



CTB

Republic of Rwanda



MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND
ECONOMIC PLANNING

ANNUAL REPORT- STUDY AND EXPERTISE FUND 2012 INTERVENTION RWA0605211 PAREC



Building of the National Museum of Karongi: Consultancy for the design funded by PAREC.

ACRONYMS	3
1 INTERVENTION AT A GLANCE	4
1.1 INTERVENTION FORM	4
1.2 BUDGET EXECUTION	4
2 CONTEXT	5
2.1 GENERAL CONTEXT.....	5
2.2 MANAGEMENT CONTEXT: EXECUTION MODALITIES	5
2.3 HARMO-CONTEXT	5
3 ANALYSIS OF PROGRESS MADE	6
3.1 STUDIES	6
3.1.1 <i>Progress of studies</i>	6
3.1.2 <i>Analysis of studies completed</i>	6
3.2 EXPERTISE.....	7
3.2.1 <i>Progress of expertise</i>	7
3.2.2 <i>Analysis of expertise</i>	7
3.3 BUDGET EXECUTION	8
3.4 QUALITY CRITERIA	8
4 STEERING AND LEARNING	11
4.1 ACTION PLAN	11
4.2 LESSONS LEARNED	11
5 ANNEXES	12
5.1 “BUDGET VERSUS CURRENT (Y – M)” REPORT	12
5.2 DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE JLCB AND FOLLOW-UP	15

Acronyms

<List all acronyms used in the Results Report (alphabetically; see examples below)>

BTC	Belgian Development Agency
JLCB	Joint Local Consultative Body
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
PAREC	Programme d'Appui à la Réalisation d'Etudes et de Consultation
SPH	School of Public Health

1 Intervention at a glance

1.1 Intervention form

Intervention name	Fonds d'études et d'expertise belgo-rwandais / Programme d'Appui à la Réalisation d'Etudes et de Consultations
Intervention Code	RWA0605211
Location	Rwanda
Budget	1.154.935,95 €
Partner Institution	MINECOFIN
Date of implementation Agreement	October 26, 2010 – October 25, 2015
Duration (months)	60
Objective	Finance totally or partially studies and expertises

1.2 Budget execution

Total Budget	Expenditure year N	Balance	Total Disbursement rate
€4,424,302	€270,294.94	€2,823,581.98	

National execution official ¹	BTC execution official ²
Janvier Ahimanishyize	Ahmad Parsa

¹ Name and Signature

² Name and Signature

2 Context

2.1 General context

The specific agreement of 26 October 2010 has specified that the fields of the studies, consultancies etc. funded by this fund have to support the sectors the Belgian Cooperation in Rwanda works with.

The joint commission on développement cooperation between the Republic of Rwanda and the Kingdom of Belgium of 18 May 2011 has decided, in line with the division of labor, that the indicative cooperation program will focus on the sectors of health, energy and decentralization. This decision has given a clear directives of the activities of the project

2.2 Management context: execution modalities

The execution modalities have been put in place after their approval by the steering committee on its meeting of October 11, 2011 and implemented throught 2012. The execution modalities are appropriate. These execution modalities have allowed the aproval of 6 request of financement in the reporting period.

2.3 Harmo-context

Exchanges and collaboration started between ther project and AFD (Agence Française de Développement) for the “environmental and social impact assesment” study for the geothermal projects in Karisimbi and Kinigi area. This study will be cofunded by the PAREC project and AFD.

For the support of a study for the military hospital, other BTC projects in the health sector have contributed in analysing the ToR and giving advices for better adressing the request.

3 Analysis of progress made

3.1 Studies

3.1.1 Progress of studies

Progress of studies ³	A	B	C	D	Comments (only if the value is C or D)
1 - Macadamia Development and Processing in Rwanda		X			
2 - Etude de guidance scientifique pour le passage intégré de la coopération belge-rwandaise dans le secteur de la santé			X		The school of public health has requested an extension period to complete the remaining activities and globally the activities have been implemented with delay.
3 - Etude biologique du lac Kivu		X			
4 - Elaboration du Scénario et Monitoring des travaux de Construction Musée de Karongi			X		The consultancy has delayed more than planned because of the low advancement of the construction work.
5 - Procedures manual EWSA			X		The study is ongoing with a delay of 3 months.
6 - 6 Films on renewable energy		X			
7 - Consultancy services to strengthen the safety health and environment programs of the Rwanda Military Hospital		X			
8 - Environment and social impact assessment of KARISIMBI and KINIGI		X			
9 - Development Assistance Database for MINECOFIN			X		
10 - Geothermal Advisory Service		X			

3.1.2 Analysis of studies completed

Title of study:	Macadamia Development and Processing in Rwanda
<i>Describe, in a few sentences, for who the study was organised, and what it was about</i>	The study was requested from the Kayonza district and was about the potential on developing and processing the macadamia.

³ A: Ahead of schedule
 B: On schedule
 C: Delayed, corrective measures are required.
 D: Seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

<i>Have the studies been used as intended?</i>	Institutions like RDB and private people has shown interest on the study
<i>To what did the study contribute?</i>	To encourage investments and initiatives to develop the production and processing of macadamia.
<i>Issues that arose, influencing factors (positive or negative)? Unexpected results (positive or negative)? How did they impact the study or the use of the study?</i>	Because of the interest and the good potentialities, the study, initially planned for the district the Kayonza district, was extended to the entire country.

Title of study:	Etude de guidance scientifique pour le passage intégré de la coopération belgo-rwandaise dans le secteur de la santé
<i>Describe, in a few sentences, for who the study was organised, and what it was about</i>	The study was done by the school of public health of the National University of Rwanda. It is a support to the SPH to follow of the Rwandan-Belgian Bilateral Cooperation on Health
<i>Have the studies been used as intended?</i>	The study has been used to put in place the scientific support to the health program
<i>To what did the study contribute?</i>	The study contributed in producing articles and a capitalization workshop on health, especially urban health
<i>Issues that arose, influencing factors (positive or negative)? Unexpected results (positive or negative)? How did they impact the study or the use of the study?</i>	

3.2 Expertise

3.2.1 Progress of expertise

Progress of expertise⁴	A	B	C	D	Comments (only if the value is C or D)
1 Geothermal validation workshop	X				

3.2.2 Analysis of expertise

⁴ A: Expertise completed in year N
B: Expertise ongoing
C: Expertise in preparatory phase: preparation going as planned (writing ToR, procurement procedure, etc.)
D: Expertise planned but delayed

Title of expertise – name of expert:	Geothermal validation workshop
<i>Describe, in a few sentences, what the expertise is/was about</i>	The workshop aimed to define the process of exploration drilling for geothermal energy
<i>To what extent is the expertise delivering results?</i>	The workshop was a platform of discussion among experts contributing to the way forward on the decision to be taken for the geothermal drilling
<i>To what has the expertise contributed?</i>	The workshop helped to advance in the process of localization of the sites for the drilling
<i>Issues that arose, influencing factors (positive or negative)? Unexpected results (positive or negative)? How did these impact the expertise and the result of this expertise</i>	The experts could not find a consensus on the data collected and a second validation workshop was done later

3.3 Budget execution

The year 2012 has been a year of starting several studies. The majority of them will be implemented in 2013. For this reason the disbursement during the year has been 270,294.94 Euros.

3.4 Quality criteria

On the basis of the elements above, attribute a simple A, B, C or D score⁵ to the following criteria

Relevance: The degree to which studies and expertise are in line with local and national priorities

Efficiency: Degree to which studies and expertise have been executed on time and on budget.

Effectiveness: Degree to which studies and expertise actually contribute to their intended objectives

5

- A: Very good performance
- B: Good performance
- C: Performing with problems, measures should be taken
- D: Not performing/ having major difficulties: measures are necessary

If a criterion cannot be assessed (e.g. because the intervention has only just started), attribute the criteria with an 'X' score. Explain why the criterion has not been assessed.

Criteria	Score
Relevance	A
Efficiency	B
Effectiveness	B

Risk management

Provide the evolution of risks⁶ and how they have been managed. Identified risks consist of risks emanating from the TFF and significant risks that have been identified during the implementation of the intervention. Risks can also be identified during the Annual reporting.

- Describe the risk
- Score the probability that the risk might occur: High, Medium, Low
- Score the impact if the risk would occur: High Medium, Low

If a risk is attributed with a High or very high score, detail the measures that have been taken/will be taken and indicate the person/actor responsible.

Risk Identification			Risk analysis			Risk Treatment			Follow-up of risks	
Description of Risk	Period of identification	Risk category	Probability	Potential Impact	Total ⁷	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status
To not have enough request of studies and expertise	2012	operational	Medium	low	A	To publicize the program among the Rwandan institutions	Project secretariat	Q2 Q3 2012	The request of studies are increasing	Finished
Increasing of the execution period of contracts	2012	operational	Medium	Low	A	Close follow up of each approved study to be financed	BTC secretariat for PAREC	Continuous	More collaboration with each beneficiary and more respect of the execution	In progress

⁶ Limit yourself to Development Risks, Reputational Risks

⁷

Potential impact	High	B	C	D
	Medium	A	B	C
	Low	A	A	B
		Low	Medium	High
Probability				

4 Steering and Learning

4.1 Action Plan

On the basis of the data and analysis above, formulate actions to be taken (/decisions to be taken) These can be both strategic as operational.

Action plan	Source	Actor	Deadline
<i>Description of the action/decision to be taken</i>	<i>The sub-chapter to which the action /decision refers (e.g. 3.2.3)</i>	<i>The person responsible for taking the decision/taking action</i>	<i>e.g. Q1, Q2, Q3 or Q4 of year N+1</i>
To continue to publicise the program within the Rwandan institution.		PAREC Secretariat	2013
To improve the follow up of the contracts funded by PAREC		BTC secretariat for PAREC	2013

4.2 Lessons Learned

Capture important Lessons Learned from the intervention's experience. Lessons Learned are new insights that must remain in the institutional memory of BTC and partners.

Lessons learned	Target audience
Description of the lesson learned.	The audience that may be interested in the lesson learned.
In special cases, to follow up the tender process very closely to assure the quality of the decision.	Internal tender committees of the institutions

5 Annexes

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

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA0605211								
Project Title : Fonds d'études et d'expertise belgo-rwandais								
Budget Version: K03 Year to month : 31/12/2012								
Currency : EUR								
YTM : Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing								
	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2011	Expenses 2012	Total	Balance	% Exec
A ALLOCATED FUNDS			2,684,325.01	1,327,781.37	269,163,65	1,596,925,02	1,067,399,99	60%
01 Allocated funds			2,684,325.01	1,327,781.37	269,163,65	1,596,925,02	1,067,399,99	60%
01 allocated funds		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
02 MCH-CAMPAGNE DE JEUAGEAGE-SITES NKORA ET		COGES	10,030,00	10,029,30	0,00	10,029,30	0,70	100%
03 MINECOFIN-RETRAITE DES PARTENAIRE AU		COGES	22,220,00	22,217,42	0,00	22,217,42	2,58	100%
04 PROGR.NAT.EXPLOIT FILIERE HYDR ELECTR.		COGES	52,200,00	52,195,96	0,00	52,195,96	4,04	100%
05 A BUSINESS PLAN FOR BRD/FOREDEM		COGES	61,100,00	61,147,42	0,00	61,147,42	-47,42	100%
06 JUSTICE SECTOR PEER REVIEW		COGES	39,850,00	38,987,97	0,00	38,987,97	882,03	98%
07 ETUDE DE PREFAISABILITE DE 10 MCH		COGES	54,200,00	54,100,66	0,00	54,100,66	99,34	100%
08 ALLOCATED TO RURAL JUSTICE CENTER		COGES	62,300,00	62,019,16	0,00	62,019,16	280,84	100%
10 DEVELOP.FILIERE ANANAS PREFECTURE DE L'EST		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
11 ETUDE COMPLEM.DIAGNOST DU POTENTIEL		COGES	55,000,00	55,154,80	0,00	55,154,80	-154,80	100%
12 DEVELOP.FILIERE MAÏS DISTRICT BUGESERA		COGES	36,000,00	35,945,99	0,00	35,945,99	54,01	100%
13 ETUDE/ EVOLUTI..HISTORIQUE ET ANALYSE INSTIT.		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
14 SWAP MINIJUST		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
15 Dev. Ass. DATABASE - MINECOFIN		COGES	50,050,00	50,013,59	0,00	50,013,59	36,41	100%
16 1 Cow / 1 Family Programme		COGES	58,150,00	58,123,05	0,00	58,123,05	26,95	100%
17 Gaz Methane study		COGES	50,200,00	52,110,49	0,00	52,110,49	-1,910,49	104%
18 Voirie-Kayonza		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
19 FILIERE ANANAS PREFECTURE DE L'EST		COGES	44,500,00	49,359,59	0,00	49,359,59	-4,859,59	111%
20 HISTORIQUE PGR		COGES	58,000,00	57,826,62	0,00	57,826,62	173,38	100%
21 EVALUAT.RESSOURCE EOLIENNE-MININFOS		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	??%
		REGIE	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0%
		COGEST	4,424,301,99	1,330,425,08	270,294,94	1,600,720,02	2,823,581,97	36%
		TOTAL	4,424,302,00	1,330,425,08	270,294,94	1,600,720,02	2,823,581,98	36%

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA0605211 Printed on donderdag 07 februari 2013

page: 1

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA0605211

Project Title : **Fonds d'études et d'expertise belgo-rwandais**

Budget Version: **K03** Year to month : 31/12/2012
 Currency : **EUR**
 YIM : **Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing**

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2011	Expenses 2012	Total	Balance	% Exec
22 SEMINAIRE IMPACT REFORMES-MINIJUST		COGES	48.500,00	48.080,59	0,00	48.080,59	419,41	99%
23 FORMATION CADRES CEPEX		COGES	4.400,00	4.376,16	0,00	4.376,16	23,84	99%
24 SEMINAIRE FINANCEMENT AGRICULTURE		COGES	31.815,00	31.802,89	0,00	31.802,89	12,11	100%
25 GISEMENT EOLIEN		COGES	114.800,00	114.702,06	0,00	114.702,06	97,94	100%
26 PISCICULTURE-UNR-RWASAVE		COGES	54.800,00	54.723,44	0,00	54.723,44	76,56	100%
27 STRATEGIE NAT.P.VOLT		COGES	57.050,00	57.004,10	0,00	57.004,10	45,90	100%
28 LIGNE ENERGIE RURALE		COGES	58.250,00	58.228,51	0,00	58.228,51	21,49	100%
29 PLAN ARCHITECT.RECONSTR.HOP BUSHENGE		COGES	28.750,00	28.731,77	0,00	28.731,77	18,23	100%
30 SHEMA DIRECTEUR AMENAGEMENT URBAIN-		COGES	60.000,00	59.930,48	0,00	59.930,48	69,52	100%
31 MINEDUC-PREPRER DOC.DE TRAVAIL POUR PLAN		COGES	33.500,00	33.459,92	0,00	33.459,92	40,08	100%
32 MUSEE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT KARONGI		COGES	71.200,00	45.273,43	16.303,80	61.577,23	9.622,77	86%
33 symbolique		COGES	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0%
34 ETUDE SUR L'ENERGIE RURALE AU RWANDA		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0%
35 APPUI SCIENTIFIQUE/ESP		COGES	63.000,00	31.230,00	31.230,00	62.460,00	540,00	98%
36 PUBLIC SECTOR CAPACITY BUILDING SECRETARIAT		COGES	60.000,00	48.787,43	0,00	48.787,43	11.212,57	81%
37 ETUDE DE FAISABILITE DVPT MACADAMIA		COGES	62.000,00	52.198,57	9.231,24	61.429,81	570,19	99%
38 PROCEDURE MANUAL EWSA		COGES	190.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	190.000,00	0%
39 KIVU LAC BIOLOGICAL BASELINE STUY		COGES	287.400,00	0,00	158.261,15	158.261,15	129.138,85	55%
40 INSTITUT NATION.MUSEES RWANDA -ENERGIE(6Films		COGES	53.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	53.000,00	0%
41 GEO THERMAL VALIDATION WORKSHOP		COGES	50.000,00	0,00	45.139,55	45.139,55	4.860,45	90%
42 DAD		COGES	88.500,00	0,00	8.997,91	8.997,91	79.502,09	10%
44 ACREDITATION RWANDA MILITARY HOSPITAL		COGES	248.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	248.000,00	0%
		REGIE	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0%
		COGEST	4.424.301,99	1.330.425,08	270.294,94	1.600.720,02	2.823.581,97	36%
		TOTAL	4.424.302,00	1.330.425,08	270.294,94	1.600.720,02	2.823.581,98	36%



Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of RWA0605211

Project Title : **Fonds d'études et d'expertise belgo-rwandais**

Budget Version: **K03** Year to month : **31/12/2012**

Currency : **EUR**

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

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2011	Expenses 2012	Total	Balance	% Exec
46 GEOTHERMAL ADVISORY BOARD		COGES	128.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	128.500,00	0%
47 STUDY ON SMART SUBSIDIES TO PRIVATE SECTOR		COGES	30.500,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	30.500,00	0%
48 ESIA		COGES	186.560,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	186.560,00	0%
Z BALANCE FOR NEW STUDIES AND EXPERTISE			1.759.976,99	2.663,71	1.131,29	3.795,00	1.756.181,99	0%
01 Balance for new studies and expertise			1.759.976,99	2.663,71	1.131,29	3.795,00	1.756.181,99	0%
01 Unallocated Funds		COGES	1.757.576,98	0,00	0,00	0,00	1.757.576,98	0%
02 FRAIS ADMINISTRATIFS ET FINANCIERS		COGES	400,00	188,57	22,43	211,00	189,00	53%
03 IMPREVUS		COGES	2.000,00	2.475,14	1.108,86	3.584,00	-1.584,00	179%
04 Imprévis		REGIE	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0%
99 Conversion rate adjustment			0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%
99 Conversion rate adjustment		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	7%

REGIE	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,01	0%
COGEST	4.424.301,99	1.330.425,08	270.294,94	1.600.720,02	2.823.581,97	38%
TOTAL	4.424.302,00	1.330.425,08	270.294,94	1.600.720,02	2.823.581,98	38%



5.2 Decisions taken by the JLCB and follow-up

Provide an overview of the important strategic decisions taken by the JLCB and the follow-up of those decisions since the beginning of the intervention.

Decision to take					Action			Follow-up	
Decision to take	Period of identification	Timing	Source	Actor	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status
Approval of the Procedure Manual of funding of PAREC	Q3 2011				Done				Done
Approval of the Steering Committee Internal Working Regulation	Q3 2011				Done				Done