- In Nyange B Health Centre in Nyange Sector of Ngororero district, service providers made a big effort between the first and second interface to avail of specialists such as dentists, ophthalmologist and paediatricians by seeking the support of Muhororo Hospital. This increased citizens' satisfaction as demonstrated by them rescoring higher on the 3 indicators pertaining to this issue. Three specialists attend the centre one day a week now. The citizens also scored higher on the service given by health animators and availability of drugs, though there the difference between the first and second scores was less. Health service users in the area still showed difficulties in the payment of contributions to health insurance, which is 3000 Rwandan Francs per capita for Ubudehe category 2[5], and which requires every adult family member to have paid before any member benefits from medical care. There was no change in the score for this indicator. The improvement in performance of this

---

[5] Under the current policy of health insurance, households fall into 1 of 3 categories depending upon their ability to pay. The first category of poor people do not pay any contribution to mutuelle and the Government pays contributes 2,000 RWF per year per person instead. The slightly higher economic category 2 contributes 3,000 RWF per year per person and the better-off category 3 contributes to mutuelle 7,000 RWF per year per person.

particular healthcare provider has affected 12 i.e. half of the project villages in which the CSO Tubibe Amahoro works.

- In Ndare sector again in Ngororero district, increased visits by agriculture staff have increased scores on the relevant indicator. On the other hand, scores have deteriorated on the indicator for the price given for their coffee harvest as it is still low and also for the indicator for agricultural machinery related to coffee due to its absence.

These are some of the examples that are beginning to emerge of the effect of the CSC as the first rollout is completed. From now till the end of the year, a barrage of data will emerge which should be consolidated across sectors, districts and domains so that it can be used as evidence of the value of CSCs. Not all the scores show a positive change. In Gaseke village in Ngororero district, people are still unhappy with the state of bridges and roads for example, resulting in no change in low scores. But while the improvement in scores may be desired, the process itself of engaging in the CSC cycle is important and seen as valuable both by communities and service providers. It provides service providers the opportunity to engage with whole villages and cells rather than dealing with each grievance individually thus increasing efficiency. It enables them to plan priorities and advocate for shifts in resources with their higher authorities.

At the same time, it gives a feeling of empowerment to communities who feel that they are being heard as well as increasing their understanding of constraints faced by service providers. Communities are brought into the planning process with a degree of participation that cannot be provided by the existing 'mandated' spaces of government such as the Joint Action Development Forum or the various committees or councils within the district. Government is embracing this PPIMA tool, a tool which outwardly appears alarming. This is in part to the admirable work being done by the District Field Officers of the 8 local partners. It has not been an easy task for them over the last 2.3 years to identify, train and mentor on average 48 Community Animators and introduce the concept to 24 villages in 3 sectors. This has meant travelling often long distances on a daily basis with only a motorbike at their disposal.

The initial plans for the successive rollouts of the CSC process were overly ambitious. It was assumed that by now i.e. July 2012, at least 3 cycles would have been completed. The reality is that even the first cycle is still not done. The initial plan did not foresee the intensity of work that the process would require. In addition, the project overlooked one major constraint – the continuous demand on the time of the district staff and service providers from other quarters. In addition, communities have also had their own commitments and have often had to prioritise engagements with local leaders and attend other events. Their agricultural activities and the rainy season also affect the ability to attend. Most of the original grant agreements with district level PPIMA partners foresaw the 2nd interface dialogue of the 1st rollout to be com-

pleted by December 2010. One and half years later, it is still not completed in many sectors as the following table shows:

District	Sector	STAGE AND NUMBER OF VILLAGES AT THE STAGE (*status as of July 2012*)				
		1st in-terface	Follow up of implementation of agreed plan	Second scoring	Second interface	Completed 1st roll out
Gakenke	Gashenyi	6	2			
	Janja		2	6		
	Kamubuga			8		
	Coko					8
	Gakenke	1	7			
	Muyongwe			7	1	
Gatsibo	Gitoki					8
	Rugarama		8			
	Rwimbogo					8
	Gasange				8	
	Kageyo		8			
	Murambi				8	
Ngororero	Kabaya			4	4	
	Kavumu				8	
	Muhanda				8	
	Ndaro				8	
	Ngororero				8	
	Nyange			4	4	
Nyaruguru	Muganza		8			
	Nyabimata			4		4
	Ruheru			8		
	Kibeho		8			
	Mata	5	1			
	Rusenge		8			

The point of highlighting this issue is to assist future work plans to be drafted in a more realistic manner. It is of course assumed that future roll-outs will be quicker. The community animators are now trained, the districts are conversant with the approach, and the communities have practiced the methodology. However, the process will still require time as commitments of service providing agencies to transform from pledges into action will take time and sometimes depend upon factors beyond their control. Also, there may be an urge to shortcut some of the steps, of which there

are numerous, and this should be advised against if it will have a negative effect on the long term objectives of the process.

One thing that is still uncertain is what happens after the second scoring of a certain domain is undertaken. Is it then going to be rescored a third time and so on? Answers seem to indicate that this will not be done, but that the domain will continue to be monitored. That does not seem a satisfactory answer. If there are no indicators against which performance will be measured, how will performance be said to have improved. In addition, with more competent Community Animators and a more informed community, the effort to be exerted by DFOs in successive cycles can be reduced. Lastly, many of the sittings of the community can be used for achieving more than one output e.g. the 2nd scoring on the 2nd domain to be rolled out along with the 3rd scoring on the 1st domain. Both community empowerment and the overhauling of planning and service delivery to be more needs-focussed are not short term endeavours. Meaningful, sustainable change needs longer term investment of time and monitoring. Thus, it is advised that a **strategy be devised to address what should occur regarding rescoring after the 2nd interface meetings.**

2.5.3　The First Batch of Outcomes Emerging

Even in this short space of time of just over 2 years of implementation, there have been numerous outcomes observed because of PPIMA. These may not be attributed to the project alone, but service providers, citizens and community animators state that PPIMA has had a major role to play in the achievements. In a regular review meeting of community animators in Gatsibo, also attended by the evaluation team, the CAs reported successes such as improved access to agricultural inputs, i.e. seeds and fertilisers, reduced domestic violence and child abuse, greater awareness about political and legal rights, easier availability of drinking water and the landless getting lands. In addition, community animators are now being more engaged by local leaders in socio-economic activities beyond PPIMA.

Beyond that review meeting, in infrastructure the community and service providers in Muhanda Sector in Ngororero identified the telephone network as an issue in the Community Scorecard. Subsequent to their promise at the interface meeting, the Sector authorities prioritized and speeded up the construction of an antenna which now serves the community in the area.

In health, the health insurance services at Kabaya Health Centre in Ngororero sector have put in place a permanent calendar agreed with the community whereby every village is informed on the day when it will be served (especially to obtain insurance cards for those who have paid and for vulnerable groups). Before this plan, it took the community hours and even the whole day to get served. At the same time, using the PPIMA community animators, the Health Centre is able to communicate to the local population the constraints it is facing, making them more understanding of its difficulties.

At the Nyange B Health Centre in Gatsibo district, over a 9-month period the following changes occurred:

Responding to the need for a dentist, ophthalmologist, paediatrician and midwives, the issues were raised with the Muhororo hospital as the Centre itself is unable to recruit such highly qualified staff. A dentist is now available at the Centre every Friday. The hospital itself has only two ophthalmologists. Despite this, it has agreed that they will come to the Centre at least twice a quarter. The Centre sent two nurses for training who now work together with Muhororo ophthalmologists when they come to the Centre. In relation to the paediatric doctor, the services of which could still not be availed of, the Centre has been able to get a doctor providing ARV service (and who attends every Monday) and he helps in treating children's diseases. Regarding citizens complaints that ambulance services were not available, the Centre realized that the community misunderstood the ambulance's purpose. It sensitized the community that priority users were pregnant mothers and urgent cases. Lastly, again in response to concerns from the community, the number of rounds to inpatient cases in the ward has been increased and extended to the entire day, not just the mornings.

Several instances have been reported throughout the PPIMA project areas of improved customer care in health centres such as the Rutake health centre in Gakenke district, Janja health centre again in Gakenke district, Nyange A and B health centre in Ngororero district and Nyarubuye health centre in Gatsibo district. This has led to reduced delays in being attended to, friendlier staff, availability of specialists and better sanitation facilities at the centre.

In agriculture, a number of instances have been noted by the evaluation team where the inadequate and untimely supply of fertilizer and seed has now stopped in the 4 PPIMA districts such as in Nyabikenke village in Gakenke District. Villagers there and elsewhere now travel shorter hours and obtain supplies on time from government depots. They thus plant timely and enjoy better harvests. Again, several instances have been reported of increased and more regular visits of the agriculture animators. Villagers are gaining knowledge on improving agricultural practices, helping boost production.

All these instances are apart from the countless voices expressed by the community that they now feel they can approach service providers, express their views with less inhibition and be heard. In turn, they are facing a more receptive cadre of serve providers. This in itself is bestowing a great deal of satisfaction amongst communities.

Problems identified at the local level regarding health insurance were raised in the National Policy Dialogue held in December 2011 in Kigali. That dialogue aided in relaxing some of the conditions that were seen as inimical to accessing healthcare by households, especially the poor ones. The previous condition that all the adult members of the household had to pay before any of them could access free healthcare was

relaxed as was the condition that clients had to wait 3 months, after they had paid, to be eligible for any care. The dialogue has also led to the health insurance policy being reviewed; a review which is occurring currently.

2.6 EFFECTIVENESS – NPA'S ROLE AS COORDI-NATOR

NPA's coordination role is satisfactory, and is reported to have improved since the replacement of the Programme Manager.

The TSU's District Field Coordinators housed in Kigali make very frequent visits to the field, are well informed and up-to-date on what is occurring in the districts under their respective responsibilities. Being based in Kigali allows them to secure the support and guidance of programme management as well as provide support to the TSU. Weekly meetings of the programme management are held in which the previous week's activities are reviewed and the forthcoming one's are outlined. These meetings are well documented.

Quarterly Review Meetings are held every three months. The evaluation team was fortunate to witness the 2nd review meeting of 2012 held in Kigali which was attended by representatives from all 14 PPIMA partners. All fourteen gave presentations on the achievements made during the concluded quarter i.e. April to June 2012. They talked of progress on planned activities, highlighted issues and showed success stories. They presented plans for the forthcoming quarter and some showed photographs or short videos of activities.

This crucial event needs a major overhaul. During the 4 hours, only 10% of the time was devoted to any sort of discussion or questions and answers. Instead, participants were subjected to innumerable power point slides and there was little interactivity or participatory dialogue. The result was that the meeting overran with weary participants. As coordinator, NPA should present an overview of activities during the quarter e.g. one common slide showing the progress of all 8 local partners on the CSC roll-out, on the performance of the 4 AJICs and a summary of district level dialogues held. Much of the remainder of the time should be spent on addressing issues of slow progress, sharing experiences and challenges, identifying ways of improving partner coordination and other matters which can be effectively addressed in a gathering of all 14 partners – a gathering which only occurs 4 times a year. And this should be done using techniques such as working in small groups, rotating presenters and encouraging more active and demanding participation from the attendees.

At the district level, the two implementing partners in each district engage with one another when organising the district level dialogues. With the recent establishment of the AJICs, it is expected that they will have another aspect to work together on to ensure that grievances are taken up by AJICs and that these centres help in addressing

them. But the bulk of their work is in ensuring that CSC is being implemented and because the two CSOs in each district work in different sectors, there is little room for much coordination there. At the same time, NPA has constantly placed emphasis on collaboration among partners to an extent where the TSU ensures that they conduct some of the activities such as public dialogues together, trainings, and radio talk shows etc.

At the national level, RCSP has been able to organise one national dialogue on Performance Contracts and National Health Insurance Scheme. It was supposed to organise quarterly dialogues as can be observed in the analysis in annex 2 but the lack of funds has been cited as the reason why no more dialogues have been held. Funds should be made available for this crucial activity and NPA should ensure that in its role, it is able to coordinate the raising of issues from the CSCs feeding into the dialogues in the 5 domains PPIMA is concentrating on.

2.7 EFFECTIVENESS – OF PPIMA'S M&E SYSTEM

2.7.1 The PPIMA Logical Framework

PPIMA's logframe has been a matter of anguish for NPA, Sida and DFID. After a very detailed and overly complex initial version presented along with its project proposal in 2009-10, NPA alongwith its donors attempted to substantially simplify the logframe, which is prudent to do in the Inception Phase once funding and other arrangements are more clear and stakeholders have been brought on board. That process, however, continued unabated until the most recent version of the logframe was approved in July 2012, albeit with reservations. The urge to get the logframe approved was heightened due the impending closure of the current phase of PPIMA where the parties realised that an inordinate amount of time had been spent on the exercise and some consensus would have to be reached. The current version of the logframe has a reduced number of outputs (or results), 3 instead of 5 and a sensibly manageable number of key indicators for each of the hierarchical objectives.

The major differences which arose during the logframe's reformulations have been in the development of appropriate indicators. To some extent, preventing the reaching of agreement was the necessity to have measurable indicators on one hand but being able to capture qualitative aspects on the other; to have targets against which performance could be measured yet allowing the flexibility, given its methodology, to capture unforeseen changes. People's lives, for example, would be affected by the project in different ways as localised initiatives took off or unforeseen partnerships were forged.

Some development practitioners argue that this is the flaw with the logframe concept itself. It attempts to capture change in discreet boxes and assign figures to that change, while reality is not like this. While the debate continues in the background,

NPA, Sida and DFID have thankfully decided to adopt the version of the logframe as of 27 July 2012 as a compromise final version.

However, it has been decided that during the Inception Period of the next phase of PPIMA, the logframe development process would be more rigorous and the end product more results-focussed. While it should be able to set targets for the number of CSC cycles to be completed and the number of policy dialogues to be held, it should also be able to capture whether and how qualitative changes are occurring in service delivery and whether empowerment of communities, and especially the marginalised elements amongst them, is taking place. The evaluation team will return in the later part of 2012 to begin this process as well as develop methodologies to be adopted by the project to capture qualitative change for the current and the next phase of PPIMA.

It is felt that in order to have a robust logframe, the process should start from an analysis of the context of the project, the problem it is trying to address and the stakeholders involved. An objective tree would be derived from this problem tree and a strategy analysis undertaken. This would help identify the activities to be undertaken, the results they would lead to and the purpose they would serve. Following on from this, a risk analysis and risk management plan would be developed. This systematic route for development of the logical framework matrix is espoused both by Sida and DFID. Sida's 2004 guidelines 'A summary of the theory behind the LFA method: The Logical Framework Approach' and DFID's 2003 guidelines 'Tools for Development: A handbook for those engaged in development activity' expand on the approach outlined above in similar ways.

The evaluation urges the following points to be born in mind for the current and for the next version of PPIMA's logframe:

- Though it should not be ignored, the goal or impact of the project lies beyond the control of the project. It is a statement of a change the project would like to contribute to but neither is it responsible for it nor is the project responsible to measure it. The goal is usually expressed in a statement which looks beyond the end of the project, beyond the geographical boundaries within it operates and/or beyond the sectors or issues which the project focuses on.

- In the case of the current logframe, the source for assessing the indicator at the goal level i.e. 'Percentage of Rwandan citizens satisfied with public service delivery' was stated as Annual Rwandan Governance Scorecard. In the next version, that source may have to be changed to one which gives a more accurate picture of reality as the scores in the Rwandan Governance Scorecard give extremely high figures for current service delivery satisfaction which is at odds with what PPIMA's score cards' data is reporting.

- As a major outcome of the project is to strengthen its partner CSOs' capacities to participate in and influence policies and plans, a baseline of current capaci-

ties of each partner CSO will have to be established. Such a baseline does not currently exist.

- The PPIMA KAP Baseline Study of 2010 has little value in terms of being used as a baseline against which change in the districts and sectors that PPIMA works in can be measured at the end of the current phase of the project. The Baseline Study selected 96 villages to sample as its 'treatment group' or villages where PPIMA would be initiated. In reality, PPIMA was only initiated in 20 of those villages. Thus, nearly 80% of the villages in the treatment group have not been 'treated 'at all. In addition, the TSU does not possess the raw data used by the Baseline Study to be able to isolate the data of those 20 villages if it wanted to.

- For trainings (of animators, service providers or CSO partners) there will no doubt be a greater focus on not how many people attend, but whether they left the trainings with improved skills and knowledge. **Systems will have to be put in place to measure this 'before' and 'after' change in knowledge because of attendance at a training.**

- Following on from the risks identified in the last column of the matrix, **a risk analysis and risk mitigation strategy will need to be elaborated.** Currently none exists.

- The process should be done with the participation of the NPA, Sida and DFID so that consensus is built from the beginning. Once the products are ready, they should be shared with those CSOs who will be potential partners in the next phase.

- The logframe should be viewed as a dynamic tool. Every 1.5 to 2 years, it should be reviewed and necessary modifications made.

The evaluation is of the view that **the TSU needs its skills to be strengthened in how to systematically develop logical frameworks and qualitative and quantitative indicators.**

2.7.2   The M&E System in the Technical Support Unit

PPIMA's M&E system is good, but in process of taking shape. M&E tools and templates are currently being tested. During the evaluation, a good stock of reports and data was provided. These are regularly compiled or collected. Any additional information sought was provided with ease. The data available is accurately reflective of what the evaluation team was able to verify during field visits.

Programme Meetings of NPA and TSU staff are held every Monday in Kigali where the previous week's activities are reviewed and the forthcoming weeks activities are discussed. These short meetings are an effective mechanism to inform the team about what everyone else is doing and to coordinate if needed. The Quarterly Review Meetings held three times a year (the fourth functions as an Annual Meeting) can be an

excellent venue to strengthen the coordination of PPIMA, share experiences and discuss issues. They can be vastly improved as discussed earlier in this report. Field visits are undertaken with regularity by the Field Coordinators in the TSU and field reports are prepared upon return. This should continue to occur.

The TSU is not expected to house all the data emanating from the field. As an example, the scores on CSCs and the associated flipcharts can be housed in the Community Animators Offices at the cell level with aggregated scores being collected by the District Field Office. However, the TSU should have available:

- An updated status of the implementation of CSCs in terms of what stage of the cycle they are at.
- An updated implementation table showing, in a succinct way, progress of each partner against key targets and explanations for deviation. See annex 2 as an example. This type of table does not seem to currently exist. In addition, if CSOs are not able to undertake activities and these are moved to the next year's workplan, it is not possible to track that the activity was actually deferred.

The monitoring and information management of PPIMA lacks clear and systematic recording of changes in action plans. For instance, Pro-Femmes Twese Hamwe, one of national implementing partners had initially planned to produce a quarterly newsletter on gender and policy issues. This activity was planned for 2011 but not even one issue of the newsletter was produced. In the 2012 workplan, this activity was changed to 'publication of gender policy and related information on Rwandan Civil Society Platform (RCSP) interactive website'. Through reports and other records it is not clear that the latter activity actually replaced the former one. A number of similar changes in almost in all partners' plans have occurred during implementation but reports and other project's records cannot clearly tell the observer about those changes.

The forthcoming period of the current phase and any extension will place further demands on the M&E system of PPIMA. These include:

- With more and more rankings becoming available from the 1st and 2nd interface meetings of the CSCs, they will need to be compared and consolidated across cells, sectors, districts and domains. The challenge will be how to standardize the measurements because from the available comparisons studied during the evaluation, not all DFOs are compiling comparisons in the same way. Some are using scales of 1 to 5, others are using percentages: the different methods of comparison to the outside observer are confusing.

- Preparations need to be made for a baseline to capture the state and current capacity of the CSOs that will be PPIMA partners in the next phase and of the knowledge, behaviours and needs of the target communities.

- With the wealth of data emerging, the M&E system should be capable of identifying issues raised at the local level which need to be brought to the attention

of policy makers at the national level for use in national dialogues or radio phone-ins.

- Currently, the standard of case studies written up in quarterly and annual reports of CSO partners is extremely poor. Along with this, the time has approached for PPIMA to be collecting and documenting case studies, lessons learnt and change stories, of which there is a dearth, to report against the qualitative indicators in the logframe. Training needs to be imparted to District Field Coordinators (of the TSU), District Field Officers (of the CSOs) and other relevant PPIMA staff for them to be able to do this or train others to do so. **The documenting of case studies has to become a systematic feature of the M&E system.**

2.8 SUSTAINABILITY – OF CITIZENS' PARTICI-PATION

There are 380 Community Animators; 190 men and women each across the 4 districts. They have all been provided training in the CSC methodology (5 days), Human Rights Based Programming (3 days) and advocacy (3 days) alongwith an orientation on the national budget with the support of CLADHO. At the cell level, they are grouped together in an informal structure with a chairperson of the animators. They also have a cell office paid for by PPIMA. The structure is replicated at the sector level with the chairpersons there supporting the work of 15 other Community Animators. However, these groupings are not formal and are susceptible to collapse if not provided continued mentoring or organised into a more formal entity. In Gatsibo, RWN has taken some steps in the direction of keeping these groups intact by introducing a piggery project whereby successive offspring are provided to each animator in rotation. RWN is also encouraging the formation of credit and savings groups amongst the animators in each sector. Similar initiatives are going on in Gakenke district in sectors where IMBARAGA operates. Whether all these initiatives will succeed remains to be seen, however the issue is that, on a strategic level, **PPIMA needs to think about long term sustainability of community animators groups which can engage with the local administration and be grassroots organisations for advocacy in their respective areas.**

The issue of group formation or social mobilisation goes beyond Community Animators. Provision of water is one of the main areas identified as a problem by communities and thus on which PPIMA is engaging government. If water infrastructure is built or repaired, depending upon the type of infrastructure, it would require the formation of Water Users Associations to look after it as government has limited resources to provide constant maintenance. Similarly, provision of land and land consolidation is another prominent issue which PPIMA communities face. Collective procurement of inputs and disposal of outputs would benefit from farmers cooperatives. Other opportunities may exist in the health and education domains such as health committees and parents associations. And then there are the groups PPIMA itself is fostering such as

the anti-corruption youth clubs which could blossom into associations providing citizens advice on legal and social issues.

This is not to say that PPIMA should broaden its focus to include group formation into its mandate, but it should be able to link up the types of groups mentioned above (and others) to CSOs which have the skills to provide the necessary guidance to such groups and strengthen them, otherwise the communities are prevented from realising their full potentials. The Joint Action Development Forum or JADF could be one venue where PPIMA can approach other partners. This issue should be debated within PPIMA and discussed with its donors. If acceptable, the necessary resource provision should be made for it in any follow-on phase of PPIMA.

Lastly, training in how to conduct CSCs should also be imparted to community leaders along with community animators so that they are more engaged in the process and can support the more active participation of the community.

2.9 SUSTAINABILITY – OF CSOS

The capacities of CSOs have been built during the project though the degree of improvement does vary. As mentioned earlier in this report, partner CSOs came from different backgrounds. None had ever engaged in the intensive CSC methodology employed within PPIMA in which concerns are discussed with service providers and a dialogue ensues facilitated by the Community Animators. Issues beyond the control of service providers have had to be taken up during project implementation and placed in front of district administrations – one forum for this being the DDFs. The District Field Officers have been through a number of trainings including those on the CSC methodology (5 days), HRBAP (3 days), advocacy (5 days) and gender (5 days). They in turn have provided trainings to community animators in the CSC methodology (5 days), HRBAP (3 days) and advocacy (3 days). In partnership with CLADHO, DFOs have provided orientations to community animators on the national budget for half a day. They have also given trainings to government partners i.e. the service providers in HRBAP and introduced them to the CSC methodology. DFOs have to submit written reports in standardized formats to the TSU on a quarterly basis reporting on achievements, issues & challenges, lessons learnt and success stories. All these activities have enabled them to improve their capacities in how to engage communities, dialogue with service providers and government and undertake advocacy, report writing and communication.

However whether this is sustainable is another issue. Only one person per district-level CSO is involved fully in PPIMA. On occasion, another such as the executive secretary may be invited to participate in trainings. But in reality, it is only one person per CSO whose capacities have been built and in many cases these persons has been recruited specifically for PPIMA and on contract. With the departure of that DFO, the investment made and capacity built will be lost. Hopefully, it will then be used elsewhere.

On the other hand, there are CSOs such as CLADHO which was working with Mine-cofin on budgetary issues prior to PPIMA. In fact the first citizen's guide in 2009 was financed by the government. CLADHO has been instrumental in getting the government to publish the citizen's guides to the national budget, district budgets and budget estimates. There is visible evidence that in the case of this organisation, and in the case of TIR and NUDOR, the organisations themselves are benefitting and strengthening because of PPIMA support. Little has been said in this report about the significant capacity development and mentoring the NPA is and has been providing partner CSOs to improve their financial management. And unlike some other trainings, this financial management support, which incidentally is provided largely by NPA's own finance team, is CSO-specific. A thorough needs analysis on financial competencies, conducted in 2011, has also served to guide what individualised support is required. Classroom trainings have been given, supplemented with regular monitoring and field visits, assessment of accuracy of bookkeeping and provision of software.

2.10 SUSTAINABILITY – OF GOVERNMENT'S COMMITMENT

At the local level, in both districts visited, the district administration including mayors and vice-mayors showed keen interest in PPIMA, were well-informed of its activities and expressed a keen desire to see its expansion to other sectors within the district. They exhibited a strong sense of ownership of PPIMA – stating that it improved the relationship between village communities and the government machinery. It enabled them to better understand the needs and issues that need to be addressed, and these were expressed during the district dialogues, in interface meetings and in radio phone-ins which are all forums not in confrontation but supportive of their own consultative mechanisms or mandated spaces. In Gatsibo, the district Mayor urged for the public dialogues to be cascaded down to the sector and cell levels, thus as he called it 'deepening accountability'. In that district, in fact, the Mayor requested the two partner CSOs namely AJPRODHO and RWN to undertake the management of a survey to assess service delivery. In Ngororero, when the district was assessed in terms of achievement of performance contracts, a representative of PPIMA was made part of the evaluation team. The district government there is appreciative that, because of PPIMA's sensitisation of local people regarding their rights under the health insurance scheme, more people have joined the scheme.

At the national level both the RGB and Minecofin, the two government bodies met, have expressed strong desire to continue their collaboration with the project. While CLADHO was involved in budgetary issues even before its engagement with PPIMA, it has been able to build its capacity considerably due to the project. Its work on the annual citizens' guides to the national budget, testimonies before the parliamentary budget committee on behalf of civil society and the recent provision of input to Minecofin on the 2012-15 Budget Framework Paper has increased its authoritative grasp

on budgetary issues and positioned it, in the eyes of government, as a credible representative of civil society.

According to Minecofin, the work that CLADHO undertakes with funding from the project encourages value-for-money being considered in budget formulation. It empowers civil society which in turn assists government as government cannot monitor every expenditure itself. However, Minecofin also states that along with citizen's rights come their obligations – obligations such as not wasting public resources and paying taxes. The responsibilities of civil society also include, according to it, sensitizing the citizenry about these issues.

Government's appreciation of PPIMA's work is evidenced by the fact that for this year's publication of the guide, the 3rd financed by PPIMA, Minecofin has indicated it is willing to fund 10,000 copies beyond the 14,000 that CLADHO has budget for and it will also provide financial assistance for dissemination of the guides.

However, currently it is unlikely that government on its own would continue the PPIMA model due both to a lack of funding and a lack of know-how.

3 Other Issues

3.1 EU FUNDED CIVIL SOCIETY INITIATIVE

Recently, the Rwanda Civil Society Platform (RCSP) has submitted a proposal to the European Union Delegation in Kigali. The 'Improving Efficiency and Accountability of Service Delivery in Rwanda' proposal is in response to a Call under the EU's NSA (Non State Actors) budget line.

The proposal has been submitted for a project which has a goal and purpose identical to PPIMA. It is intended to be carried out involving 8 of PPIMA's existing 14 partners. Initially, the districts identified were PPIMA's existing 4 districts. That has since been amended and 4 other districts have replaced them. The first tranche of funding for the project has already been released.

The proposal does not seek to engage communities in the Community Score Card process and so is devoid of one of the key features which make PPIMA successful. Instead, it proposes, amongst other things to establish ICT centres in the 4 districts, which will possess a mobile and web-based system, so that citizens can raise their concerns linked to service delivery and obtain real-time feedback from government and other service providers. It then proposes that the information collected through these centres which are referred to as Community Service Delivery Monitoring and Feedback Centres, and from the existing 4 AJICs, Transparency Rwanda's ALAC centres and the ongoing Community Scorecard process through PPIMA project, will all feed into district level planning to influence decision making and service delivery at the district level. The mechanism for this will be public policy dialogues in which government and civil society will participate. As a follow-up to the commitments made at these dialogues, citizens will be able to evaluate and give marks to service providers using an IT evaluation system. The marks will be beamed on to the Platform's service delivery monitoring dashboard.

RCSP has been asked, by the EU to sign an agreement with NPA that it will provide necessary technical support. The exact requirements are rather unclear, as is who will pay for this additional assignment, but NPA should assess whether this additional demand will have a negative effect on its existing PPIMA project. The PPIMA project is still in its infancy, only the first rollout has been completed or is being completed and the model has still not proven itself on a large scale. Its impacts are yet to be realised. Diverting attention to this new project will be detrimental to PPIMA. More thought should have been given to how this new EU project could build on existing PPIMA strengths and where synergies could be forged, rather than a watered-down, hi-tech version being rolled out. However, it appears that the EU is still pre-

pared to discuss the specifics of the project and such discussions could be beneficial to all parties, thus while Sida and DFID have already been engaging with the EU on this matter, more dialogue is needed between the three donors, NPA and RSCP.

3.2 PROGRESS ON RECOMMENDATIONS IN MID TERM REVIEW

The Mid-Term Review of PPIMA was undertaken in August 2011. The MTR gave a series of recommendations including 9 on district level engagement, 1 on national level engagement, 3 on partnerships, 2 on gender, 6 on programme and financial management, 5 on monitoring and evaluation, and 4 on decentralised government. According to the TOR, the current evaluation needs to review progress of PPIMA against the recommendations. The review, discussed with the NPA management, is attached as Annex 3. The evaluation views that satisfactory progress is being made on implementation of the recommendations and there are no priority recommendations which have not been urgently addressed. Implementation on some of the recommendations is, and will continue to be, an ongoing process. A few points worthy of note here are:

- The evaluation agrees with NPA regarding recommendation no.8 which states that standard indicators for each domain (agriculture, health, water & sanitation, infrastructure, education) should be devised. Each community faces different sets of issues within the domain that it identifies for the CSC rollout. In addition, one of the strengths of the CSC process is that it encourages participation right from the beginning of the CSC process including the identification of the key indicators on which service provision should be assessed. Thus, PPIMA should re-order the steps suggested in the recommendation. After indicators in different communities have been drawn up, PPIMA should review which indicators are the most commonly repeated in the CSCs and draw general conclusions from them and their scores for advocacy purposes.

- Regarding recommendation no.10, while it is true that the RCSP website is active and regularly updated, there are no forums or pages on it where *active discussion* takes place.

4 Conclusions

- The project is highly relevant to national priorities associated with decentralisation, improving service delivery, transparency and accountability. The key national strategies and policies lay stress on targeting these issues. However, capacities of communities to articulate their concerns were poor and mechanisms to transmit their demands to different levels of government were lacking. The CSOs that NPA has partnered with have attempted to fill that void through relevant activities such as the rollout of the Community Score Card, the holding of national and district level dialogues, the opening of Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centres and publication of material on budgetary issues, decentralisation and corruption. Where CSOs themselves have lacked capacities, the project has provided both financial and technical support to improve them.

- The project did well to concentrate on 4 districts and within those districts on 6 sectors each. This has increased cost efficiency and coordination. This however leaves a lot of room for geographic expansion to other villages within existing districts and existing sectors should the need for expansion arise.

- The 14 PPIMA partners themselves came from different backgrounds and were of different levels of maturity. NPA provided across-the-board support such as in how to undertake the scorecard process and improve advocacy abilities, as well as targeted support in the case of their improving their financial competencies. The performance of partners and their degree of commitment to the project has been mixed. In addition, some have viewed PPIMA as a project, the activities of which did not need to be aligned with other aspects of their own work or work that PPIMA as a whole was doing. Some have institutionally benefitted while others have relied on external consultants for undertaking abilities. PPIMA was able to encourage mutual learning and skill sharing which can be enhanced in the future. There is increased evidence of the CSOs working together in districts and the new phase will provide a stimulus to increase this.

- Annual workplans of partners have been revised more than once and there is little assessment made in the PPIMA documentation about why this occurs on the scale that it does. However, the evaluation has assessed that ambitious targets, lack of funding, poor commitment and capacity of some partners, and unavailability of government staff play important roles. Again though, the lessons learnt should provide for more realistic workplanning to occur in the future

- The Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centres (AJICs) are too young for a proper assessment of their performance to be made however, they serve a need, their coordinators are being mentored and the youth clubs are showing signs of being able to play a positive role. The number of reported cases is rising though the AJICs' target catchment area is quite big relative to their resources to reach all the area. Transparency International, the project partner to which cases are forwarded, along with the CSOs which host the centres, provide satisfactory training and support.

- The Community Score Card is proving to be successful in terms of community empowerment and engagement with local authorities. It is a very thorough process, which takes several months to complete, and as the steps go by, communities plan priorities for their development needs, engage with service providers and monitor improvement in service delivery. Needs are separately assessed for marginalised groups within the villages while in the whole process, a cadre of community animators is developed. Only the rollout of the first domain has been done: in 28 villages the rollout is complete while 52 are still following up the implementation of the agreed workplan after the 1st interface dialogue between service providers and the communities for the first domain. It is highly likely that subsequent rollouts will be much faster but should not be unnecessarily hastened.

- Both reported and observed socio-economic developments in communities because of the response of government to the community score card process have included improved access to agricultural inputs, i.e. seeds and fertilisers, better service provision in health centres, improved availability of drinking water and the landless getting lands.

- NPA plays a satisfactory coordinating role – its District Field Coordinators and Technical Support Unit regularly follow-up and provide support to the concerned staff of the implementing partners, feedback is provided on quarterly progress reports and a quarterly review is held though this could be improved in its effectiveness. It is not easy to coordinate 14 different partners and provide the necessary follow-up and support, and the demand will increase in the next phase as more issues in scorecards come to the fore for advocating at the policy level.

- After an arduous process, the logical framework of the project has now been accepted its current form. The process has raised the need to, in future, engage in some sort of strategy development in a consultative manner. It has highlighted the need for both qualitative and quantitative indicators to be included in the framework, which then fulfil the demands of a wider group of stakeholders and are useful also for the project itself to see not only what is occurring but how it is occurring.

- The M&E system of PPIMA can be deemed as satisfactory. A great deal of useful information is housed in it. Quarterly reports are regularly submitted and reviewed, audits of partners are regularly held and followed-up, and data is available with ease. Weekly management meetings are regularly held also.

The documentation of stories of significant change and case studies highlighting successes or achievements is quite rudimentary and needs to be improved

- In terms of sustainability, the cadre of community animators is already meeting together in the form of informal groups but sustainability of these groups could be enhanced with more structure given to them. In addition, scope exists for the formation of structured community groups in the 5 domains that the project currently works in and this should be assessed. This will require some linking up with CSOs which are engaged in such community mobilisation. It would broaden the mandate of PPIMA too much were it to engage in group formation itself.

- The sustainability of CSOs and the skills they have acquired due to their association with PPIMA presents a mixed picture. In some cases, nearly all the technical skill enhancement has been of 1 or 2 individuals. In other cases the institution itself has matured and improved. Both national and district Government has been satisfied in its engagement with PPIMA and the partners, but it is unlikely that currently the activities under PPIMA will continue without external funding – one reason being that PPIMA has still to prove itself at a replicable scale.

- Few donors are engaged in similar activities thought the EU has started a project called EASD-R or 'Improving Efficiency and Accountability of Service Delivery in Rwanda' in partnership with Rwanda Civil Society Platform and involving 8 existing PPIMA partners. It needs to be made sure that the project reinforces and does not weaken PPIMA because of the demands it may impose on NPA, RCSP and the other partners.

- The Mid-Term Review of PPIMA was undertaken in August 2011. The MTR gave a series of recommendations. The evaluation views that satisfactory progress is being made on implementation of the recommendations and there are no priority recommendations which have not been urgently addressed. Implementation on some of the recommendations is, and will continue to be, an ongoing process.

5 Recommendations

PPIMA is very young and not currently sustainable if external support were removed. Even within a short time frame, it has shown extremely promising results. Sida and DFID rightly identified a programme to support which can have enormous potential for Rwanda and beyond. Local and national government have embraced what appears to be an intrusive and confrontational project. Communities are beginning to feel a sense of empowerment and improvement in their lives and CSOs have been equipped with better skills in advocacy and community engagement.

However, the outcomes that are being observed are small in number and magnitude. For the full effect of the programme to be realised and for it to gain prominent impact as a model to be adopted and replicated, it needs further donor support and this is strongly recommended.

The key recommendations are as follows:

Strategy Development and Planning for Second Phase

- The development of a logical framework matrix for the next phase should be initiated in time for it to be ready for the Inception Phase. It should be developed after NPA and its donors have gone through the entire logical framework analysis cycle and in a consultative and participatory manner. That process should start from an analysis of the context of the project, the problem it is trying to address and the stakeholders involved. An objective tree would be derived from this problem tree and a strategy analysis undertaken. This would help identify the activities to be undertaken, the results they would lead to and the purpose they would serve.

- The next stage would be the development of the matrix which as agreed during the evaluation should be outcome-focussed and with an appropriate mix of qualitative and quantitative indicators.

- Following on from the risks identified in the last column of the logical framework matrix after the process mentioned above, a risk analysis and risk mitigation strategy will need to be elaborated.

- The next phase should be preceded by an assessment of the performance of the current PPIMA partners, the commitments they have shown, the improvements in capacity they have demonstrated and the type of skill sets required of CSOs for the future. This will assist in shortlisting those CSOs with which a renewed partnership should be forged. It will also serve both as a

planning tool and as a benchmark to measure performance of the CSOs towards in the middle or towards the end of the 2nd phase.

- The temptation to expand geographically should be avoided as spreading itself more thinly will diffuse the impact PPIMA could potentially make. For the near term, PPIMA should continue to concentrate on the sectors and districts it is functioning in, until a viable model of some scale is created and observable.

- A baseline survey will need to be initiated in preparation for the next phase. A significant amount of data on quantitative indicators exists. It needs to be reinforced with qualitative information regarding the current type and degree of engagement of communities with service providers, communities' knowledge of decentralisation, budgetary matters and their rights, extent of satisfaction with service delivery, felt needs in communities, current capacities of community animators and other relevant indicators etc.

NPA's Coordination Role

- PPIMA needs to exploit the presence of 14 different skill sets within its fold more vigorously than currently occurring. Strategy development and work planning prior to the next phase needs to ensure that both PPIMA and its partners are able to reinforce each others' efforts to achieve the partners' own goals and the goals of PPIMA.

- The Quarterly Review Meetings need to be revamped to bring out their coordination, discussion and information sharing ability. This should be done using techniques such as working in small groups, rotating presenters and encouraging more active and demanding participation from the attendees.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Regularly updated information on progress against targets needs to be used as a monitoring tool. It needs to clearly show any revisions in original targets.

- Trainings form an important component of PPIMA work and measuring their effectiveness is required. Systems will have to be put in place to measure the 'before' and 'after' change in knowledge because of attendance at a training.

- PPIMA and CSOs need to be trained in documenting case studies/stories of change, which are able to become to a body of evidence to demonstrate that PPIMA is contributing to CSOs' capacities to analyse and advocate, communities are increasingly actively engaging with and receiving responses from government authorities, PPIMA is contributing to changes in government policies and improvements in the socio-economic condition of targeted communities is occurring partly due to the efforts of the project. These are the

types of indicators that the current logical framework requires reporting on. It is expected that the future one will also require reporting on similar indicators.

- A strategy for regular monitoring of the community score card after the first rollout needs to be developed as an analysis of the scores from the 2nd interface have shown that while there is improvement, there is scope and need for more to be accomplished. Apart from policy level issues which may take longer to translate into better service provision, changes in service providers' abilities to improve service provision may also take longer than the few months between a first and second scoring. If an active focus does not remain on domains that have previously been rolled out, there may be a tendency for continuous monitoring of them to de-emphasised.

Anti-Corruption and Justice Information Centres

- The AJIC model needs to be reassessed and necessary amendments to it made before funding the centres in a follow-on phase. This may require the reduced emphasis on efforts to promote interent-type cafes and more focus on enabling the youth clubs to be able to sensitise the local population regarding their rights, corruption and other grievances and to support this in a larger geographical area.

Other activities

- The regularity of national level dialogues fed by the now abundant information emanating from the field level, particularly the issues identified in the CSCs, needs to be increased. This will require more funding.

- Exposure visits can prove invaluable in assisting community animators in sharing ideas and learning how things can be done better. Also, they can be used as a useful demonstration to exhibit to senior government officials how PPIMA functions. Funding for them should be allocated.

- In the next phase, adequate financial resources need to be allocated for capacity building in M&E of the Technical Support Unit in areas as logical framework development and of PPIMA generally in areas such as case study writing and risk mitigation strategy development etc.

indicates a PPIMA implementation district. PPIMA is implemented in 4 out of Rwanda's 30 districts.

Annex 2 – Implementation Status of Partners' Workplans

Implementing Part-ner	Proposed Activities	Implementing date as per original contract in 2010	Implementation date as per 2011 work plan	Implementation date as per 2012 work plan	Implementation status
RCSP: Rwanda civil Society Platform	Publication and dissemination of a quarterly policy and aid effectiveness newsletter	Sep-10	March, June, Sept, Dec 2011	One article posted on the interactive web-site every month from March - Dec 2012	Only one volume of policy and aid effectiveness newsletter produced and disseminated in 2011 and not quarterly as planned.
	Quarterly governance and poli-cy/service delivery dialogue forums	Sept, Oct, Nov, Dec 2010	March, June, Sept, Dec 2011	Nov - Dec 2012	Two public policy dialogues (PPDs) organised on Health Insurance and Performance Contracts in Kigali and 3 PPDs on Health Insurance in Rulindo, Nyamagabe and Gisagara dis-tricts in 2011.
	Creation of interactive website	Sep-10	Official launch of the website Jan 2011	Updating the website every week and pro-duce website reports March, June, Sept, Dec 2012	Revised official website www.rcsprwanda.org launched on 23rd December 2011.

Implementing Partner	Proposed Activities	Implementing date as per original contract in 2010	Implementation date as per 2011 work plan	Implementation date as per 2012 work plan	Implementation status
CCOAIB: Conseil de Concertation des Organisations d'Appui aux Initiatives de Base	Production and dissemination of popular guide on the decentralisation process	Dec-10	Printing and distribution of 8,000 copies in July 2010	Printing and distributing of 8,000 popular guides Feb 2012	The guide has been published and copies distributed
	Production of one video documentary on decentralisation	Dec-10	Jul-10	Apr-12	The video has not yet been produced
CLADHO: Collectif des Ligues et Associations des Droits de l'Homme	Budget transparency study	Not planned	Apr-11	Mar-12	The study has been ongoing since 2011 but no report has been yet produced by the consultant
	Produce and disseminate citizen guide to the budget	Not planned	May-11	Development, launch and dissemination of Citizen Guide to the budget 2012/2013 June - Aug 2012	National dialogue on budget has been conducted in 2011 and the guide produced. The one for 2012 is in course of preparation.
	Radio and TV press conference on National budget	Not planned	Jun-11	Jun-12	The press conference for 2011 has been done, and the one for 2012 will be organised after publication of the citizen guide.

Implementing Partner	Proposed Activities	Implementing date as per original contract in 2010	Implementation date as per 2011 work plan	Implementation date as per 2012 work plan	Implementation status
TI-R: Transparency International Rwanda	Publication and distribution of "The Transparent" a quarterly TR magazine	Quarterly	March, June, Sept, Dec 2011	Distribution of 12,000 copies March, June, Sept, Dec 2012	The Magazine has been being produced since 2009 and until 2011, eleven (11) issues had been produced and distributed and issues for 2012 produced as planned.
	Survey on corruption and publish corruption index for Rwanda	Not planned	Publication and dissemination of findings Nov - Dec 2011	Publication of the findings Nov - Dec 2012	Index for 2011 published
	Capacity building for the 4 AJICs	Not planned	Technical support to PPIMA partners 4 AJICs May - Dec 2011	Capacity building and coordination of AJICs Jan - Dec 2012	TR is technically supporting and coordinating the AJICs
Pro-Femmes/Twese Hamwe	Quarterly newsletter on gender and policy issues	Not planned	Every quarter 2011	Publication of gender policy and related information on RCSP interactive website Feb - Dec 2012	The newsletter was not produced in 2011 due to the resignation of PPIMA coordinator, and for 2012 it has been decided that instead of the newsletter publication of gender policy and related information would be made through the RCSP interactive website.

Implementing Part-ner	Proposed Activities	Implementing date as per original contract in 2010	Implementation date as per 2011 work plan	Implementation date as per 2012 work plan	Implementation status
	Monitor the Implementation of gender budget statements in the 4 Ministries (MINEDUC, MINISANTE, MINAGRI, MI-NINFRA)	Not planned	March - July 2011	Collecting data from the four Ministries March, April, May, Jul, Sept, Nov 2012	The activity was not fully rea-lized in 2011 as obtaining in-formation from the concerned ministries was a challenge, and the organisation reports that it is still pushing the Ministry of Gender and Gender Monitoring Office to create gender data-base
NUDOR: National Union of Disabilities Organisations of Rwanda	Support people with disabilities and institution to influence and monitor the implementation of service delivery at all levels	The organisation has not done any core PPIMA activities, it is rather being supported by the project in its establishment so that it can carry out advocacy in favour of the disabled.			
AJPRODHO: Association de la Jeunesse pour la Promotion des Droits de l'Homme	Community Scorecard	2nd interface planned in Dec 2010	April - Dec 2011	Completion of 1st rollout Jan - May 2012 and start of 2nd rollout May 2012	1st rollout completed only in 2 sectors
	Governance and policy/service delivery dialogue forums (DDFs) at district level	Not planned	March, Aug, Dec 2011	June-Jul, Dec 2012	Two DDFs took place in 2011 and one has been so far orga-nised in 2012

55

Implementing Partner	Proposed Activities	Implementing date as per original contract in 2010	Implementation date as per 2011 work plan	Implementation date as per 2012 work plan	Implementation status
	Call-in radio talk shows on policy/service delivery	Not planned	July, Dec 2011	March-Apr, Sept-Oct 2012	Was not organised in 2011 due to many activities and one has been organised in the 1st quarter of 2012
	Conducting youth hearing at National level	Consultation meetings to set up coordination structures Sept-Dec	June - Nov 2011	Jun-12	Research on youth concerns has been carried out and the report available. Currently youth hearing event during which these concerns will be presented to the decision-makers is under preparation.
	AJIC centre	Not planned	May - Nov 2011	Feb-12	Official launched in March 2012
RWN: Rwanda Women Network	Community Scorecard	2nd interface meeting planned in Dec 2010	March - Dec 2011	Completion of 1st rollout Jan - May 2012 and start of 2nd rollout June 2012	Still in the 1st rollout
	Quarterly governance and policy/service delivery dialogue forums at district level	Not planned	March, June, Sept, Dec 2011	March & Sept 2012	Two DDFs took place in 2011 and one has been so far organised in 2012

Implementing Partner	Proposed Activities	Implementing date as per original contract in 2010	Implementation date as per 2011 work plan	Implementation date as per 2012 work plan	Implementation status
	Call-in radio talk shows on policy/service delivery	One planned in Dec 2010	May, Aug, Nov 2011	June, Dec 2012	The show has not yet been organised until now; they plan to organise one during Aug 2012
TUBIBE AMAHO-RO	Community Scorecard	2nd interface meeting planned in Dec 2010	April - May 2011	Completion of 1st rollout Feb - March 2012 and start of 2nd rollout May 2012	Still in the first rollout
	Governance and policy/service delivery dialogue forums at district level	Not planned	Jul-11	June-July, Dec 2012	Only one DDF was organised in 2011
	Call-in radio talk shows on policy/service delivery	One planned in Dec 2010	Jul, Oct 2011	March-April, Sept-Oct 2012	Only one was organised in 2011. The one for 2012 is planned for Aug
	AJIC centre	Not planned	Should be operational from May 2011	Should be operational from Feb 2012	Not yet officially launched but operational since May 2012
ADI: Association pour le Développement Intégré "ADI TERIMBERE"	Community Scorecard	2nd interface meeting planned in Dec 2010	1st roll out should be completed April - Nov 2011	Completion of 1st rollout Jan - April 2012 and start of 2nd rollout June 2012	Still in the 1st rollout
	Governance and policy/service delivery forums at	Not planned	March, June, Sept, Dec 2011	June, Dec 2012	Only one DDF was organised in 2011

Implementing Partner	Proposed Activities	Implementing date as per original contract in 2010	Implementation date as per 2011 work plan	Implementation date as per 2012 work plan	Implementation status
	district level				
	Call-in radio talk shows on policy/service delivery	One planned in Dec 2010	June, Nov 2011	May, June 2012	Only one was organised in 2011. The one for 2012 is planned for Aug
ADTS: Association pour le Dévéloppement et la Transformation Sociale	Community Scorecard	Monitoring of agreed action plans after 1st interface Dec 2010	July - Aug 2011	Completion of 1st rollout Feb - Jul 2012 and start of 2nd rollout Jul 2012	Still in the 1st rollout
	Governance and policy/service delivery dialogue forums at district level	Dec-10	Jul-11	June-July, Dec 2012	Only one DDF was organised in 2011
	Call-in radio talk shows on policy/service delivery	Dec-10	July, Oct 2011	March-Apr & Sept-Oct 2012	Only one was organised in 2011. For 2012 one is planned in Sept and the other in December.
	Develop Community-friendly training HRBA manual and guide	Oct-10	HRBA Manual and Guide should be printed June - Jul 2011	Feb - March 2012	HRBA and guide produced in 2011 and remaining activities were completed in the 1st quarter of 2012 as planned
	AJIC centre	Not planned	Should be operational from Aug 2011	Should be operational from March 2012	Not yet officially launched but operational since February 2012

Implementing Partner	Proposed Activities	Implementing date as per original contract in 2010	Implementation date as per 2011 work plan	Implementation date as per 2012 work plan	Implementation status
IMBARAGA: Rwanda Farmers Federation	Community Scorecard	2nd interface planned in Dec 2010	2 CSC completed in Coko and Muyongwe sectors, 1 CSC completed in Gakenke	Completion of 1st rollout Feb - May 2012 and start of 2nd rollout Apr 2012	Still in the 1st rollout
	Governance and policy/service delivery dialogue forums at district level	Not planned	March, May, Sept, Dec 2011	March-April, Sept-Oct 2012	Only one DDF was organised in 2011
	Call-in radio talk shows on policy/service delivery	Dec-10	May, Sept, Dec 2011	June-July, Dec 2012	Only one was organised in 2011. For 2012 one is planned in Sept and the other in December.
COPORWA: Community of Potters of Rwanda	Community Scorecard	Monitoring of agreed action plans after 1st interface Dec 2010	2 CSC completed in Kibeho and Rusenge sectors, 1 CSC completed in Mata	Completion of 1st rollout Jan - Feb 2012 and start 2nd rollout June 2012	Still in 1st rollout
	Governance and policy/service delivery dialogue forums at district level	Dec-10	May, Sept, Dec 2011	April, Sept-Oct 2012	Only one DDF was organised in 2011

Implementing Part-ner	Proposed Activities	Implementing date as per original contract in 2010	Implementation date as per 2011 work plan	Implementation date as per 2012 work plan	Implementation status
	Call-in radio talk shows on policy/service delivery	Dec-10	May, Sept, Dec 2011	June-July, Dec 2012	Only one was organised in 2011. The one for 2012 is planned for Aug
ADENYA: Association pour le Dévéloppement de Nyabimata	Community Scorecard	2nd interface planned in Dec 2010	2 CSC completed in Ruheru and Nya-bimata sectors, 1 CSC completed in Muganza	Completion of 1st rollout Feb - Jun 2011 and start 2nd rollout Jul 2012	Still in the 1st rollout
	Governance and policy/service delivery dialogue forums at district level	Not planned	June, Sept, Dec 2011	June-July, Dec 2012	Only one DDF was organised in 2011
	Call-in radio talk shows on policy/service delivery	Dec-10	June, Sept, Dec 2011	Sept, Oct 2012	Only one was organised in 2011. The one for 2012 is planned for Aug
	AJIC centre	Not planned	May-11	Mar-12	Not yet officially launched but operational since May 2012

Annex 3 – Review of Progress after 2011 Mid Term Review

	RECOMMENDATION	PROGRESS TO DATE
District Level Management		
1	Finalise and publish the guide to decentralisation. This has to be a practical guide that explains the formal rules that govern who has the power to make what kinds of decisions and the mandated mechanisms for engaging with duty holders. PPIMA should consider finalising this vital piece of work itself if the next draft is not satisfactory.	A satisfactory version was finalized and translated into Kinyarwanda. The guide was launched in July 2011 and is in the process of being disseminated.
2	Supplement the description of the formal system by analysing the incentives and norms that govern the actions of key players at decentralised level. This would take the form of a 'Power Change Analysis'or 'Power Analysis' common within the Sida system or a political economy analysis as applied by DFID.	No progress though NPA states it will be done in the future.
3	Train implementers throughout the PPIMA system in the implications of the "rules of the game" so that that focus of and tactics of advocacy can be tailored to the realities of how decisions are made.	ToT in advocacy was undertaken in April 2012 and capacities are being transferred to the Community Animators in the respective PPIMA operational districts.
4	Build advocacy skills in district Partner staff re-orienting their role towards community advocacy.	As above. This is ongoing and will be completed by end of July 2012
5	Develop aggregate and synthesized data showing trends and issues enabling systemic solutions applicable to districts and sectors.	Strategies have been formulated to translate CSC findings - derived from common service domains of sectors and villages - into aggregated data for advocacy. On completion of each scorecard, a report focusing on issues that could not be addressed at the local level is compiled presented in Government structures like the JADF meetings and the district planning meetings.
6	Engage skilled statisticians for data analysis.	Data analysis is not complex enough to require a statistician.
7	Bring the skills of the national partners to bear on such issues as: budget analysis, gender analysis and others - at sector and district levels - applying the experience	This is being done and has been discussed in this evaluation report. CLADHO with district level partners have sensitized community animators on the budget making process. District

	RECOMMENDATION	*PROGRESS TO DATE*
	gained to promote national level advocacy.	level partners have been involved in annual budget analysis led by CLADHO. Transparency Rwanda has been engaged in training and supporting district level partners on to identify and advocate against anti-corruption and advocacy issues related to public accountability and injustices. RCSP has coordinated and organized public dialogues at national level to discuss issues arising from the community score card process. It is agreed that even greater exploitation of the skills and knowledge of the national partners to address issues at the sector and district levels would be beneficial. The popular guide to decentralisation process produced by CCOAIB will be used by the district level partners to sensitize local authorities and communities on participating in the government provided spaces for addressing their issues and contribute to the district planning and budgeting process.
8	Consider introducing standard indicators for each domain together with measures chosen by the community to enable trends to be identified and to support advocacy on common issues.	Consideration to introduce standard indicators is not possible due the methodology of community score card but see observations against recommendation no.5 above.
9	Development of a participatory strategy in government mandated spaces. Government actors may well support community advocacy efforts, as technical officers will usually be happy to get extra resources to address issues; they will also appreciate the chance to report participation in mandated spaces. The reaction of government actors to citizens' concerns in the different spaces will be monitored and outcomes recorded.	Participatory efforts are on-going and will improve as project activities are implemented. Examples are: 'The citizen's guide to decentralisation' and 'The citizens guide to the national budget' which are being discussed in *Muganda* meetings, JADF meetings. Using local government structures to distribute and discuss gives more impact on how local leaders and citizens respond. These booklets will be distributed with the assistance of the Minecofin and the Ministry of Local Government. Decentralised authorities and PPIMA Partners will distribute the guides and hold discussions on the subject in government provided spaces.
National Level Engagement		
10	Reinvigorate the RCSP website for it to become a vehicle for active discussion and exchange.	By January 2012 PPIMA activities were being published on the website. PPIMA Partners information about their activities is progressively uploaded on the website and it has been re-

	RECOMMENDATION	*PROGRESS TO DATE*
		ported that a good number of people are visiting it.
Partnerships		
11	Review work plans and ensure that Partners are confident that they can deliver their commitments in the given timeframes. Ensure that in planning exercises the delivery capacity is adequate to the requirement to be met.	TSU undertook a viability review of the activities of PPIMA project in December and January this year; refocusing on the relevance as well as the extension of the project period.
12	Undertake a re-branding exercise to de-emphasize the roles of PPIMA (and NPA). A higher profile for the Partners as independent organisations will raise awareness of their roles when interacting with Communities and Government, and when carrying out training courses, planning exercises and preparing project documentation.	The process was put on hold due to the anti-abortion campaigns which involved the key PPIMA partners and raised uncertainties on the way forward of the project.
13	NPA should assess whether in the long-term it is likely to have the technical capacity to backstop this kind of intervention. If not it should seek to develop partnerships with academic institutions or companies that can supply these services.	NPA's approach is to ensure the right technical capacity is provided at all time. In the event of a capacity deficit NPA will outsource for the necessary competence.
Gender		
14	Extend gender training to CSC animators.	Partners were trained in gender and it will be extended to CSC animators in next phase of the project.
15	Train and mentor the leadership of Implementing Partners.	Partner leaders are always included in all trainings organised by NPA like; - Financial management for NGOs, - Budgeting & planning - Financial reporting - Human capital capacity building - Cash flow management - Budget analysis - Public Policy Human Rights Based Approaches
Programme & Financial Management		
16	Re-evaluate activities against the time available to ensure they meet the required standard. The key criteria must be: The time needed to make the intervention sustainable in the long-term.	A review meeting was held in January to assess and reflect on the relevance and pertinence of planned activities ensuring appropriate modifications against availability of time.
17	Deploy project management tools to ensure effective scheduling.	The log frame is under revision to develop realistic measurable indicators. A Programmatic Approach Handbook has been drafted. Weekly programme meetings are held.
18	Evaluate operational risk in the planning sessions ensuring that mitigation measures	Not done.

	RECOMMENDATION	*PROGRESS TO DATE*
	in place.	
19	Make greater use of financial management information for proactive programme management and reporting.	This is being done.
20	Reactivate staff performance management processes.	Appraisal methodology in place.
21	Appoint a new Programme Manager.	Completed.
Monitoring & Evaluation		
22	Confirm that the revised log frame completed as part of this review will be the basis for future reporting.	Work in progress.
23	Deploy an M&E expert to assess the need and potential for a full impact evaluation of the project and combine this with a further review of the log frame (January 2012). The same expert should train the beneficiaries on M&E.	This was reviewed and a handbook is in place.
24	Re-focus the M&E and reporting on significant changes in indicators, on risks and on lessons learned.	This has been incorporated in the results matrix, but work is required on the risks component.
25	Adopt a system of quarterly and annual reporting with clear differences in the functions of the two.	NPA will retain six-monthly & annual reporting to donors.
26	Develop and experiment with strategies designed to engage with the spaces that government has created.	This was discussed with partners and it being done.
Decentralised Government		
27	More stress is needed on the advocacy end of the process to ensure a response from government.	As above.
28	More stress in understanding how the decentralised system works.	A guide to decentralisation process has been produced and sensitization is being done.
29	More stress in developing and experimenting with strategies to engage with the spaces the government has created.	As above.
30	How best to deal with the wealth of information being generated and synthesized for use as evidence for advocacy at higher levels.	Strategies are in place are continuously being discussed with Partners in order to package the evidence for higher advocacy.

Annex 4 – Terms of Reference

2012-05-16

Terms of reference - evaluation of PPIMA

Background

The Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy (PPIMA) project is a civil society support project aimed at promoting an active interest among Rwandan civil society organisations and citizens in public policy affairs. The project is designed to help these actors self-organize and acquire the skills needed to engage effectively in national and local level processes of policy formulation and implementation, which will ensure that policies work to deliver improved services, especially for poor Rwandans. PPIMA is implemented by Norwegian Peoples Aid (NPA) and is mainly funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and Department for International Development (DFID). CARE and Save the Children are collaboration partners to the project.

The project purpose is that *Rwandan civil society and citizens in PPIMA's target districts are actively participating in and influencing national and local level policies and plans for poverty reduction.* The principal approaches to achieve this purpose are: increasing access to information, building CSO capacity in evidence gathering, analysis and advocacy; and strengthening the fight against corruption by establishing anti-corruption clubs and supporting Transparency International Rwanda (TIR). A campaign for the enactment of an Access to Information law is a key thrust. PPIMA seeks to use a variety of media to increase access to information; there are no formal media partnerships. The project outputs[6] are:

- Output 1: PPIMA partners have the capacity to influence Government public policies and plans;
- Output 2: PPIMA partners are organized to influence public policies and plans;

---

[6] The term 'output' is used for these results, as it is the terminology used in DFID templates for results frameworks. In the terminology of the OECD/DAC glossary for results based management the term 'outcome' would be more appropriate.

- Output 3: Citizens and 14 CSOs involved in PPIMA activities are engaged in public policies[7].

A community score card process that produces an analysis of issues around key services in Rwanda has been developed. The process is designed to engage village communities in assessing and providing feedback on the quality and effectiveness of the public services they receive.The score card process engages both service users (citizens) and service providers in a discussion of the issues that affect service delivery. It brings the participants together to share their perspectives and develop a joint action plan to improve services. The engagement is non-confrontational and well suited to the Rwandan context. Decentralised government is sufficiently autonomous to be able to allocate resources and change plans to respond to citizens expressed priorities.

The key PPIMA project interventions will include:

- Technical and institutional support to Rwandan civil society to develop key capacities and capabilities in public policy analysis and dialogue. Also planned is the establishment of a Civil Society Policy Monitoring Group which will assist the Rwandan civil sector to participate effectively in public policy dialogue.
- Development and dissemination of popular guides on key public policies, policy processes and laws.
- Establishment of a robust Public Policy information system through an interactive website to be hosted by the Rwanda Civil Society Platform. The website will enable civil society organizations and citizens to access and share key resources on public policy affairs.
- Execution, dissemination and discussions of studies on key public policy issues. An annual Rwanda Open Budget Survey and a number of client satisfaction and public expenditure monitoring surveys are also planned.
- Public forums at national and local level to dialogue wide-ranging policy matters of interest to the public.
- A civil society campaign for the enactment of a progressive law on access to public information (access to information act).
- National and local level monitoring of public budgets and service delivery in 4 districts, to assess and give feedback to government on effectiveness of policy, especially in relation to poverty reduction and service delivery. This will entail an annual analysis of and feedback on the national budget and a range

---

[7] The outputs have been revised as of May 2012, to reflect recommendations from the MTR and subject to final approval.

of public satisfaction surveys. A modified Citizens Score Card Methodology will be piloted in 4 selected districts. The major use of the data will be in enabling an active and informed engagement of civil society and citizens in key policy making processes such as the sector working groups, the Joint Action development Forums (JADF) and other local processes.

- Establishement and operationalization of four anti-corruption and justice clubs in five districts; establishment, with the support of Transparency International, of a national advocacy and legal advisory centre (ALAC) to receive, follow up cases, and offer legal advice to victims and witnesses of corruption.
- Implementation of a multi-media strategy (involving print, radio, television, mobile telephony) to increase citizens voice in public policy dialogue and in the demand for greater public accountability and the efforts to combat corruption in Rwanda.

Objectives and scope

The objective of the evaluation is twofold. The first objective is to evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programme up until May/June 2012. The evaluation will serve as an important input to the DFID's and Sida's assessment of a possible second phase of support to PPIMA.

The second objective is to complement the monitoring of PPIMA with qualitative data and conduct research and an evaluative analysis of the following indicators in the results framework[8]:

- indicator 3 under the project purpose of the results framework (cases and most significant change stories on citizen participation and responses from government authorities);
- indicator 1.3 (most significant change on capacity to analyse public policies);
- indicator 2.2 (type of inclusive activities with citizens organised by partners);
- indicator 2.3 (type of activities organised by CSO's jointly);
- indicator 3.5 (type of advocacy efforts initiated by the 14 PPIMA partners).

The second objective will assist NPA and the PPIMA partners to assess the outcomes of the programme, and thus evaluate the relevance and effectiveness of the programme activities. The evaluation shall in this regard complement and validate find-

---

[8] The results framework is enclosed as annex A.

ings of the internal monitoring of the programme. It shall assist the implementing partners in identifying and manage risks.

Methodology

The first phase of the evaluation consists of an evaluation of the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programme up until May/June 2012. The consultant shall propose a methodological approach to fulfil this task. Some specific requirements in this first phase (to be reflected in the methodology) include:

- Field visit(s) including consultation with programme beneficiaries.
- Review of progress against recommendations from the 2011 Mid Term Review of PPIMA.
- Review of the revised programme logframe (within this specific consideration should be given to the value of repeating the original baseline survey).
- Completion of the DFID Annual Review template[9].
- Identifying key lessons/recommendations to inform planning for any extension of PPIMA.

The second phase of the evaluation will complement the on-going monitoring of the quantitative indicators with qualitative data. Hence a a qualitative methodological approach shall be used for this phase of the evaluation. The consultant is expected to suggest appropriate techniques for evaluating the indicators listed above, ranging from e.g. qualitative/semi-structured/structured interviews, focus group interviews, group interviews, qualitative/semi-structured/structured observations, discourse analysis etc. The evaluation team shall focus on collecting data from the *target groups* of PPIMA activities at district level. Video material from activities and radio talk shows will be available to the consultants.

Field visits shall be carried out on two occasions: as soon as possible after the contract has been awarded, and in November 2012.

Evaluation questions

---

[9] PPIMA / NPA will complete a self-assessment and populate the DFID Annual Review template. The role of the consultants will be to validate and revise / update the self-assessment based on their review. Specific consideration needs to be given to value for money. Format and How To Note attached at Annex B. DFID will provide further briefing if needed.

The evaluation questions concerning the first phase of the evaluation are connected to four of the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, i.e. the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programme up to May/June 2012. The evaluation shall build on the findings from the Mid Term Review that was carried out in 2011. It shall include lessons learned and recommendations regarding a possible continuation of the programme.

The second phase shall complement the monitoring of PPIMA with qualitative data and an evaluative analysis of the above mentioned indicators in the results framework.

Stakeholder involvement

Since there are two objectives for this evaluation there are two different types of stakeholders to take into consideration. Regarding the first phase of the evaluation the main stakeholders are DFID and Sida. Hence, representatives from DFID, Sida and NPA will form an evaluation management group which will provide oversight and quality assurance of this part of the evaluation. The management group shall be provided with opportunities to comment on the proposal and a draft report. It will formally approve the final report. Briefing sessions with the management group shall be organised at the end of the first field visit. DFID and Sida will use the final report as a source for assessing future funding to the programme.

The second phase of the evaluation is formative and the primary intended users are NPA and the local NGO's which implement the programme activities. Therefore it is important to involve these stakeholders in the evaluation process and allow opportunities for them to comment on methodology and findings and participate in elaborating conclusions and recommendations. Sida and DFID shall be able to comment on the approach suggested in the proposal, and shall be briefed on findings after the second field visit.

Workplan and reporting

The evaluation is to be carried out over the period May/June 2012 until December 2012. It will include two field visits to Rwanda. One in May/June 2012 and one in November 2012. Three reports shall be delivered: one elaborated evaluation report (of no more than 30 pages excluding annexes), and the completed DFID Annual Review template, after the first field visit in May/June; and one report which will compliment other monitoring data after the second field visit in November. Only the first report need to be formally approved by the management group.

The consultant shall in the proposal elaborate on a detailed work plan.

Evaluation team

Qualifications of the evaluation team:

- The team leader shall have expert knowledge of and experience of conducting evaluations.
- At least one team member shall have significant experience and knowledge of support to civil society and working with civil society and broader understanding on empowerment and accountability between the citizens and the state.
- At least one team member shall have significant experience from and expert knowledge about qualitative methods.
- At least one team member should preferably have ability to conduct interviews, carry out observations and read documents in Kinyarwanda.