



BTC



**MINALOC MINISTRY OF LOCAL
GOVERNMENT**
P.O BOX 3445 KIGALI
Website: www.minaloc.gov.rw

RESULTS REPORT 2014

INTERVENTION RDSP ECD

**RWANDA DECENTRALIZATION SUPPORT PROGRAMME
ENHANCING THE CAPACITIES OF DISTRICTS**

RWA 1308911



P.

Acronyms

BTC	Belgian Development Agency
CB	Capacity Building
DEL CO	Delegated Co-Manager of the Project
D SWG	Decentralization Sector Working Group
ECD	Enhancing the Capacities of Districts
EDPRS 2	The 2 nd Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
KfW	German Development Bank
HRM	Human Resources Management
JSR	Joint Sector Reviews
LED	Local Economic Development
LODA	Local Administrative Entities Development Agency
LCF	Local Competitiveness Facility
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MINALOC	Ministry of Local Government (Ministère de l'Administration Locale)
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
PS	Permanent Secretary
PPP	Public Private Partnerships
RALGA	Rwanda Association of Local Government Authorities
RDSP	Rwanda Decentralization Support Programme
RGB	Rwanda Governance Board
SC	Steering Committee
SPIU	Single Project Implementation Unit
TA/NTA	Technical Assistance/National Technical Assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
TFF	Technical and Financial File

1.2 Budget execution

	Budget	Expenditure		Balance	Disbursement rate at the end of year 2014
		Previous years	Year covered by report (2014)		
Total	13.500.000,00	NA	2.113,00	13.497.887,00	0%
Output 1	4.362.500	NA	0	4.362.500	
Output 2	3.215.000	NA	0	3.215.000	
Output 3	1.485.000	NA	0	1.485.000	
Output 4	426.500	NA	0	426.500	
Output 5	600.000	NA	0	600.000	
Contingencies	450.000	NA	0	450.000	
General means	2.961.000	NA	2.113,00	2.958.887	0%

1.3 Self-assessment performance

1.3.1 Relevance

	Performance
Relevance	A

1.3.2 Effectiveness

	Performance
Effectiveness	B

1.3.3 Efficiency

	Performance
Efficiency	Not relevant - this is too early in project implementation

1.3.4 Potential sustainability

	Performance
Potential sustainability	Not relevant - this is too early in project implementation

National execution official ²	BTC execution official ³
Vincent Munyeshaka Permanent Secretary	Anne Pierre Mingelbier Program Officer



AP Mingelbier 17-02-2015

Monitoring & Evaluation in Local Government incl. Sector Decentralization		
---	--	--

The collaboration with Belgian Embassy and especially with the Attaché in charge of decentralization has been continuous and constructive, which is of importance in the complex context of this new concentration sector for Belgium in Rwanda and since no specific technical expertise (ATI) was available.

2.2 Performance outcome

This section of the results report is not relevant for the reporting period, because the intervention has not yet actually started.



[Handwritten signature]

2.5 Risk management

Risk Identification	Risk analysis		Risk Treatment		Follow-up of risk		Potential Impact	Total	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status
	Period of identification	Risk category	Risk category	Probability									
Misunderstanding of LED concept and key parameters	Q4 2014	Technical	Technical	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	ToR to Elaborate a concept note Validation of the concept note by SC	KP	31 st January			
No skilled ATI LED available on time (Q2 2014)	Q4 2014	Technical	Technical	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Relaunching of application 2d joint selection	PCU HR HQ HR HQ	30 th June 31 st January 28 th February			
Difficulties to integrate cross-cutting issues	Q4 2014	Technical	Technical	High	High	High	High	ToR to elaborate a concept note – with reference to the Gender, HIV HQ backstopping missions conducted in 2014 Gender scan budget could also be applied to other cross-cutting issues (environment, decent work for example) Validation of the concept note by SC	KP	28 th February			
Delay in start of operational period setting the PCU (arrival of Delco)	Q4 2014	Operational	Operational	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Conduct a first SC in Q1	PO	30 th June Mid-March			

3 Steering and Learning

3.1 Strategic re-orientations

Not applicable by now, but for one strategic activity ; the decision to conduct a Study Tour to assess the South African model on LED LCF (as inspiration for the TFF) will be taken at a later stage once the concept note on LED and once the LED Team is in place.

3.2 Recommendations

Main recommendations after the backstopping mission:

Starting up RDSP / ECD :		Pilot	Date limit / period	Actual situation
Recruitment ATN	LED	PCU/RR	Early Q3 2015	After arrival ITA LED
	CB	PCU/RR	End Q2 2015	After arrival DELCO
	Sector coordination	PCU/RR	End Q2 2015	After arrival DELCO
Acquisition equipment	Vehicles	PCU/RR	Early Q2 2015	After arrival DELCO
	Office furniture	PCU/RR	Early Q2 2015	After arrival DELCO
Steering committee start up	Presentation first operational / financial planning, start-up modalities, validation of mandates etc.	PCU / RR	Fin Q1 2015	After arrival DELCO
Study on Private sector		PCU	Q3 2015	After validated concept not on LED
Concept note LED	ToR	KP	End January 2015	
	Note	PCU/ITA LED	End of June 2015	After arrival of LED expert
Concept note Transversal Themes	ToR	KP	End February 2015	
	Note	PCU	End of June 2015	
Baseline	Backstopping mission	PCU	Q2 2015	Mobilisation MDF, KPT
	Baseline report	PCU	Early Q3 2015	SC meeting
Study Tour	Justification & ToR	PCU	2016 ?	To identify on a later stage
Execution and financing Agreements LODA, RALGA, RGB	Preparation of Templates,	PCU-CAF	Early Q2 2015	
	Signature	PCU	Q2 2015	
	Execution	PCU-CAF	July 2015	

4 Annexes

4.1 Quality criteria

1. RELEVANCE: The degree to which the intervention is in line with local and national policies and priorities as well as with the expectations of the beneficiaries				
<i>In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least one 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D</i>				
Assessment RELEVANCE: total score	A	B	C	D
	X			
1.1 What is the present level of relevance of the intervention?				
...	A	Clearly still embedded in national policies and Belgian strategy, responds to aid effectiveness commitments, highly relevant to needs of target group.		
...	B	Still fits well in national policies and Belgian strategy (without always being explicit), reasonably compatible with aid effectiveness commitments, relevant to target group's needs.		
...	C	Some issues regarding consistency with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid effectiveness or relevance.		
...	D	Contradictions with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid efficiency commitments; relevance to needs is questionable. Major adaptations needed.		
1.2 As presently designed, is the intervention logic still holding true?				
	A	Clear and well-structured intervention logic; feasible and consistent vertical logic of objectives; adequate indicators; Risks and Assumptions clearly identified and managed; exit strategy in place (if applicable).		
	B	Adequate intervention logic although it might need some improvements regarding hierarchy of objectives, indicators, Risk and Assumptions.		
	C	Problems with intervention logic may affect performance of intervention and capacity to monitor and evaluate progress; improvements necessary.		
	D	Intervention logic is faulty and requires major revision for the intervention to have a chance of success.		

2. EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTATION TO DATE: Degree to which the resources of the intervention (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted into results in an economical way				
<i>In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least two 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B', no 'C' or 'D' = B; at least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D</i>				
Assessment EFFICIENCY : total score	A	B	C	D
2.1 How well are inputs (financial, HR, goods & equipment) managed?				
	A	All inputs are available on time and within budget.		
	B	Most inputs are available in reasonable time and do not require substantial budget adjustments. However there is room for improvement.		
	C	Availability and usage of inputs face problems, which need to be addressed; otherwise results may be at risk.		
	D	Availability and management of inputs have serious deficiencies, which threaten the achievement of results. Substantial change is needed.		
2.2 How well is the implementation of activities managed?				
	A	Activities implemented on schedule		

4.1 Financial/economic viability?	
A	Financial/economic sustainability is potentially very good: costs for services and maintenance are covered or affordable; external factors will not change that.
B	Financial/economic sustainability is likely to be good, but problems might arise namely from changing external economic factors.
C	Problems need to be addressed regarding financial sustainability either in terms of institutional or target groups costs or changing economic context.
D	Financial/economic sustainability is very questionable unless major changes are made.
4.2 What is the level of ownership of the intervention by target groups and will it continue after the end of external support?	
A	The steering committee and other relevant local structures are strongly involved in all stages of implementation and are committed to continue producing and using results.
B	Implementation is based in a good part on the steering committee and other relevant local structures, which are also somewhat involved in decision-making. Likelihood of sustainability is good, but there is room for improvement.
C	The intervention uses mainly ad-hoc arrangements and the steering committee and other relevant local structures to ensure sustainability. Continued results are not guaranteed. Corrective measures are needed.
D	The intervention depends completely on ad-hoc structures with no prospect of sustainability. Fundamental changes are needed to enable sustainability.
4.3 What is the level of policy support provided and the degree of interaction between intervention and policy level?	
A	Policy and institutions have been highly supportive of intervention and will continue to be so.
B	Policy and policy enforcing institutions have been generally supportive, or at least have not hindered the intervention, and are likely to continue to be so.
C	Intervention sustainability is limited due to lack of policy support. Corrective measures are needed.
D	Policies have been and likely will be in contradiction with the intervention. Fundamental changes needed to make intervention sustainable.
4.4 How well is the intervention contributing to institutional and management capacity?	
A	Intervention is embedded in institutional structures and has contributed to improve the institutional and management capacity (even if this is not an explicit goal).
B	Intervention management is well embedded in institutional structures and has somewhat contributed to capacity building. Additional expertise might be required. Improvements in order to guarantee sustainability are possible.
C	Intervention relies too much on ad-hoc structures instead of institutions; capacity building has not been sufficient to fully ensure sustainability. Corrective measures are needed.
D	Intervention is relying on ad hoc and capacity transfer to existing institutions, which could guarantee sustainability, is unlikely unless fundamental changes are undertaken.

4.2 Decisions taken by the steering committee and follow-up

Not relevant since no steering committee took place.



4.3 Updated Logical framework

Not relevant

4.4 MoRe Results at a glance

Not relevant

Logical framework's results or indicators modified in last 12 months?	NA
Baseline Report registered on PIT?	NA
Planning MTR (registration of report)	NA
Planning ETR (registration of report)	NA
Backstopping missions EST GOV – Kurt Petit	12/2014

4.5 “Budget versus current (y – m)” Report

See annex

4.6 Communication resources

Not relevant



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA1308911

Project Title : **Rwanda Decentralization Support Programme (RDSP) - Enhancing the Capacities of Districts (ECD)**

Budget Version: **C02** Year to month : 31/12/2014

Currency : **EUR**

YIM : **Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing**

A...	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2013	Expenses 2014	Total	Balance	% Exec
01 LG Capacity Building			10.089.000,00	0,00	1.803,47	1.803,47	10.087.196,53	0%
01 Support to the implementation of LG CB (including financial		COGES	4.362.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	4.362.500,00	0%
02 Technical Support to the implementation of LG CB (NTA)		REGIE	3.350.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	3.350.000,00	0%
03 Support to RGB (incl organizational strengthening)		COGES	112.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	112.500,00	0%
04 Support to coordination and monitoring of LG CB (incl.		COGES	550.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	550.000,00	0%
02 LED capacity building			350.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	350.000,00	0%
01 Support to LED Planning (incl. organizational strengthening		COGES	3.215.000,00	0,00	1.442,77	1.442,77	3.213.557,23	0%
02 Safe and sustainable LED implementation (O&M, H&S,		COGES	750.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	750.000,00	0%
03 enabling environment for LED Pilots (LCF Pilots		COGES	450.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	450.000,00	0%
04 technical support to LED (1 ITA& 4NTA)		COGES	800.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	800.000,00	0%
03 Inclusive Participation and Equality in LGs			1.215.000,00	0,00	1.442,77	1.442,77	1.213.557,23	0%
01 LED Participation (LG and private sector) (incl.		COGES	1.485.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	1.485.000,00	0%
02 Advocacy on Gender Budgeting (incl. organizational		COGES	660.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	660.000,00	0%
03 Training and Monitoring Gender Budgeting		COGES	125.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	125.000,00	0%
04 Equality in strategic LG positions		COGES	550.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	550.000,00	0%
04 Sector Coordination			150.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	150.000,00	0%
01 policy coordination and analysis (incl. organizational		COGES	426.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	426.500,00	0%
02 support to policy coordination an analysis (incl 1 NTA)		COGES	320.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	320.000,00	0%
05 Lessons Learnt			106.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	106.500,00	0%
01 LED Pilot approach		REGIE	600.000,00	0,00	360,70	360,70	599.639,30	0%
02 Demand driven capacity building		REGIE	170.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	170.000,00	0%
		REGIE	130.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	130.000,00	0%
TOTAL			4.995.000,00	0,00	2.001,47	2.001,47	4.992.998,53	0%
		COGEST	8.505.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	8.505.000,00	0%
			13.500.000,00	0,00	2.001,47	2.001,47	13.497.998,53	0%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA1308911

Project Title :

Rwanda Decentralization Support Programme (RDSP) - Enhancing the Capacities of Districts (ECD)

Year to month : 31/12/2014

Budget Version:

C02

Currency :

EUR

YTM :

Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2013	Expenses 2014	Total	Balance	% Exec
03 workload TA dedicated to lessons learned & capitalisation								
		REGIE	300.000,00	0,00	360,70	360,70	299.639,30	0%
X CONTINGENCIES			500.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	500.000,00	0%
01 Contingencies								
01 Contingencies co-management		COGES	450.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	450.000,00	0%
02 Contingencies BTC direct mgmt		REGIE	50.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	50.000,00	0%
Z GENERAL MEANS			2.911.000,00	0,00	198,00	198,00	2.910.802,00	0%
01 Salaries								
01 Program Co-manager		REGIE	720.000,00	0,00	198,00	198,00	719.802,00	0%
02 Program Co-manager (preparation phase)		REGIE	90.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	90.000,00	0%
03 Program ITA Finance & Admin		REGIE	720.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	720.000,00	0%
04 Program ITA Finance & Admin (preparation phase)		REGIE	90.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	90.000,00	0%
05 Allocation for SPU staff (incl PM)		REGIE	200.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	200.000,00	0%
06 Administration and Finance staff		REGIE	204.800,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	204.800,00	0%
07 Drivers		REGIE	140.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	140.000,00	0%
02 Investments			210.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	210.000,00	0%
01 Vehicles								
02 ICT Equipment		REGIE	160.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	160.000,00	0%
03 Running Costs			216.200,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	216.200,00	0%
01 Vehicle Operating Costs								
02 Communication costs		REGIE	28.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	28.500,00	0%
03 Missions		REGIE	42.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	42.000,00	0%
04 External Communication costs		REGIE	11.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	11.000,00	0%
		REGIE	4.995.000,00	0,00	2.001,47	2.001,47	4.992.998,53	0%
		COGEST	8.505.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	8.505.000,00	0%
		TOTAL	13.500.000,00	0,00	2.001,47	2.001,47	13.497.998,53	0%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA1308911

Project Title : **Rwanda Decentralization Support Programme (RDSP) - Enhancing the Capacities of Districts (ECD)**

Budget Version: **C02** Year to month : 31/12/2014

Currency : EUR

YIM : **Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing**

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2013	Expenses 2014	Total	Balance	% Exec
05 Training		REGIE	40.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	40.500,00	0%
06 Financial costs		REGIE	8.200,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	8.200,00	0%
07 Other		REGIE	32.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	32.000,00	0%
08 VAT costs		REGIE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0%
04 Audit, Monitoring and Evaluation			320.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	320.000,00	0%
01 Monitoring and evaluation		REGIE	150.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	150.000,00	0%
02 update & follow up organizational assessments (LODA,		REGIE	50.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	50.000,00	0%
03 Audits		REGIE	60.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	60.000,00	0%
04 Backstopping		REGIE	60.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	60.000,00	0%
99 Conversion rate adjustment								0%



REGIE	4.995.000,00	0,00	2.001,47	2.001,47	4.992.998,53	0%
COGEST	8.505.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	8.505.000,00	0%
TOTAL	13.500.000,00	0,00	2.001,47	2.001,47	13.497.998,53	0%

