



**BTC**

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
P. O. BOX. 3445 KIGALI  
Website: [www.minaloc.gov.rw](http://www.minaloc.gov.rw)

# RESULTS REPORT 2016-2017

## RWANDA DECENTRALISATION SUPPORT PROGRAMME

SUPPORT TO DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT PLANS (DDP)

RWA 13 090 11



September 2017

*Handwritten signature*

## Table of contents

### Contents

<b>ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>1 INTERVENTION AT A GLANCE</b> .....	<b>6</b>
1.1 INTERVENTION FORM .....	6
1.2 BUDGET EXECUTION .....	7
1.3 SELF-ASSESSMENT PERFORMANCE.....	7
1.3.1 <i>Relevance</i> .....	7
1.3.2 <i>Effectiveness</i> .....	8
1.3.3 <i>Efficiency</i> .....	8
1.3.4 <i>Potential sustainability</i> .....	9
1.4 CONCLUSIONS .....	9
<b>2 RESULTS MONITORING</b> .....	<b>11</b>
2.1 EVOLUTION OF THE CONTEXT .....	11
2.1.1 <i>General context</i> .....	11
2.1.2 <i>Institutional context</i> .....	11
2.1.3 <i>Management context: execution modalities</i> .....	12
2.1.4 <i>Harmo context</i> .....	12
2.2 PERFORMANCE LONG TERM OUTCOME: DISTRICTS' CAPACITY TO DEVELOP A SUSTAINABLE ENVIRONMENT FOR LED IS ENHANCED .....	13
2.2.1 <i>Progress of indicator</i> .....	13
2.2.2 <i>Analysis of progress made</i> .....	13
2.2.3 <i>Potential Impact</i> .....	13
2.3 SHORT-TERM OUTCOME 6: LED INFRASTRUCTURE IMPLEMENTED IN 30 DISTRICTS AND THE CITY OF KIGALI .....	14
2.3.1 <i>Progress of indicators</i> .....	14
2.3.2 <i>Progress of outputs</i> .....	15
2.3.3 <i>Analysis of progress made</i> .....	15
2.4 SHORT-TERM OUTCOME 7: INNOVATIVE ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIPS ARE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH LCF IN 4 PILOT DISTRICTS TO ENHANCE PRO-POOR .....	15
2.4.1 <i>Progress of indicators</i> .....	15
2.4.2 <i>Progress of outputs</i> .....	16
2.4.3 <i>Analysis of progress made</i> .....	16
2.5 PERFORMANCE OUTPUT 8: LODA EXTERNAL GRANTS TO SUPPORT DDPs IMPLEMENTATION IS EXECUTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH PFM REGULATORY FRAMEWORK .....	17
2.5.1 <i>Progress of indicators</i> .....	17
2.5.2 <i>Progress of outputs</i> .....	17
2.5.3 <i>Analysis of progress made</i> .....	17
2.6 TRANSVERSAL THEMES.....	18
2.6.1 <i>Gender</i> .....	18
2.6.2 <i>Environment</i> .....	20
2.6.3 <i>Decent Work</i> .....	20
2.7 RISK MANAGEMENT (ECD/DDP) .....	21
<b>3 STEERING AND LEARNING</b> .....	<b>22</b>
3.1 STRATEGIC RE-ORIENTATIONS.....	22

3.2	RECOMMENDATIONS .....	22
3.3	LESSONS LEARNED .....	23
<b>4</b>	<b>ANNEXES.....</b>	<b>24</b>
4.1	QUALITY CRITERIA .....	24
4.2	DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND FOLLOW-UP (RDSP-DDP AND ECD) 27	
4.3	UPDATED LOGICAL FRAMEWORK (RDSP-ECD AND DDP) .....	28
4.4	MORE RESULTS AT A GLANCE .....	29
4.5	“BUDGET VERSUS CURRENT (Y – M)” REPORT .....	30
4.6	COMMUNICATION RESOURCES .....	31
4.7.	MAIN ACTIVITIES PERFORMED (RDSP-DDP) .....	31

Not. 

## Acronyms

ASAP	As soon as possible
BDC	Business Development Centres
BTC	Belgian Development Agency
CB	Capacity Building
CD	Capacity Development
CDCs	Community Development Committees
Cf.	Confer
DCB	District Capacity Building
DCBPs	District Capacity Building Plans
DDPs	District development plans
DEL CO	BTC Co-Manager of the Programme
DG	Directorate General
DIP	Decentralization Implementation Policy
DPSC	Decentralization Program Steering Committee
DSWG	Decentralization Sector Working Group
ECD	Enhancing the Capacities of Districts
EDPRS 2	The 2nd Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
EKN	Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
ETR	End-of-Term Review
GMO	Gender Monitoring Office
GoR	Government of Rwanda
HR	Human Resources
HRM	Human Resources Management
IP	Implementing Partner
JSR	Joint Sector Reviews
KfW	German Development Bank
LCF	Local Competitiveness Facility
LED	Local Economic Development
LGs	Local Governments
LODA	Local Administrative Entities Development Agency
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
M/F	Male/Female
MIFOTRA	Ministry of Public service
MINALOC	Ministry of Local Government
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework (sometimes also called MTBF : Medium Term Budget Framework)
MTR	Mid-term Review
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
PCU	Programme Coordination Unit

PFM	Public Finance Management
PIM	Programme Implementation Manual
PPP	Public-Private Partnerships
PS	Permanent Secretary
PSF	Private Sector Federation
RALGA	Rwanda Association of Local Government Authorities
RDSP	Rwanda Decentralization Support Programme
RGB	Rwanda Governance Board
RWA	Rwanda
RWF	Rwandan Franks
SPIU	Single Project Implementation Unit
SSP	Sector Strategic Program
SWG	sector Working Group
TT	Thematic Themes
TA/NTA	Technical Assistant/National Technical Assistant
TFF	Technical and Financial File
ToT	Training of Trainers
ToR	Terms of Reference

## 1 Intervention at a glance

### 1.1 Intervention form

<b>Intervention title</b>	<b>RWANDA DECENTRALISATION SUPPORT PROGRAM: Support to District Development Plans (DDP)</b>
<b>Intervention Number</b>	NN3014042
<b>Navision code BTC</b>	RWA13 090 11
<b>Location</b>	MINALOC-RWANDA
<b>Total budget</b>	11,150,000 EUROS
<b>Partner Institution</b>	Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC) Local Administrative Entities Development Agency (LODA) Districts
<b>Start date Specific Agreement</b>	June 30, 2015
<b>Date intervention start /Opening steering committee</b>	October 13, 2015
<b>Planned end date of execution period</b>	March 12, 2020
<b>End date Specific Agreement</b>	December 12, 2020
<b>Target groups</b>	LODA, Districts and Local Multi-stakeholders (Private companies, cooperatives, CSO, etc.)
<b>Impact<sup>1</sup></b>	To sustainably enhance the capacity of LGs to deliver services and to develop an enabling environment for LED in respect of best governance practices
<b>Long Term Outcome</b>	Districts' capacity to develop a sustainable environment for LED is enhanced
<b>Short Term Outcomes</b>	6. LED infrastructure implemented in 30 Districts and the City of Kigali
	7. Innovative economic partnership projects are implemented through LCF in 4 pilot Districts to enhance pro-poor LED
	8. LODA external Grants to support DDP's implementation is executed in compliance with PFM regulatory framework
<b>Year covered by the report</b>	<b>Fiscal year 2015- 2016 &amp; 2016-2017 (January 2016-June 2017)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Impact refers to global objective, Long Term outcome refers to specific objective, Outcome refers to expected result

## 1.2 Budget execution

	Budget		Expenditure		Balance	Disbursement rate at the end of June 2017
	(version D)	(version E)	Previous years (April 2014 - December 2015)	Year covered by report (January 2016 - June 2017)		
<b>Total</b>	<b>14.500.000</b>	<b>11.150.000</b>	<b>4.353.880</b>	<b>4.507.204</b>	<b>2.288.916</b>	<b>79%</b>
Output 6	11.000.000	8.450.000	4.353.880	3.912.667	183.453	98%
Output 7	3.200.000	2.400.000	0	585.959	1.814.041	24%
Output 8	300.000	300.000	0	8.578	291.422	3%

## 1.3 Self-assessment performance

### 1.3.1 Relevance

	Performance
Relevance	A

The Rwanda Decentralization Support Program; component 2; *Support to District Development Plans (DDP)* is in line with Rwanda national policies and priorities, as well as with the expectations of the beneficiaries. In fact, this program (RDSP) is in line with Vision 2020, EDPRS II, Governance and Decentralization SSP especially with the area of Local Economic Development and the role of private sector, Capacity Development for Local Governance and Decentralized service delivery, etc. The component is complementary to the component 1 (Enhancing the capacities of the Districts).

The program respects the aid effectiveness principles, which include the use of country frameworks, funds predictability, mutual accountability, ownership and harmonization, where the fund is utilized to the utmost in a well-coordinated manner and transparent to donors.

Support provided by the intervention is classified in 3 categories;

1. **Outcome 6:** Support to District Local Economic Development (LED) infrastructure in 30 Districts and City of Kigali, through LODA
2. **Outcome 7:** Support to economic partnerships projects through Local Competitiveness Facility in 4 pilot districts through LODA
3. **Outcome 8:** Support to LODA to execute these 2 above fund in compliance with PFM regulatory framework.

The logical framework the program started with in 2015-2016 was adapted in 2016-2017 in order to comply with Result Based Management standards.

### 1.3.2 Effectiveness

	<b>Performance</b>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<b>B</b>

The revision of the programme LogFrame, aligning it with RBM standards is expected to contribute to the effectiveness of the programme and attainment of the Long Term Outcome named “*Districts’ capacity to develop a sustainable environment for LED is enhanced*”. This long term outcome has 3 short-term outcomes under it, of which 2 are performed by Implementing Partner LODA, thus the attainment of this long-term outcome will depend mainly on results from this implementing partner.

The Program Coordination Unit (PCU) together with LODA designated focal points of the program in that facilitate the linkage in all processes; planning, reporting, issues to be discussed, etc.

The implementation of DDP during 2015-2016 has been focused on outcome 6 largely, which by the end of the reporting period finished its implementation period (2016-2017) (though progress on the outcome is continue to evolve, see below).

Outcome 7 did not have any activities during 2016-2017. Implementation rather started in Q1 of 2017-2018. A whole lot did happen for the preparation of LCF, yet this has been captured by Outcome 2 of the ECD part of the programme by the awareness campaign of the population.

Outcome 8 did not develop a detailed action plan for 2016-2017, yet some joint monitoring missions and PFM assessments did happen. Nonetheless, the main bulk of this outcome will be implemented from 2017-2018 onwards.

### 1.3.3 Efficiency

	<b>Performance</b>
<b>Efficiency</b>	<b>B</b>

The revision of the programme LogFrame, aligning it with RBM standards is expected to contribute to the effectiveness of the programme, as it does for the effectiveness.

For the outcome 6, the modality used with LODA was National Execution (NEX) where fund of BTC contributed to the basket fund of LED in LODA together with National Budget, Netherlands Embassy, KFW. LODA used this fund putting together to finance LED projects in all Districts and City of Kigali.

LCF Grant agreement was signed on 15/06/2017 and transfer of the foreseen first instalment to LODA under the grant agreement took place for funding 35 projects having signed contracts.

Financial resources, human resources, goods and equipment were available in reasonable time. All needed Human resources at the RDSP side are in place. The LCF Fund Manager were hired to facilitate the implementation of LCF.

In line with the execution rate of activities, execution rate of funds is high for Outcome 6, and close to 0 for outcomes 7 and 8.



### 1.3.4 Potential sustainability

Potential sustainability	Performance
	B

Ownership of RDSP is strong with implementing partners due to the participatory approach taken by programme management and the fact that RDSP funds for LED infrastructure are disbursed using the national systems. The intervention is imbedded in institutional structures (MINALOC SPIU, LODA) and contributes to strengthening their management capacity. The Steering Committee, the Technical Committee, and technical staff of MINALOC and LODA are strongly involved in all stages of implementation, and committed.

Concerning the sustainability of the funded Districts infrastructure projects and LCF projects, measures are taken: like

- Institutional capacity is in place but still to be strengthened with regard maintenance of infrastructure, and other government institution to increase budget for maintenance. A separate budget for maintenance will be set aside each year and this will increase the life span of the infrastructures.
- Joint auditing of the “value for money” of infrastructure investments as well a joint monitoring missions are undertaken with the Netherlands Embassy and KfW. If LODA’s partners are generally positive about value for money, it is also recognised that issues exist in terms of integration of local LED infrastructure with the local value chains.
- Capacity building on planning, development and management of LED infrastructure, under Outcome 2 of RDSP (part of the ECD pillar of the programme).

Financial/economic sustainability of private-private partnerships under Outcome 7 (Local Competitiveness Facility) is a key point for attention that has been taken on board of LCF design (activities under ECD outcome 2). LCF being a pilot programme, assessment of sustainability, including potential scaling up, is part of the design of the programme. Also, RDSP supported the development of LODA’s Monitoring and Evaluation Information System (MEIS) to accommodate LCF. Therefore, LCF management is fully embedded in MEIS, positively contributing to sustainability. Furthermore, the Government of Rwanda budgeted funds (approx. 600,000 EUR) for a second LCF call in 2017-2018, herewith demonstrating strong confidence in the mechanism and its capacity to make a difference, even before the end of the pilot phase.


## 1.4 Conclusions

RDSP/DDP’s governance and management structures are now well established and functional. LODA is familiar with the intervention and committed. Technical assistance functions well and is appreciated by LODA as an effective CB approach.

In 2016-2017, improvements continued to be made to the programme’s initial design: the results framework was fully revised in a participatory manner to comply with Results Based Management standards and for better efficiency and effectiveness. The Baseline report of the program was produced taking into account the updates of the result matrix.

Staffing requirements both on BTC side as on the partners’ side had been much underestimated in the programme design: partial corrections were made by recruiting Junior TAs (RDSP currently benefits from the support of 4 JTAs) and a LCF fund manager in LODA.

RDSP's embeddedness in partners' structures is conducive to partner ownership and results sustainability. However, the budget cut that affected RDSP in 2016 impacts on the programme's capacity to deliver the intended results. Additionally, BTC's decision not to fund a second call for proposals under LCF until positive results of the first call are demonstrated contradicted the usual partnership spirit under RDSP.

National execution official	BTC execution official
<p><b>Yves Bernard NINGABIRE</b>  <b>Yves Bernard NINGABIRE</b>            Director General Planning            Monitoring &amp; Evaluation - MINATEOC</p> <p><b>Director of intervention (a.i.)</b></p>	<p><b>Laurent MESSIAEN</b></p>  <p><b>Co-manager</b></p>

## 2 Results Monitoring

### 2.1 Evolution of the context

#### 2.1.1. General context

Rwanda Decentralization Support Program (RDSP) is a 4.5 years duration project funded by Belgian Government through its development agency (BTC). Primary beneficiaries of the project include LODA, MINALOC, RGB, RALGA and all Districts as well as companies (both formal and informal) supported by LCF. For the DDP part of the programme, RGB and RALGA are not very much involved.

RDSP (ECD and DDP) is complex, and as the first Belgium-supported intervention in the Decentralisation sector, it is not building on already existing collaborations. Rather, RDSP was designed for a part to explore areas and possibilities for Belgium-Rwanda cooperation in the sector: RDSP has 14 short-term outcomes, works with 4 central level partners and 8 pilot Districts (4 for LCF) using a broad diversity of modalities.

During the reporting period some changes to the general context occurred:

- The logical framework the program started with, in 2015-2016 was adapted in the year 2016-2017.
- The program budget cut, initially the total budget of the program was 28 Million € and the budget was reduced to 22 Million €. The DDP part of the program went from a 14.5 Million € budget to 11.15 Million €.
- The implementation of LCF initially was planned to be done in 8 pilot districts (Nyagatare, Gastibo, Huye, Gisagara, Gakenke, Musanze, Karongi and Rutsiro) but based on recommendations from MINALOC, the number was reduced to 4 pilot districts (Nyagatare, Gisagara, Gakenke, and Rutsiro).

#### 2.1.2. Institutional context

Based on RDSP organigram, the intervention has 4 categories of staff.

- The first category composed of 3 International Technical Assistants (Co-Manager, CAF and LED). The second category is composed of 6 National Technical Advisors (4 for LED and LCF, 1 for Sector Coordination and 1 for Capacity Development).
- The third category composed of 7 MINALOC-SPIU staff (contacted by MINALOC but funded by BTC) and
- The four category is composed by 4 Juniors (1 in M&E, 1 in RBM, 1 in LED and 1 in GA management)

Additional to that the Intervention fund the salaries of 3 staff within the Implementing Partners. 2 staff in RALGA (LED Policy Analyst and PM&E specialist), 1 in LODA (LCF fund Manager).

The Program Manager started its retreat according to the law with effect by June 2017 and the process of recruiting another Program manager is ongoing. By the first quarter on the year 2017-2018, he will start its functions.

### **2.1.3. Management context: execution modalities**

For the outcome 6, the modality used with LODA was National Execution (NEX) where fund of BTC contributed to the basket fund of LED in LODA together with National Budget, Netherlands Embassy, KfW. LODA used this fund putting together to finance LED projects in all Districts and City of Kigali.

For LCF, a Grant agreement was signed on 15/06/2017 and transfer of the foreseen first instalment to LODA under the grant agreement took place for funding 35 projects having signed contracts. LCF design includes all necessary templates for planning, M&E and reporting and funds requests, from supported projects to Districts, from Districts to LODA and from LODA to RDSP.

The outcome 8 is self-managed by BTC where it pays directly the expenses done.

The planning process for Outcome 6 LED infrastructure projects is conducted by LODA within the national planning process, starting in October with the first call for Budget preparation coming from MINECOFIN and ends with National budget approval by the National Assembly. The Fiscal year starts in July and ends in June.

Reporting process follow the usual National report processes, like

- Monthly report (financial report submit to MINECOFIN through MINALOC),
- Quarterly reports (Progress report submit to MINECOFIN through MINALOC, quarterly report submit to MINALOC based on Annual action plan and MONOP reports submit to BTC) and
- Annual report (Annual results report submit to BTC and report submit to MINALOC based on Annual action plan.

### **2.1.4. Harmo context**

DP harmonisation was strongest in the area of support to District LED infrastructure, where close coordination took place between Netherlands Embassy, KfW and RDSP under the framework set by the joint MoU signed between these development partners and the Government. Annual joint audits are organised, and in October 2016, the first joint monitoring mission of infrastructure projects took place. Earlier missions had been undertaken separately by Netherlands and KfW. RDSP played a key role in initiating closer collaboration.

At technical level, RDSP TAs imbedded in LODA worked closely and in a well-coordinated manner with TAs provided by KfW and by GIZ. RDSP support to LODA trainings for District staff and representatives on feasibility studies guidelines was implemented in close collaboration with KfW TAs and based on guidelines developed by KfW. LODA management demonstrated a strong ability to coordinate provided TA, which created a very good framework for collaboration.

## 2.2 Performance long term outcome: Districts' capacity to develop a sustainable environment for LED is enhanced



### 2.2.1 Progress of indicator

LTO 2: Districts' capacity to develop a sustainable environment for LED is enhanced					
Indicators	Baseline value	Target '16-'17	Mid-term target 2018	Target '18-'19	End Target 2020
% multistakeholders satisfied with the quality and inclusiveness of LED processes in 8 pilot District	55,56% M: 53,80% F: 51,27%	/	60%	65%	65%

### 2.2.2 Analysis of progress made

The Specific Agreement of RDSP-DDP was signed in June 2015 and implementation of the DDP part of the programme started in October 2015. This annual report is the first one for DDP that fully covers implementation rather than start-up or preparation. As for the three short term outcomes of the DDP programme though, progress has been made for outcome 6 and somewhat outcome 8. Outcome 7 will fully start in fiscal year 2017-2018

No target for the Long Term Objective has been foreseen by the baseline report for the end of FY 16-17 since, given the time frame as sketched before: one outcome had its first activities during this reporting period (OC8), one was focused on preparation processes only (OC7, preparation processes part of ECD OC2), and just one has had a lot of activity (OC6) and even finalized its implementation period during this reporting period. Yet, even though the activities that took place under this outcome, no long term progress can be expected in such short notice. A first assessment of this progress is planned to take place during a mid-term M&E review in April 2018.

### 2.2.3 Potential Impact

RDSP's intended impact reads: *"To sustainably enhance the capacity of LGs to deliver services and to develop an enabling environment for LED in respect of best governance practices"*

The indicators are as follows:

Impact	% of citizens expressing satisfaction with the quality and timeliness of service delivery at the local level
--------	--

	% of entrepreneurs and cooperatives who are satisfied with the business environment for LED in 4 pilot districts
--	--

As we described above how the timeline results chain of DDP did not foresee any progress on the Long Term Objective of the progress, the same definitely is true for its overlaying impact, since this impact (sphere of interest) lays even further ahead on said results chain.

### 2.3 Short-term outcome 6: LED infrastructure implemented in 30 districts and the city of Kigali



#### 2.3.1 Progress of indicators

Short-term outcome 6: LED infrastructure implemented in 30 districts and the city of Kigali					
Indicators	Baseline value	Target & effective value '16-'17	Mid-term target	Target '18-'19	End Target 2020
% of RDSP supported LED infrastructure investment projects that are completed	0	Target: 60% Effective : 78%	80%	100%	100%

According to the agreement signed between governments of Rwanda and Belgium, MINALOC through its agency LODA has been given the responsibility to manage the DDP transfers to districts and city of Kigali to fund infrastructure projects. LODA is the RDSP's key partner institution directly responsible to achieve results and take responsibility for implementation of the related activities in this case related to outcome 6. Funding for the projects under outcome 6 is a joint action, in cooperation with KfW (Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau) and the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to Rwanda

The projects funded in 2016-2017 fiscal year are in the following area of interventions: (i) electrification, (ii) Market orientated infrastructure (iii) Water and sanitation, and (iv) Road construction. LED infrastructures implemented are 35 projects. Out of 35 projects considered for this period, 6 projects are completed and 29 projects are on-going. The general implementation status is 78%.

### 2.3.2 Progress of outputs

Progress of outputs <sup>2</sup>	Progress outputs:				Output Indicators	Baseline 2015	Targets & Effective Value 2017
	A	B	C	D			
LED infrastructure projects funded (78%)			X		6.OPI: % of RDSP funding that was delivered to the beneficiary Districts and city of Kigali	0	Target : 100%  Effective value: 100%

### 2.3.3 Analysis of progress made

The implementation of outcome 6 has ended by the end of this reporting period. It has to be noted that while the end target (for 2020) of the only output leading to this outcome has been reached fully by the end of this reporting period, there still is further progress needed for the outcome to reach its end target. This is not unexpected and moreover completely in line with the foreseen results logic (for which the effective value in fact is ahead of target). Reasons the delay in result achievement can mainly be found in the design of this part of the programme, in which RDSP only contributes to one part of the funding of the projects, and others (being KfW and NL embassy). As stated this was foreseen and no challenges are currently expected in this regard, yet monitoring will continue to happen, with a next joint monitoring mission planned in November 2017.

## 2.4 Short-term outcome 7: Innovative economic partnerships are implemented through LCF in 4 pilot Districts to enhance pro-poor

### 2.4.1 Progress of indicators

Outcome 7: Innovative economic partnerships are implemented through a Local Competitiveness Facility in 8 pilot districts					
Indicators	Baseline value	Target & effective value '16-'17	Mid-term target '17-'18	Target '18-'19	End Target 2020
7.OC1: # of people additionally employed in companies supported by LCF	0	/	560	1120	1120
7.OC2: # of companies which developed or manage at least one additional step in the value chain	0	/	16	33	33
7.OC3: # of new products, services, processes or capabilities developed in LCF funded projects	0	/	4 (1/district)	8 (2/district)	8 (2/district)

No progress has been foreseen, and -though monitoring did not happen- has been made, since the first payments of the LCF grants to beneficiaries did not happen before Q1 of 2017-2018.

<sup>2</sup>

A The output is ahead of schedule  
 B The output is on schedule  
 C The output is delayed, corrective measures are required  
 D The output is seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

*Handwritten signature*

## 2.4.2 Progress of outputs

Progress of outputs <sup>3</sup>	Progress outputs:				Output Indicators	Baseline 2015	Targets & Effective Value 2017
	A	B	C	D			
Support to LCF projects provided in 4 pilot Districts	-	-	X	-	Number of economic partnership projects funded	0	Target : 24 Effective value: 0
					Number of companies involved in supported partnerships	0	Target : 48 Effective value: 0

Funding of companies did not happen by the end of the reporting period. By the time of the writing of this report though, funding did happen, so we can report that -with a delay of two months- effective values for indicators were 34 and 94 respectively. Thus targets have been exceeded, though slightly delayed.

## 2.4.3 Analysis of progress made

The real implementation of short term outcome 7 has not yet started by the end of fiscal year 2016-2017. Rather, an intensive preparatory phase has taken place under RDSP-ECD outcome 2 (as foreseen during the formulation). We refer to the ECD annual report for an analysis of the progress made under this outcome.

During the preparatory phase for LCF, effort went to both the capitalizing of lessons learnt (for future activities, organizational learning and external communication) and setting up of a M&E framework that will be used for monitoring of the progress made once the funding to beneficiaries happens (September 2017). Not only has a baseline survey been performed and a sturdy baseline report produced (including indicators and targets that go far beyond the level of detail of the general RDSP results framework), there was also planned for a qualitative evaluation of progress and results, making use of the Most Significant Change technique. The outcome indicator targets set by the RDSP baseline report have been confirmed by a surveying of the stakeholders

LCF being a pilot project, sustainability, scaling up possibilities, and a thorough understanding of the impact are key issues for this outcome.

Future progress and attainment of the set target relies heavily on the results of the ongoing discussion on a second call for LCF. This 2<sup>nd</sup> call was initially foreseen in the TFF, yet a budget freeze from BTC-side has put heavy constraints on this possibility.

<sup>3</sup>

A	The output is ahead of schedule
B	The output is on schedule
C	The output is delayed, corrective measures are required.
D	The output is seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.



## 2.5 Performance output 8: LODA external grants to support DDPs implementation is executed in compliance with PFM regulatory framework

### 2.5.1 Progress of indicators

Output 8: LODA external grants to support DDPs implementation is executed in compliance with PFM regulatory framework					
Indicators	Baseline value	Target & effective value '16-'17	Mid-term target '17-'18	Target '18-'19	End Target 2020
8.O1: The external joint audit annually commissioned by Belgium, EKN, KfW is unqualified	0	Target: 1 Effective: 1	1	1	/
8.O2: % of recommendations of LODA external audits that are fully implemented within 12 months following the publication of the audit reports	0%	/	50%	70%	TBD

A joint audit, together with KfW and EKN took place from October 3<sup>rd</sup> to October 14<sup>th</sup> 2016. The audit opinion was unqualified. Nevertheless, important financial and management findings have been identified and discussed with LODA.

### 2.5.2 Progress of outputs

Progress of outputs <sup>4</sup>	Progress outputs:				Output Indicators	Baseline 2015	Targets & Effective Value 2017
	A	B	C	D			
LODA supported on enhancing oversight of audit recommendations and District compliance with guidelines		X			Number of technical advices provided to LODA in view of enhanced oversight	0	Target : 2 Effective value: 18
An analysis of 4 pilots district's weaknesses in PFM vs. existing improvement measures is performed and shared to guide LCF management	-	-	-	-	Number of information sharing sessions on Districts' weaknesses in PFM vs. existing improvement measures	0	Target : / Effective value: 0

### 2.5.3 Analysis of progress made

A joint monitoring mission of Districts LED infrastructure with KfW and EKN took place in October 2016. The purpose of the mission was the evaluation of several projects which have been realised by the Local Administrative Entities Development Agency (LODA). It aimed to find out whether adjustments to the planning, development, and management of the infrastructure were needed.

<sup>4</sup>

- A The output is ahead of schedule
- B The output is on schedule
- C The output is delayed, corrective measures are required
- D The output is seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

Important findings have been made, discussed and followed up with LODA. Key areas for improvement included planning of private sector development projects where adequate, quality feasibility studies are still lacking and where private sector stakeholder are involved too late, and procurement management by Districts. A specific audit for two negatively evaluated projects was performed, after which it was decided to suspend a part of the expenses. The next (and last) joint audit and joint supervision mission are planned for November 2017.

An analysis of the pilot district weaknesses in PFM was initiated in June 2017, but not yet finished by the end of the reporting period, meaning no findings could yet be shared with stakeholders.

For fiscal year 2017-2018 a detailed action plan and budget for outcome 8 has been set up, for both planning and monitoring purposes.

## 2.6 Transversal Themes

### 2.6.1 Gender

#### 2.6.1.1 According to you and your implementing partner what are the main gender gaps in the areas / outcomes covered by your intervention?

Across RDSP, the main gender gap is that our partners and ourselves remain somehow blind on the status of gender equality in the different outcome areas of RDSP, and on whether our action affects it (and if so, how?). We also don't yet know well which outcome area apart from Outcome 7 (LCF) to consider in priority regarding gender (i.e. for strongest impact).

The initiative PCU took while planning for 2016-2017 (see below) has been a positive step in terms of gender mainstreaming in RDSP by raising awareness within the RDSP technical committee (PCU, MINALOC, partners), making gender concepts better understood and integrating basic thinking on gender into the planning stage. We also adapted planning documents (templates) to reflect this (i.e. annex 1 to grant agreement amendments for 2016-2017 – activity planning - includes a box for each activity where the IP states how gender will be mainstreamed in the activity). However, this often remained at the surface, with statements like *“Both men and women will participate and organizers should keep in mind meeting specific gender concerns”*. Thus, we learned from there that it matters much that the PCU offers support to IPs in understanding the status of gender equality within the different outcome areas, as well as the impact of being gender blind on it (is the unspoken assumption that our activities are gender neutral reflect reality?). We determined to do this in view of the overall effectiveness of RDSP in reaching its intended results, thus being specially interested in identifying where in our outcome matrix does gender blindness affect the reaching of intended results.

#### 2.6.1.2 How does your intervention take gender into account?

*- Does your project have a gender component?*

We have an outcome looking at gender (3B, Gender Equality in LED processes is enhanced in 8 pilot districts) and tried to mainstream gender sensitivity within the intervention through

organising for expert inputs at the planning workshop for 2016-2017.

- *Do you work with gender-sensitive indicators and do you collect sex-disaggregated data's?*  
Yes (baseline RDSP, baseline LCF)

- *Is your implementing partner pursuing any specific Gender policy, gender strategy, gender action plan?*  
RALGA with which we work on Outcome 3B does under that outcome.

- *Are your beneficiaries sensitized about gender discrimination?*  
No. Awareness-raising activities on gender discrimination are planned to take place in 2017-2018 with LCF beneficiaries as part of generic capacity building support RDSP will provide through LODA

**2.6.1.3 Has your intervention been through a Gender budget scan or through any other method to mainstream gender?**

*Partially (only Outcome 3B with RALGA did, under guidance from the BTC office)*

- *If no, do you consider your intervention as 'gender blind'<sup>5</sup>?*  
Yes, to some extent (Outcome 3B and outcome 7 - LCF are not blind)

- *If yes,*

- *what where the main gender transformative actions<sup>6</sup> of your project?*

- Outcome 3B: Gender Equality in LED processes is enhanced in 8 pilot districts

- *what where the main gender sensitive actions<sup>7</sup> of your project*

- support 30 Districts and city of Kigali through LODA to include gender as a cross-cutting issue in District LED Strategies
- taking into account women's special needs in trainings

- *do you liaise with or support a gender body<sup>8</sup> in Rwanda?*

- GMO under outcome 3B, a gender expert for planning 2016-2017.

**2.6.1.4 Did your intervention organize any awareness activity for the staff, implementing partner? (Workshops, trainings, etc.)**

Yes, see under 2.6.1.1. and 2.6.1.2. above

**2.6.1.5 Do you collaborate, are you in contact with a gender-friendly actor in Rwanda?**

We do through RALGA which works with GMO thanks to our support. This focuses on LED processes in 8 pilot Districts

**2.6.1.6 What are your challenges to take gender into consideration in your intervention?**

See 2.6.1.1.

<sup>5</sup> Gender blind activities do not take differences between women and men into account, nor do they address gender relations. This does not imply that they are 'gender neutral' after conducting.

<sup>6</sup> A gender transformative action has an impact or transform the gender roles and the division of labour in a social group. It focuses on changes and often take into account empowerment processes.

<sup>7</sup> A gender sensitive action is taking into account the differences between women and men but do not envisage changes in gender roles/division of labour.

<sup>8</sup> The gender body is made of official institutions promoting gender equality in the country (GMO, MIGEPROF, National Women Council, etc.)

### **2.6.1.7 What is/are your proposal(s) to address those challenges?**

The BTC representation was involved in our 2016 efforts and the experience contributed to resolving at representation level to procure consultancy services on gender under a framework contract. RDSP will make use of these services from the planning stage for 2018-2019 (planning retreat in October-November 2017). We intend to request the consultants to guide the exercise in a more strategic manner than the previous time.

### **2.6.2 Environment**

Under Output 6 on funding of LED infrastructure, feasibility studies including an environmental impact assessment are expected to be carried out by Districts. LODA is supported under RDSP-ECD Output 2 (Capacity development on LED) to train local civil servants in implementation of the guidelines for feasibility studies. The Local Competitiveness Facility projects might also have bearing on environmental mainstreaming.

### **2.6.3 Decent Work**

Decent work is specifically relevant under the LED part of RDSP but no clear strategy was yet identified on how to include this issue. The ITA LED will assess possibilities to develop a manual on safety to be taken into consideration when implementing LODA-funded District infrastructure or LED projects (like handcraft centres) were relevant. Decent work is however not part of the Government's cross-cutting themes under EDPRS 2.

RDSP provides good working conditions for all staff funded by BTC and expects Implementing Partners, Beneficiaries and Stakeholders to adhere to the rules and regulations as put in place by ILO (International Labour Organisation).

13  
M

## **2.7 Risk management (ECD/DDP)**

See the table in annex in Excel document.



2.7. RDSP RISK MANAGEMENT

2017		Activities 2017					Risk assessment (2017)			Activities 2017 Q4				
							2017							
							Q4							
Risk/ Issue/ Event	Magnitude	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Program	Status	Likelihood	Impact	Magnitude	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Program	Status
<b>RDSP GENERAL</b>														
Logframe not harmonised with the decentralisation policy and strategic plans	Low risk	Review the TFF logframe	PCU	Oct-15	TFF Log frame improved by consultancy on RHM Matrix	Completed	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk					
Baseline data for most indicators in the logframe not available: the program find difficult to know its starting point and its contribution to the decentralisation Policy strategic plans	Low risk	Baseline Study conducted and final report ready	PCU	Jun-16	RHM results matrix available, Baseline Study finalized	Completed	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk					
Changing priorities challenge programme coherence (New result, addendums, etc.)	Medium risk	Bring to the attention of steering committee if need arises	PCU	continuous	Different Addenda processed, causing no program challenges	On-going	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk					
Limited result of capacity building activities due to inappropriate or poor quality service provision and poor management of capacity building cycle (e.g. needs assessment, definition of CB activities, objectives and methodology, implementing CB activities, monitoring, evaluation, etc.)	Medium risk	Regular checks if GAs modalities are implemented and constantly engaged with IP's on quality issues.	PCU	Continuous	The PCU ensures that the basics on quality assurance of documents are met before any of these activities are carried out through Concept Notes & ToRs approvals and checked by quarterly reports analysis	On-going	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk	Increase support to RGH in a view to make the coaching programme results-oriented and effective	TA to RGH, JTA RHM, Co-	Continuous	Being integrated in individual planning documents of staff	On-going
	Medium risk	Provide checks if ToRs are Smart and monitor the procurement processes and implementation of contract.	PCU				Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk					
	Medium risk	PCU to ensure training modules are discussed and validated	PCU				Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk					
	Medium risk	PCU to ensure Local Government submit their training demands.	PCU				Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk					
Unclear achievement of program results and objective due to a somewhat unclear RDSP result chain combined with a focus on activity outputs rather than outcomes, thus an unclear understanding of the activities' contribution to the RDSP result chain	High risk	Clarify RDSP Results chain (participatory)	PCU	Sep-16	RHM and Gender Mainstreaming made a focus in discussions with IP's and development of annual action plans, since May 2016	On-going	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk	Result planning template introduced for 2017-2018. Training and on the job support for TC on RHM and Gender planned for October 2017 (procurement of RHM coach + use of gender experts under RR framework contract)	PMJ-S, JTA RHM	Oct-17	Draft ToR RHM coach available	Planned
Ensure Results Based Management definition of activities in annual action plan and budget	PCU													
	Focus on gender as a priority cross cutting issue and ensure its effective mainstreaming	PCU												
	Define R3 in such way that it provide qualitative information on programme outcome	PCU												
	Recruit additional human resource/consultancy for improved RHM for programme activities and by JTA	PCU												
Funding cut for any reason	Medium risk	Being proactive to identify beforehand likely possible causes (e.g. poor performance of the program or political issues) and plan for actions.	PCU	Jun-16	Action Plans and Budgets for 2016-2017 aligned to the budget cut of 6M Euro. Adjustments have been made accordingly	On-going	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk	Implement changes in close collaboration with (HTC, MDVAI & C) and IP's	co-manages	Sep-17	Changes not yet communicated by Belgian Embassy	Planned
Proper selection of adequate team for MTR (knowledge on the context)	PCU													
Constantly assessing political priorities of both countries and proactively talking resources with IP to align programme	PCU													
Bilateral discussions	RJSP													
<b>Grant Agreement</b>														
[Delayed transfers to IP's (low-lose partnership)	High risk	Critically analyse IP's planning and budgeting to have enough insurance that it is realistic	PCU	quarterly	IP's AP & budgets are discussed with PCU before approval by the SC	On-going	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk	Provide training and on the job support to IP's in realistic planning and budgeting	PM, JTA CFA	Oct-17	TC training workshop being planned	Planned
		Ensure to have timely and exhaustive information on budget, use of funds, realized activities and planning	PCU	quarterly	Institutional visits by (PCU) staff on operational and fiduciary aspects done regularly quarterly	On-going								
		Closely monitor application of grant agreement conditions and implementation of audit recommendations through regular monitoring (site visits...) and ensuring adequate revisions by partners	PCU	Continuous	Regular activities monitoring and re-adjustment of AP if need be is an ongoing exercise	On-going								
		Carefully monitor the absorption capacities of IP's	PCU	Dec-16	This is regularly checked (quarterly)	On-going								

Handwritten initials and signature in the bottom right corner.





Transfers to LCF beneficiaries delayed or blocked due to poor implementation by beneficiaries as well as delays and low quality in reporting on use of funds	High risk	Fiduciary risk assessment performed prior to selecting beneficiaries (adequate "SMART" selection criteria, adequate information and capacities for selection committee)	PCU/LA/DA	Dec-16	Included at the due diligence stage	Completed (1st call)	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk							
		Ensure effective early warning system is in place	PCU/LA/DA	Dec-16	LCF management includes development and implementation of a monitoring plan (site visits and advice) by LODA - Durban area on going	Early warning system not yet in place	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk	same as column 1						
		Support LODA in designing short appropriate realistic reporting pathways	PCU/LA/DA	Dec-16	The LCF manual includes appropriate reporting pathways but obtaining reports from partnerships may be problematic	On going	High risk	High risk	High risk	Regular field visits by NTAs						
Poor and late information on LCF projects due to complicated reporting pathways (from cooperatives to districts, Districts to NTA, NTA to LODA and LODA to RDSIP)	Medium risk	Agree with LODA on what piloting means, criteria for successful pilot phase, implications Plan accordingly	PCU/LA/DA	Sep-17	Several meetings took place. Decision on hold	On going	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk	same as column 1						
No adequate information on the success or not of LCF pilot due to not having designed and implemented adequate 'pilot management' measures (risk identified in Q2 2017)																
<b>LED activities</b>																
Duplication or contradiction on Capacity Building on Local Economic Development (LED) between RALGIA and LODA	Medium risk	Ensure Harmonization of Capacity building on LED by LODA and RALGIA	PCU	Jun-16	This was a recommendation by the SC meeting of 20/6/16 where emphasis was on complementarity rather than overlap	Completed	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk							
RDSIP 3 LED Outcomes not achieved because of limited joint understanding of LED concept by key stakeholders (local and central levels)		Promote joint understanding through identification, analysis and promotion of good practices on LED	PCU	Jun-16	A joint RALGIA and LODA LED CI discussed and each institution aware of their task	Completed	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk							
		Technical working group study visit on LED	PCU	Jun-16	Two visits successfully carried out	Completed	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk							
		Support policy actions on LED under Outcomes 2, 3 and 4	PCU		Policy actions included in RDSIP action-plans	Continuous	Low risk	Low risk	Low risk							
Outcome 5: weak foundation for knowledge management due to challenges in collecting adequate information	Low risk	NTA will be recruited for coordination and quality assurance of lessons learnt process	PCU	Jun-16	Junior TA to coordinate knowledge management, RBM and communication started in March 2017	Completed	Medium risk	Medium risk	Low risk	Topics and procedures for knowledge management being clarified (discussed at June 2017 TC meeting). Use of most significant change method planned in September	JTA RHM, KM	Sep-17	Draft ToR for MSC under development	Planned		
		Clarify approach in implementing R5 (definition, guidelines, decision making procedures)	PCU	Jun-16	New approach to be developed due to budget cut	Completed	Medium risk	Medium risk	Low risk							
Outcome 6 - Low LED impact of supported district investments	Low risk	Ensure application of TFF criteria, adequate selection of projects for support (LED investment (NEX) = 39% of RDSIP budget)	PCU	Jun-16	Application of SC criteria verified and project infrastructure lists approved by SC	Completed	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk							
		Ensure RDSIP contribution to improving overall management of district LED projects	PCU	continuous	Support LODA in developing and implementing an adequate action-plan based on findings of joint monitoring mission	On-going	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk	see row 67						
Non compliance of NEX LED investment project management with TFF conditions (adjusted by an approved concept note) leads to blockages	Medium risk	Ensure proper NEX management (Nex = 39% of RDSIP budget) and adequate communication with LODA	PCU	continuous	The PCU closely follow the execution of NEX funds and reports on expenditures. In addition, there is an annual audit and joint monitoring mission by DPs on NEX. SC Decision 13/5th. SC approved changes in list of projects	On-going	Low risk	Low risk	Medium risk	Develop action-plan based on recommendations of previous joint monitoring mission; organise 2nd joint monitoring mission in October 2017	ITA CFA with support from co-manager	Oct-17	Annual report signed (2016 joint monitoring mission, technical actions agreed bilaterally)	Planned		
<b>HR</b>																
The PCU unable to ensure proper programme management including supervision of activity implementation done by third parties	Medium risk	Recruit additional staff	PCU	Jun-16	Recruitment of additional staff, accountant and two junior TAs	Completed	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk							
		Reinforce the capacity of staff in place	PCU	continuous	On the job mentoring	On-going	Medium risk	Medium risk	Medium risk							
<b>Finance Administration</b>																
Not enough funds at the right time for implementing activities	Low risk	Have clear and known processes	PCU	Jun-16		Completed	Low	Low	Low Risk							
		Have effective internal control actions	PCU	Jun-16	The PCU has put in place the PIM which is the guiding document for the RDSIP. It was approved by the SC. Audit recommendations, internal w/shops on modalities have been realized											
	Inappropriate actions are taken by RDSIP staff, due to the fact that RDSIP procedures are not documented, communicated and reviewed on a timely basis	Low risk	RDSIP procedures well documented in PIM	PCU	Jun-16											
			PIM well understood	PCU	contin		On-going	Low	Low	Low Risk						
Improper management	Medium risk	Implementation of PIM adequately monitored, regular reviews take place	PCU	contin												
		Carefully follow-up on previous audit recommendations	PCU	Dec-17	RDSIP not audited yet, but preventative measures in place	On-going	Medium	Medium	Medium Risk	The RDSIP audit will be organized in October 2017. The ToR must be approved and recommendations will be followed through MONOP	PCU/ FIN	Sep-17				
Internal control actions to put in place	Medium risk		PCU	contin												
			PCU													
GA financial aspects not properly follow-up, controlled and managed	Medium risk	Identifying weaknesses and plan for Organizational Strengthening measures	PCU	contin	The audit of Oct 16 gives important recommendations to be implemented by III	On-going	Medium	Medium	Medium	LCF GA financial aspects will be explained to new LCF fund manager. On site visit will be proposed	PCU/ FIN	Sep-17				



### 3 Steering and Learning

#### 3.1 Strategic re-orientations

The logical framework the program started with in 2015-2016 was adapted in the year 2016-2017. The original (TFF) RDSP results matrix had 4 levels: **Global objective (impact)**, **Specific objective (outcome)**, **Results and Activities**. Where there was some challenges like: Gap between activities and results, not compliant with RBM-standards and Specific Objective too long and confusing. The Program worked the RBM expert to harmonize this logical framework in order to comply the Result Based Management and come up with 5 levels of results as follows: **Impact, Long-term Outcomes, Short-term Outcomes, Outputs, Activities**. Additional to that the Baseline report of the program was produced and it was talking into consideration the revising logical framework of the program. This table summarizes the changes happened.

PREVIOUS LOGFRAME	CURRENT LOGFRAME
1 Global objective ,	1 Impact
1 Specific objective	2 Long-term Outcomes
✓	14 Short-term Outcomes
8 Results	30 Outputs
Activities	Activities

The budget cut that affected RDSP (6 million euro cut over the ECD and the DDP parts) affected RDSP's capacity to deliver the initially intended results.

Here are some envisaged strategic re-orientations for the future:

- In terms of supporting Districts to implement feasibility studies, it was realised that only training will not be sufficient. Hence in 17-18 FY a coaching programme will commence to support Districts with (1) elaboration of simplified feasibility studies (schools, health centres, roads) and (2) writing ToR and analysing full feasibility studies from consultants for more complex projects (modern markets, private sector development projects).
- In terms of LCF, there is currently no clarity whether a second call for proposals will be organised, and if not what will happen with the left over funds. A strategic re-orientation might be required depending on the decision taken.

#### 3.2 Recommendations

Recommendations	Actor	Deadline 2017-2018
The planning process for RDSP project should be harmonised with national planning and budgeting calendar provided by MINECOFIN to ensure full integration of RDSP-supported activities in the Implementing Partner's institutional action-plan and budget. This will ease reporting very much (no parallel system).	MINALOC, PCU & IPs	Q2
Where possible, streamline and simplify program implementation procedures under the grant agreement modality (planning, financing, reporting) to reduce administration burden while ensuring (a) a stronger results-orientation and (b) that the necessary information is made available to PCU by implementing partners.	PCU and IPs	Q1 - Q2



Make a decision on a way forward for LCF (2 <sup>nd</sup> call, accompanying measures, M&E of pilot phase, BTC funding for upcoming calls)	Steering Committee RDSP	Q2
Procure coaches to support Districts with Feasibility Studies	LODA (recommendation already approved and part of action plan FY 17-18)	Procurement of coaches to start in Q1

### 3.3 Lessons Learned

Some lessons have been learnt and they are expected to play a role in improving performance and compliance with project requirements. These include among others:

- ✓ The PCU and IPs do the participatory planning of activities, implementation and reporting and good communication and collaboration facilitated the smooth running of the program.
- ✓ Regular monitoring of activities helped minimise delays that would otherwise compromise achievement of targets (monthly reports)

## 4 Annexes

### 4.1 Quality criteria

<b>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</b>				
<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			
<b>1.1 What is the present level of relevance of the intervention?</b>				
X	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.		
<b>1.2 As presently designed, is the intervention logic still holding true?</b>				
	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).		
X	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.		

<b>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</b>				
<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
		X		
<b>2.1 How well are inputs (financial, HR, goods &amp; equipment) managed?</b>				
	A	All inputs are available on time and within budget.		
X	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.		
<b>2.2 How well is the implementation of activities managed?</b>				
	A	Activities implemented on schedule		
X	B	Most activities are on schedule. Delays exist, but do not harm the delivery of outputs		
	C	Activities are delayed. Corrections are necessary to deliver without too much delay.		
	D	Serious delay. Outputs will not be delivered unless major changes in planning.		
<b>2.3 How well are outputs achieved?</b>				



	<b>A</b>	All outputs have been and most likely will be delivered as scheduled with good quality contributing to outcomes as planned.
X	<b>B</b>	Output delivery is and will most likely be according to plan, but there is room for improvement in terms of quality, coverage and timing.
	<b>C</b>	Some output are/will be not delivered on time or with good quality. Adjustments are necessary.
	<b>D</b>	Quality and delivery of outputs has and most likely will have serious deficiencies. Major adjustments are needed to ensure that at least the key outputs are delivered on time.

**3. EFFECTIVENESS TO DATE: Degree to which the outcome (Specific Objective) is achieved as planned at the end of year N**

*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*

Assessment EFFECTIVENESS : total score	A	B	C	D
		X		
<b>3.1 As presently implemented what is the likelihood of the outcome to be achieved?</b>				
	<b>A</b>	Full achievement of the outcome is likely in terms of quality and coverage. Negative effects (if any) have been mitigated.		
X	<b>B</b>	Outcome will be achieved with minor limitations; negative effects (if any) have not caused much harm.		
	<b>C</b>	Outcome will be achieved only partially among others because of negative effects to which management was not able to fully adapt. Corrective measures have to be taken to improve ability to achieve outcome.		
	<b>D</b>	The intervention will not achieve its outcome unless major, fundamental measures are taken.		
<b>3.2 Are activities and outputs adapted (when needed), in order to achieve the outcome?</b>				
	<b>A</b>	The intervention is successful in adapting its strategies / activities and outputs to changing external conditions in order to achieve the outcome. Risks and assumptions are managed in a proactive manner.		
X	<b>B</b>	The intervention is relatively successful in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in order to achieve its outcome. Risks management is rather passive.		
	<b>C</b>	The intervention has not entirely succeeded in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in a timely or adequate manner. Risk management has been rather static. An important change in strategies is necessary in order to ensure the intervention can achieve its outcome.		
	<b>D</b>	The intervention has failed to respond to changing external conditions, risks were insufficiently managed. Major changes are needed to attain the outcome.		

**4. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY: The degree of likelihood to maintain and reproduce the benefits of an intervention in the long run (beyond the implementation period of the intervention).**

*In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: At least 3 'A's, no 'C' or 'D' = A; Maximum two 'C's, no 'D' = B; At least three 'C's, no 'D' = C; At least one 'D' = D*

Assessment POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY : total score	A	B	C	D
	<del>A</del>	X		
<b>4.1 Financial/economic viability?</b>				
	<b>A</b>	Financial/economic sustainability is potentially very good: costs for services and maintenance are covered or affordable; external factors will not change that.		
<del>X</del>	<b>B</b>	Financial/economic sustainability is likely to be good, but problems might arise namely from changing external economic factors.		
X	<b>C</b>	Problems need to be addressed regarding financial sustainability either in terms of institutional or target groups costs or changing economic context.		
	<b>D</b>	Financial/economic sustainability is very questionable unless major changes are made.		
<b>4.2 What is the level of ownership of the intervention by target groups and will it continue after the end of external support?</b>				
X	<b>A</b>	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>B</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.
<b>4.3 What is the level of policy support provided and the degree of interaction between intervention and policy level?</b>		
X	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.
<b>4.4 How well is the intervention contributing to institutional and management capacity?</b>		
X	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.



13  
20

## **4.2 Decisions taken by the steering committee and follow-up (RDSP-DDP and ECD)**

See the table in annex in Excel document.




**4.2. DECISION TAKEN BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND FOLLOW-UP**

Problem	Date	Source	Deadline	Organizational Responsible	Progress	Status	Action needed to implement the decision (if any)	Organizational Responsible	Deadline	Progress	Status		
Review of MINALOC organizational chart for RDSP	29-jun-15 SC	SC	15-Jul-15	RDSP	Co-Manager + Program manager	Charts being finalized	Implemented	Charts being finalized	RDSP	Co-Manager + Manager	15-10-15	Charts being finalized	Completed
			15-Jul-15	RDSP	PS MINALOC	Decision approved	Implemented	Immediate	MINALOC Manager	29/7/15	Done	Completed	
3. Implementing Partners to provide their respective organizational charts with identification of organisational Units that will serve as entry points to RDSP.	29-jun-15 SC	SC	15-Jul-15	RDSP	RALGA, LODA, RGB	Guidelines given	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	Co-Manager + Manager	15/10/2015	Done	Completed
			15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	Meeting set to revise the SC responsibilities	Implemented	Review of existing rules and regulations	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	15/10/2015	Done	Completed
Decision of SC on RDSF and Expedients for the Steering Committee	29-jun-15 SC	SC	15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	Decision approved	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	29/7/15	Done	Completed
			15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	Decision approved	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	29/7/15	Done	Completed
1. Director of Intervention and Team to revise SC responsibilities, taking into account standard BTC procedures templates as stated in the Technical and Financial File (TFF) and the demarcation with other Steering Committees in place (e.g. in LODA)	29-jun-15 SC	SC	15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	Decision approved	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	29/7/15	Done	Completed
			15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	Decision approved	Implemented	Preparation of the meeting in progress	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	Before next Steering Committee meeting	Consultation meeting done early August	Completed
5. The DG (DI a.1) in charge of planning at MINALOC will check with the MINECOFIN whether or not it is necessary for them to sign the PSC meeting minutes.	29-jun-15 SC	SC	15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI a.1	DI a.1 is to consult MINECOFIN for discussion on this issue	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	Program manager	29/7/15	Done	Completed
			15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	Decision approved	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	Program manager	29/7/15	Done	Completed
1. To put activities' road map in the MONOP (BTC Monitoring and Operations Tool).	29-jun-15 SC	SC	15-Jul-15	RDSP	Co-Manager + Program manager	Decision approved	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	Program manager	29/7/15	Done	Completed
			15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	Decision approved	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	Program manager	29/7/15	Done	Completed
1. To include the signing of the MOU between LODA, MINALOC, MINECOFIN and DPs in the RDSP start up plan	29-jun-15 SC	SC	15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	DI + Co-manager	Implemented	The MOU has been approved by concerned DPs	MINALOC, MINECOFIN, LODA, RDSP	DI + Co-manager	MOU signed	10-10-15	Completed
			15-Jul-15	RDSP	DI + Co-manager	Decision approved	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	Program manager	29/7/15	Done	Completed


Handwritten initials and a signature.



1. To meet MINALOC DG Planning, DG Territorial Administration and Governance and NCBS to discuss how best coordination with other interventions can be achieved.	29-jun-15	ISC	15-Jul-15	RDSP	Co-Manager + Program manager	DI + Co-manager	Implemented	Preparation of the meeting in progress	RDSP, MINALOC DGs and NCBS	DI + Co-manager	Meetings held with DGs MINALOC, implementing Partner and	Done in August/Sept 15	Completed
2. To align RDSP planned Capacity Building activities to those of District Capacity Building plans.					Co-Manager + Program manager	Co-manager + program manager	Implemented	To be discussed in retreat	RDSP, MINALOC, LODA, RGB, RALGA and NCBS	DRDSP staff	14-15/7/15	Retreat time table and invitations sent	Completed
3. Roadmap for RDSP startup with implementing institutions	29-jun-15				Co-Manager + Program manager	Co-manager + program manager	Implemented	To be discussed in retreat	RDSP, MINALOC, LODA, RGB, RALGA and NCBS	DRDSP staff	14-15/7/16	Discussed	Completed
4. To respect and implement the RDSP roadmap as planned in order to catch up with the delay of the activities.					RDSP staff	Co-manager + program manager	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP staff	RDSP staff	Before September 2015	Implementation roadmap already in place	Completed
1. 2nd Mt. Exco for Parties NC Government and local Peoples Issues													
1. ANNECOFIN not to be signatory to the Steering Committee minutes approved	13/10/2015	SC	13/10/2015	RDSP	Co-Manager + Program manager	Decision approved	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	Co-Manager + Manager	13/10/2015	Done	Completed
2. RDSP activities Startup update approved					RDSP	Co-Manager + Program manager	Activities startup approved	Implemented	Immediate	Co-Manager + Manager	13/10/2015	Done	Completed
3. Presentation on SC Rules and Regulations approved					RDSP	Co-Manager + Program manager	Rules and Regulations approved with adjustments	Implemented	Immediate	Co-Manager + Manager	13/10/2015	Done	Completed
7th Mt. Exco for Parties													
Decision 1/2nd Ad hoc technical committee to discuss disbursement modalities with LODA and submit a joint proposal to the chair and co-chair.							Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	ITA CFA	13/10/2015	Done	Completed
Decision 2/2nd Final RDSP draft Log frame approved	13/10/2015	SC	13/10/2015	RDSP	RDSP staff	Logframe approved	On Track	To be immediately used	RDSP/AIN ALOC	RDSP staff	13/10/2015	Completed	Completed
Decision 3/2nd Addition of new Result by RGB request within the RDSP log frame to be considered					RDSP	RGB and RDSP	Consultation Guidelines given	Implemented	Meetings between RGB and RDSP staff to commence	Co-Manager + Manager	30-Oct-15	Discussions still on going	Completed
Decision 4/2nd Choice of Pilot Districts and Placement of 4 NTAs on LODA/LED approved			13/10/2015	LODA	LODA	Recruitment of 4 NTAs to start by end of October	Implemented	Recruitment process on going	RDSP/LODA ITA	RDSP, ITA/LODA	30-Oct-15	NTAs LED recruited, and placed under	Completed
Decision 5/2nd RDSP Budget revision and re-allocation approved			13/10/2015	RDSP	RDSP staff	Budget to be used	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	ITA CAF	13/10/2015	Done	Completed
Decision 6/2nd Implementing Partners Operational Plans for 2015-2016 approved with observations			13/10/2015	LODA, RALGA	RALGA, LODA, RGB	Guidelines given	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	Co-Manager + Manager	15/11/2015	The three Action Plans 2015-2016	Completed
Decision 7/2nd Grant Agreements and activities Roadmap approved			13/10/2015	RDSP	RDSP	Immediate	Implemented	Preparation of meetings with partners	RDSP	RDSP staff	15/11/2015	N/A	Completed
Decision 8/2nd RDSP PCU Organizational Chart			13/10/2015	RDSP	RDSP	Immediate	Implemented	Immediate	RDSP	RDSP staff	13/10/2015	N/A	Completed




<p><b>Decision 9/2:</b> The extended RDSP structure is to be submitted to the new steering committee</p>	<p>13-Oct-15</p>	<p>RDSP PCU</p>	<p>RDSP PCU</p>	<p>meeting to be organized with LODA</p>	<p>Delayed</p>	<p>- Adapt extended structure in coordination with partners - PCU+IP structure to be produced</p>	<p>RDSP PCU</p>	<p>RDSP staff</p>	<p>- december 2015 - April 2017</p>	<p>Draft approved by intervention Director and BTC office</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>1. LODA's first disbursement on investment recommended after signing of MoU</p>	<p>30-Oct-15</p>	<p>RDSP/LODA DA</p>	<p>ITA/CAF + DAF</p>	<p>meeting to be organized with LODA</p>	<p>Implemented</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>RDSP</p>	<p>ITA/CAF</p>	<p>30-Oct-15</p>	<p>2 disbursements made (Nov+ Dec)</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>2. RGB's suggested Result 2 not to be included in AP until non objection is obtained</p>	<p>30-Oct-15</p>	<p>RDSP + RGB</p>	<p>RDSP + RGB</p>	<p>meeting to be organized with RGB</p>	<p>Implemented</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>RDSP+RGB</p>	<p>RDSP+RGB</p>	<p>30-Oct-15</p>	<p>Meetings on going and planned activities to be considered in 2016-2017 RGB Action Plan</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>3. All planned activities from implementing partners to have explanatory notes on results expected and how they can be achieved</p>	<p>30-Oct-15</p>	<p>LODA, RALGA, RGB</p>	<p>LODA, RALGA, RGB</p>	<p>Guidelines given</p>	<p>Implemented</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>LODA, RALGA, RGB</p>	<p>Heads of institutions</p>	<p>201-2016</p>	<p>Procedure for Concept implemented</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>4. LED ITA to coordinate local economic development concept training</p>	<p>no set date</p>	<p>LODA, RALGA, RGB</p>	<p>LODA</p>	<p>starting preparations</p>	<p>Implemented</p>	<p>Preparation of the training modules and tools of assessment</p>	<p>LODA</p>	<p>ITA + 4 NTAs</p>	<p>no set date</p>	<p>Coordination of LED concept training on going</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p>7. Results 4 &amp; 5 of the logframe to be discussed with implementing partners and DPs on how best they can be achieved</p>	<p>Before next SC meeting</p>	<p>RDSP</p>	<p>RDSP</p>	<p>Guidelines given</p>	<p>Implemented</p>	<p>Organization of meetings with partners</p>	<p>RDSP</p>	<p>RDSP</p>	<p>Before next SC meeting</p>	<p>Results 4 &amp; 5 implementation discussion in progress and will</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p><b>1d. SC TIF Disbursement and Approvals</b></p>	<p>28-04-16</p>	<p>SC</p>	<p>RDSP PCU</p>	<p>AP's &amp; Budgets prepared under consideration of budget cuts</p>	<p>implemented</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>IPs</p>	<p>RDSP PCU</p>	<p>30/6/2016</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p><b>Decision 1/3rd:</b> RDSP Action Plan and Budget to be reviewed and approved by SC (after communication PS MINALOC on budget reallocation between ECD and DDP)</p>	<p>28-04-16</p>	<p>SC</p>	<p>RDSP PCU</p>	<p>Done</p>	<p>Implemented</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>PCU, RGB &amp; BTC</p>	<p>RGB</p>	<p>Open</p>	<p>On going</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p><b>Decision 2/3rd:</b> TIF adaptation: Additional modality under RGB's Grant agreement for Procurement execution - Joint Responsibility when BTC System is used (see TFF ECD- 5.6.2)</p>	<p>28-04-16</p>	<p>SC</p>	<p>RDSP PCU + IP's</p>	<p>On going</p>	<p>Implemented</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>PCU &amp; Ips</p>	<p>PCU</p>	<p>30/6/2016</p>	<p>On going</p>	<p>On Track</p>
<p><b>Decision 3/3rd:</b> Understanding and performance of reporting process to be improved by: - Additional CB session on reporting for IP's - Adhering to the "5 working days business standard" (both PCU and IP's) - IP' to send draft quarterly reports to PCU 30 days after end of reporting period</p>	<p>29-04-16</p>	<p>SC</p>	<p>RGB</p>	<p>The evaluation tool under development</p>	<p>On Track</p>	<p>PNIES + JTA MAKE to train Ips on use of system</p>	<p>PCU</p>	<p>PCU</p>	<p>- 31-12-2016 - 30/04/2017</p>	<p>On going, new JTA arrived on 03/04/2017</p>	<p>Delayed</p>
<p><b>Decision 4/3rd:</b> Feasibility to develop a web-based evaluation tool for trainings to be analysed (process to be owned by RGB)</p>	<p>28-04-16</p>	<p>SC</p>	<p>MINALOC</p>	<p>ToRs for the accountant ready but not yet established in the SPlU structure</p>	<p>Negotiations with MIFOTRA on going</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>MINALOC &amp; PCU</p>	<p>MINALOC &amp; PCU</p>	<p>Open ended</p>	<p>On going</p>	<p>Completed</p>
<p><b>Decision 5/3rd:</b> Recruitment of 1 accountant for PCU (1 year renewable after joint evaluation). (Co-managed, under MINALOC SPlU contract)</p>	<p>28-04-16</p>	<p>SC</p>	<p>MINALOC</p>	<p>ToRs for the accountant ready but not yet established in the SPlU structure</p>	<p>Negotiations with MIFOTRA on going</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>MINALOC &amp; PCU</p>	<p>MINALOC &amp; PCU</p>	<p>Open ended</p>	<p>On going</p>	<p>Completed</p>






Decision 6/3rd Gender as priority cross cutting issue for 2016-2017	SC	28-06-16	PCU + IPs	PCU + IPs	APs and Budgets 2016 - 2017 from IPs have Gender considerations	On track	Immediate	PCU & Ips	PCU & Ips	30/6/2016	On going	Completed
Decision 7/3rd Request for 1 Annual Report to Belgium instead of 2 to be addressed to DGDD and decision communicated to SC chair and co-chair	SC	28-04-16	BTC RepRwa	BTC RepRwa	Discussions on going	On going	Negative answer received	BTC	BTC	Open ended	Open ended	Cancelled
Decision 8/3rd Extension of the period to present a final baseline report (by end of August 2016)	SC	28-04-16	PCU	PCU	Consultant already recruited and will start in August	Delayed	Consultant notified of the delay	PCU/BTC	PCU	August 31/2016	Discussions on going	Completed
Decision 9a/3rd Non-objection given on changes in FY15/16 list of LED infrastructure projects	SC	28-04-16	LODA	LODA	NO given by Chair and Co-chair	Completed	Immediate	LODA	LODA	Completed	Completed	Completed
Decision 9b/3rd Non-objection given on proposed list of LED infrastructure projects for FY16/17 (subject to confirmation after information on budget cuts is received LODA will prioritize according to the final available budget.)	SC	30-05-16	LODA	LODA	List of priority projects to be funded by RDSF through LODA submitted	Completed	Immediate	LODA	LODA	Completed	Completed	Completed
Decision 10/3rd number of RDSF instalments for funding LED infrastructure projects to be reduced to 3 per year for FY15/16 and FY 16/17	SC	28-04-16	PCU	PCU	SC approved the 3 instalments	On going	Immediate	LODA	PCU	Completed	Completed	Completed
Decision 11/3rd Orientations for Result 4 approved	SC	28-04-16	PCU	NTA SC	Preparations	On going	Immediate	NTA SC	MINALOC/PCU	Completed	Completed	Completed
Decision 12/3rd Recruitment of a secretary to the SWG secretariat under MINALOC contract (subject to considerations on budget cuts and reallocation)	SC	31-05-16	MINALOC	MINALOC	Toks for the secretary position ready for advertisement	On going	Immediate	MINALOC/PCU	MINALOC	On going	On track	Completed
Decision 13/3rd Change of modality for budget lines A 02 06 and A 02 08 from BTC self-management to self-management	SC	28-04-16	PCU	ITA CFA	completed	completed	Immediate	PCU/BTC	PCU	Completed	Completed	Completed
Decision 14/3rd Orientations for Result 5 approved (subject to considerations on budget reallocation.)	SC	Upcoming TC meeting	PCU	PCU	Orientation approved but budget cuts will affect its	Delayed	Delayed	BTC/PCU	PCU	Delayed	Delayed	Cancelled
Decision 15/3rd Establish a Technical Committee to review and approve the LCF assessment report + the proposed design for LCF. This TC to advise the SC to give final approval of LCF assessment report and	SC	28-04-16	LODA	LODA + ITA LED	Technical committee put in place	Discussions on going	On track	LODA/PCU	LODA	Immediate	Immediate	Completed
Decision 16/3rd PM - Version 1.0. approved	SC	28-04-16	PCU	ITA CFA	PM approved	Completed	Immediate	PCU	PCU	Immediate	Immediate	Completed
Decision 17/3rd Next SCM on 2/06/2016	SC	02-06-16	PCU	PM - Co-Man	Documents to be discussed were not yet ready	Preparations on going	Delayed	PCU	PCU	On going	On going	Completed
2nd SCM Recommendations	SC	28-04-16	PCU + IPs	PCU + IPs	Immediate	Immediate	On track	All IPs	PCU	Immediate	On track	Completed
1/ General recommendations to PCU and IPs on planning and reports: - Improve on planning - improve quality and timeliness of reporting - Improve communication between PCU and IPs	SC	28-04-16	LODA	LODA	Immediate	Immediate	On track	LODA	PCU	Immediate	On Track	Completed
2/ Recommendation on planning and reporting to LODA. Use consistent terminology and avoid mentioning "coaching for Tot"	SC	28-04-16	RALGA	RALGA	Immediate	Immediate	on Track	RALGA	RALGA	Immediate	PCU discussed with RALGA	Completed
3/ Recommendation on planning and reporting to RALGA. provide Q2 financial report to PCU	SC	28-04-16	RALGA	RALGA	Immediate	Immediate	on Track	RALGA	RALGA	Immediate	PCU discussed with RALGA	Completed




4. Formal request to merge the RDSP Annual Reports (on ECD and DDD) to Belgium, must be sent by chair and co-chair to the Belgian Embassy.	SC	28-04-16	BTC RepRWA	BTC RepRWA		Delayed	Delayed	BTC	BTC	Open ended	Dialog on going	Completed
5. RDSP Technical Committee to determine concrete orientations in terms of implementation for Result 5	SC	Upcoming TC Meeting	PCU	PCU	Budget cuts affected the implementation of OS	Delayed	Develop new proposal with new JTA (arrived on 03/04/2017)	PCU	JTA RBNI (TC)	30-05-2017	Under discussion	Delayed
6/LODA to brief the LCF Technical Committee on LED approaches applicable in Rwanda	SC	28-04-16	LODA	LODA + JTA LED	Immediate	on Track	Technical committee put in place	LODA	PCU	Immediate	On going	Completed
7. SC meetings to remain strategic and limited to a maximum of 3 hours	SC	02-06-16	PCU	PN1 + Co-Man	Immediate	Immediate		PCU	PCU	Immediate	On going	Completed
<b>4th SC M Decisions and Approvals</b>												
Decision 1.4th: In case grant agreement amendments for 2016-2017 cannot be signed before the end of June 2016, the current grant agreements will be extended for two months to avoid a gap in the validity of supporting documents related to 2015-2016 activities that are shifted or extended to 2016-2017	20-06-16	SC	15-07-16	PCU	PCU	Immediate	on going	Decision discussed with IPs for proper handling	PCU and IPs	PCU	30/07/2016	On track
Decision 2.4th: The Action Plans and Budgets (PCU + IPs) for 2016-2017 Grant Agreements approved	SC	16-07-16	PCU	PCU	Immediate	on going	APs & Budgets ready for GA signing	PCU and IPs	PCU	30/07/2017	On track	Completed
Decision 3.4th: The revised list of infrastructure projects to be funded by LODA (after budget cut) is approved. The implementation period for this support will be limited to 2 quarters and payments will be made in 2 instalments instead of 3.	SC	20-06-16	LODA	PCU	Immediate	on going	Preparations under way to effect the decision	PCU	PCU	Continuous	On track	Completed
Decision 4.4th: The SC also approved to convene a meeting by September 2016 to be updated on the signature of new Specific Agreement after the recent budget cuts. The meeting will also be updated on the possibility to merge the hitherto 2 Specific Agreements into one	SC	30/09/2016	BTC	BTC	On course	On going	BTC preparing the SA	BTC	BTC	30/09/2016	On track	Completed
Decision 5.4th: Transfer of 300,000 EUR from "contingency co-management" to "general means co-management" to cater for SPU salaries is approved	SC	20-06-16	PCU	PCU	Immediate	On going	Transfer on course	PCU	PCU	15/06/2016	Completed	Completed
<b>4th SC M Recommendations</b>												
1- The PCU and IPs to report on results and indicators achievement rather than reporting on activities	20-06-16	SC	15/08/2016	PCU	PCU	Immediate	On going	Discussed with Ips for immediate application	PCU	PCU	15/08/2016	On track
2- In case of activities with the lower tiers of local Governments, IPs to technically discuss with the PCU the possibility to provide facilitation fees directly to participants rather than through a service provider as service providers may not be available in all cells or sectors (on a case-by-case basis).	SC	Continuous	PCU	PCU	Immediate	To be carried out in next GA implementation	Preparations under way to effect the decision	PCU	PN1	Continuous	On track	No request made to PCU
3- RALGA and LODA to submit requests for new budget transfers under their respective grant agreements as soon as possible as the PCU checking and approval process will take time.	SC	15/06/2015	PCU	LODA & RALGA	Immediate	On going	PCU visits to the two IPs for discussion	PCU	PN1	15/06/2015	On track	Completed

5/25




4- Process of establishment of a SWG Secretariat and recruitment of a secretary to the SWG to be expedited.	SC	30/07/2016	NTA Sector coordinat or, MINALOC and PCU	NTA	Immediate	On going	Preparation of TOR completed	PCU	NTA	30/07/2016	On track	Completed
5- IPs to enhance internal coordination in preparing documents for submission to PCU. Focal points in both PCU and IPs to be consolidated	SC	Continuous	PCU and IPs	PCU	Immediate	On going	To be discussed in TC meetings	PCU	PNI	Continuous	On track	On Track
6- Phrasing of outcomes, outputs and indicators will be fine-tuned as necessary, as part of the finalisation of the new results matrix.	SC	Continuous	PCU	PCU	On going	On going	Consultations on going with our IPs and RBN consultant	PCU	PNIES	Continuous	On track	Completed
7- A Technical Committee including NCBS and the PCU will approve both the evaluation and design of the LG Coaching programme under RGB.	SC	30/08/2016	RGB & NCBS	PCU	Discussions not yet started	Discussions not yet started	Coaching programme approved	PCU	PCU	No deadline outlined	Delayed	Completed
8- IPs to create synergies and avoid potential overlaps in activities through dialogue and coordination (e.g. in capacity building and LED activities)	SC	Effective from the signing of GA 2016-2017	RALGA & LODA	PCU	Discussions on going	On course	Discussions have been going on	PCU	RALGA & LODA	To be implemented during the next GA	On track	On Track
9- The SC highly recommends the merging of the 2 specific agreements into one to allow for flexibility and decrease on administrative requirements in reporting	SC	30/09/2016	BTC	BTC	Discussions on going	On course	Negative advice received	BTC	BTC	30/09/2016	On track	Cancelled
10- Next SC meeting to take place in early September to approve the final revised RDSP results matrix as well as 2016-2017 action plan and budget for LCF.	SC	30/09/2017	PCU	PCU	Discussions with RBN consultant and LODA on	On course	Continuous	PCU & LODA	PCU	30/09/2017	On track	Completed
5th SC Meeting Decisions and Approvals 27/10/16	SC	27-10-16	SC	SC	Immediate	On course	the structure being drafted	PCU	PCU team + DI	By next SC	On going	On Track
Decision 1/5th: The extended RDSP structure will be presented at the next SC meeting	SC	27-10-16	SC	SC	Immediate	On course	the structure being drafted	PCU	PCU team + DI	By next SC	On going	On Track
Decision 2/5th: BTC representation to inform SC of the status of the request of Belgium's Directorate of Development Cooperation (DGDD) to align the reporting period for annual results reports with the Rwandan fiscal year	SC	27-10-16	BTC	BTC	Discussion with BTC on going	On course	Immediate	BTC/PCU	BTC	By next SC	On going	Completed
Decision 3/5th: RDSP SC will not pursue further the request to merge RDSP's two Specific Agreements	SC	27-10-16	SC	SC	Immediate	Terminated	Immediate	SC	RDSP	None	Terminated	Completed
Decision 4/5th: SC extends PCU's mandate on changes to Ips Action Plans and Budgets under Grant Agreement modality, to agreeing on changes to target group, annual target or scheduling of an activity.	SC	27-10-16	PCU	PCU	Immediate	On going	Immediate	PCU	PCU team	Continuous	On going	Completed
Decision 5/5th: SC gives mandate to grant Agreement signatories to approve changes in the nature of activity (including replacement, removal and addition) and in expected results of an activity through an amendment, while remaining within the results structure and annual budgetary envelop. PCU provides technical support in this case.	SC	27-10-16	GA signatories	GA signatories	Immediate	On going	Immediate	GA signatories	GA signatories	Immediate	On going	Completed

Handwritten signature and initials in blue ink.











<p><b>Decision 13.5th</b> SC approves - The revised full list of LED infrastructure projects supported by RDSP (2015-2017)</p> <p>- The 17 projects changed from approved list for FY 15-16</p> <p>- The 'a priori' request for the replacement of the 'Ndora water supply system' project by the 'Rehabilitation and construction of bridges' project (Gisgana) for FY 16-17</p> <p>*SC informs LODA that 'a posteriori approvals' will not be possible in the future for any change in the list of infrastructure projects</p>				Immediate	On course	Immediate	LODA	LODA	This quarter	On track	Completed
<p><b>Decision 14.5th</b> The final report of the joint monitoring mission and audit on LED infrastructure projects will be shared with the SC</p>				When available	On going	Study under way	LODA	LODA	This quarter	On track	Completed
<p><b>Decision 15.5th</b> SC approves the principle of RDSP support for organisational strengthening of MINALOC and requests MINALOC to prepare a proposal in line with RDSP guidelines. Activities, outputs and outcomes to be identified should align to the existing RDSP results</p>				Immediate	On course	Preparations under way	MINALOC/NTA SC	NTA Sector Coordination	Immediate	On track	Completed
<p><b>Decision 16.5th</b> MINALOC will formulate a new proposal on the counterpart fund for RDSP</p>				Immediate	On course	Preparations under way	MINALOC	MINALOC	Immediate	On track	Completed
<p><b>Decision 17.5th</b> Use of the counterpart fund for RDSP will be regularly reported on to the SC.</p>				When GoR funds are available and used by PCU	Under negotiations	Preparations under way	MINALOC	DI	Next SC meeting	Confirmation of commitment for 2017-2018 expected	On Track
5th SC VI Recommendations 27/10/2016											
<p>1. The SC will be informed on changes made to grant agreements at the SC meeting following such changes.</p>				Immediate	When changes occur	Preparations under way	PCU	IPs	Every end of quarter	Every end of quarter	On Track
<p>2. For indicators on service delivery, RGB and MINALOC's new inspection department to seek</p>				Immediate	On course	Under discussion	RGB & MINALOC	RGB & MINALOC	Immediate	On track	On Track
<p>3. Identify core members of the LCF investment committee and design the process to ensure effective decision-making while minimizing time requested from other participants. This should be stipulated in the operational manual and tools will be developed for the Investment and the Technical Committee.</p>				Immediate	On course	Preparations in final stages	PCU & LODA	LODA	Immediate	On track	Completed
<p>4. Seek ways to make the LCF application process less time consuming, while keeping the approach efficient and credible.</p>				Immediate	On course	On track	PCU & LODA	LODA	Immediate	On track	Completed
<p>5. The assessment of pilot districts' management capacity should not delay the LCF implementation process.</p>				Immediate	On course	On track	LODA	LODA	Immediate	On track	Completed
<p>6. LCF needs to be business-oriented and responsive to effectively and efficiently meet the needs of community-based businesses.</p>				On track	On course	Sensitization campaigns	LODA	LODA	Immediate	On course	Completed



7. Gender Equality: consider participation of National Women Council in District-level decision-making processes on LCF						Immediate	Under discussion	Under preparation	PCU & LODA	LODA	Immediate	On course	Completed
8. Ensure that WDA (NEP Skills development Unit) is a member of the Technical committee on LCF						Immediate	On course	On track	PCU	PCU	Immediate	On course	Completed
9. MINALOC to find a quick solution for the PCU office						Offices given	Completed	Completed	MINALOC & PCU	MINALOC & PCU	Immediate	Completed	Completed
6/5: SC approves 2017-2018 RDSP action plan and budget planning with the following specifications for funds under grant agreements:	SC					Immediate	Completed	Completed	LODA, PCU, MINALOC & BTC	LODA & PCU	Immediate	Amendment to GA signed	Completed
Approval of LODA's revised Action-Plan and Budget for 2016-2017 (GA Amendment)						Immediate	Completed	Completed	LODA, PCU, MINALOC	LODA & PCU	Immediate	Amendment to GA signed	Completed
Approval of RALGA's revised Action-Plan and Budget for 2016-2017 (GA Amendment)						Immediate	Completed	Completed	LODA, PCU, MINALOC	LODA & PCU	Immediate	Amendment to GA signed	Completed
6/6: SC approves 2017-2018 RDSP action plan and budget planning with the following specifications for funds under grant agreements:	SC		15-08-17	PCU/PIO	PM	Roadmap confirmed at TC meeting	On going						On track
6/1: SC recommends to share information over all CB activities under RDSP CEBs to share LG CD plans with PCU and PCU to share action plans with CEBs in view of harmonizing CB activities			30-06-17	CEBS-PCU									
6/2: SC recommends to make sure coaches are not de-facto district staff, but keep an advisory role			N.A.	RGB	RGB PM								
6/3: SC recommends to enhance communication on LCF eligibility and selection criteria during awareness campaigns in order to reduce the number of no-eligible applications that do not meet the criteria at all.			By next call for proposals	LODA	LCF Fund Manager								
6/4: SC approves all requested budget changes			01-07-17	PCU	ATI CFA	Budget changes implemented	Completed						
6/5: SC approves 2017-2018 RDSP action plan and budget planning with the following specifications for funds under grant agreements:			01-07-17	PCU	DI/DELCO	Implemented except for grant agreements (in preparation)	On-going						
- Budgets are approved subject to fund availability; - At least 90% of RDSP-supported activities to be aligned with official financial management system of all IPs			N.A.	IP	IP PM								
6/6: SC recommends further coordination and sharing of good practices between Implementing Partners regarding methodologies for activities addressing Policy dialogue			30-09-17	PCU	ITA CFA								
6/7: SC requests PCU to further discuss procurement issues with partners in order to improve tendering processes.			N.A.	IP	IP PM								
6/8: SC recommends implementing partners to communicate early enough with local governments on planned activities at local level, in order to improve the effectiveness of all planning			N.A.	IP	IP PM								

3



6.9 SC encourages all RDSF stakeholders to follow up and support the process of audit and facilitate the collaboration between PCU and IPs in implementing related action plans.

N.A.

IP

management

13  
NS



### 4.3 Updated Logical framework (RDSP-ECD and DDP)

See the table in annex in Excel document.





RDSP INTERVENTION FRAMEWORK					
LEVEL	IND. CODE	NAME	AREA	RESPONSIBLE PARTNER	
<b>IMPACT</b>		To sustainably enhance the capacity of Local Governments to deliver services and to support an enabling environment for LED in respect of best governance practices			
Ind.	I1	% of citizens expressing satisfaction with the quality and timeliness of service delivery at the local level [SSP ind.3]			
Ind.	I2	% of entrepreneurs and cooperatives who are satisfied with the business environment for LED in 8 pilot districts			
<b>LONG-TERM OUTCOME 1</b>		Districts' capacity to deliver quality services, including on Local Economic Development, is efficiently and effectively enhanced			
Ind.	LTO1	Level of implementation of the service charters (8 pilot districts)			
<b>OUTCOME 1A</b>		<b>Improved Local Government Capacity Building Processes and Coordination Mechanism</b>			
Ind.	1A.OC	Level of satisfaction of LG and other key stakeholders with LG CB processes (Needs assessment, CB plans, implementation and M&E of CB plans) and coordination mechanism	Capacity Building LGs		
<b>OUTPUT 1A.1</b>		<b>Local Government Capacity Building plans developed based on the needs assessment</b>			
Ind.	1A.OP1	# of LG annual CB plans developed compliant with the quality checklist (realistic, participatory, demand driven, considering key sector priority,...)			
<b>OUTPUT 1A.2</b>		<b>Local Government CB planned activities are implemented</b>			
Ind.	1A.OP2	% of LG CB plans activities that are implemented			
<b>OUTPUT 1A.3</b>		<b>LG CB monitoring mechanism developed and used</b>			
Ind.	1A.OP3a	# of districts using the developed M&E mechanism			
Ind.	1A.OP3b	% of approved recommendations from the LG CB monitoring implemented by concerned stakeholders			
<b>OUTPUT 1A.4</b>		<b>LG Capacity Building and Service Delivery TWG coordination role supported</b>			
Ind.	1A.OP4	# of meetings of the LG CB and SD TWG where recommendations to the SWG were made			
<b>OUTCOME 1B</b>		<b>Service Delivery in Local Governments enhanced</b>			
Ind.	1B.OC	% of selected services of service charters that are implemented as prescribed in 8 pilot districts		RGB	
Ind.	1B.OC	% of citizens satisfied with services provided by LG			
<b>OUTPUT 1B.1</b>		<b>The status of service delivery in LG is communicated to concerned stakeholders</b>			
Ind.	1B.OP5	% of concerned stakeholders having used the CRC findings on Service delivery status in LG			
<b>OUTPUT 1B.2</b>		<b>Implementation of Service Charters in LG's is monitored</b>			
Ind.	1B.OP6	% of recommendations from service charters monitoring implemented by concerned stakeholders in 8 pilot districts			

107. M

<b>OUTPUT 1B.3</b>	<b>Citizens' suggestions are used in Advocacy for improvement of service delivery in LGs</b>			
Ind.	1B.OP7	# of recorded citizens' suggestions on Service Delivery advocated for		
<b>OUTPUT 1B.4</b>	<b>CSO's suggestions are used in Advocacy for improvement of service delivery in LGs</b>			
Ind.	1B.OP8	# of recorded CSOs suggestions on Service Delivery advocated for		
<b>OUTCOME 1C</b>	<b>RGB identified organisational functions supported</b>			
Ind.	1C.OC	# RGB organizational functions with improved performance		
<b>OUTPUT 1C.1</b>	<b>Key strategic documents produced</b>			
Ind.	1C.OP9	# of strategic documents produced		
<b>OUTPUT 1C.2</b>	<b>Trainings in identified areas are conducted</b>			
Ind.	1C.OP10	# of training sessions conducted		<b>RGB Institutional strengthening</b>
<b>OUTPUT 1C.3</b>	<b>Research applied Software provided</b>			
Ind.	1C.OP11	# of software provided		
<b>OUTPUT 1C.4</b>	<b>Technical assistance provided to RGB in order to enhance organizational performance</b>			
Ind.	1C.OP12	# of Technical assistants provided		
<b>OUTCOME 2A</b>	<b>Local Governments LED infrastructure investments in all Districts are efficiently implemented and sustainably managed</b>			
Ind.	2A.OC	% of LGs capacity to manage efficiently and sustainably LED infrastructure investments		
<b>OUTPUT 2A.1</b>	<b>LG staff acquire skills on how to develop ToR for feasibility studies and how to analyse feasibility studies conducted by consultants</b>			
Ind.	2A.OP1	% of Project Profile Documents (PPDs) submitted to LODA having a feasibility study		<b>Capacity Building (for LED investments)</b>
<b>OUTPUT 2A.2</b>	<b>LGs have the capacity to plan, implement and manage efficiently LED infrastructure projects</b>			
Ind.	2A.OP2a	% of Districts implementing the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) system according to LODA guidelines		
Ind.	2A.OP2b	% of RDSP supported LED infrastructure projects for which basic M&E-info is available in the MEIS		
<b>OUTPUT 2A.3</b>	<b>LGs understand LED for its effective planning and implementation</b>			
Ind.	2A.OP3a	# of Districts with District LED Strategy		
Ind.	2A.OP3b	# of BDEUs receiving capacity building		
<b>OUTCOME 2B</b>	<b>LCF well designed, prepared and managed in 4 pilot Districts for LED</b>			
Ind.	2B.OC	% of LCF partnership projects' quarterly reports that are in line with set reporting standards		<b>LODA</b>
<b>OUTPUT 2B.1</b>	<b>Stakeholders in 4 pilot Districts are ready for LCF implementation</b>			
Ind.	2B.OP3a	Number of awareness meetings on LCF at Sector Level		
Ind.	2B.OP3b	Number of LCF documents published on LODA-LCF website		
Ind.	2B.OP3c	Number of concept notes submitted to LCF secretariat		
				<b>LCF preparation</b>

<b>OUTPUT 2B.2</b>	<b>Technical assistance and capacity development provided in 4 pilot districts for well-managed LCF projects</b>		<b>and management</b>
Ind.	2B.OPa	# of companies that have received CB during call for proposals	
<b>OUTPUT 2B.2</b>	<b>Technical assistance and capacity development provided in 4 pilot Districts for well managed LCF projects</b>		
Ind.	2B.OPa	2B.OP6 : % of quarterly reports from LCF partnership projects submitted	
<b>OUTCOME 2C</b>	<b>LODA Institutional Strengthening</b>		
Ind.	2C.OC	% of approved LCF quarterly reports from the districts recorded in MEIS	<b>LODA institutional strengthening</b>
<b>OUTPUT 2C.1</b>	<b>LODA can efficiently manage LCF by using MEIS</b>		
Ind.	2C.OP8	% of Quarterly reports from LCF partnership projects shared in MEIS	
<b>OUTCOME 3A</b>	<b>Inclusive Participation practices in LED processes in 8 pilot districts are strengthened</b>		
Ind.	3A.OC	% of multi-stakeholders testifying improved practices of inclusive participation in LED-related process in 8 pilot districts by 2019	<b>Inclusive participation in LED processes</b>
<b>OUTPUT 3A.1</b>	<b>Pilot Districts are supported to effectively engage multi-stakeholder in LED processes</b>		
Ind.	3A.OP1a	3A.OP1a: % of multi-stakeholders testifying existence of strong and well-organized partnerships between public sector, private sector and CSOs	
Ind.	3A.OP1b	3A.OP1b: Number of pilot districts receiving tailor-made assistance to optimally engage multi-stakeholder in LED processes	
Ind.	3A.OP1c	3A.OP1c: % of multi-stakeholders satisfied with the conduciveness of LED environment in 8 pilot districts	
<b>OUTCOME 3B</b>	<b>Gender Equality in LED processes is enhanced in 8 pilot districts</b>		<b>RALGA</b>
Ind.	3B.OC	% of multi-stakeholders testifying improved practices of gender responsive planning, budgeting and reporting in 8 pilot districts by 2019	<b>Gender equality in LED processes</b>
<b>OUTPUT 3B.1</b>	<b>Pilot districts' compliance with gender responsive planning, budgeting and reporting guidelines is enhanced</b>		
Ind.	3B.OP2	% of districts complying with the Gender Budget Statement in plans, budgets and reports in 8 pilot Districts	
<b>OUTCOME 3C</b>	<b>RALGA Secretariat is strengthened and well-functioning</b>		
Ind.	3C.OC	Degree to which RALGA Secretariat effectively and efficiently responds to members and partners' demands by 2019 (institutional demands)	<b>RALGA Institutional strengthening</b>
<b>OUTPUT 3C.1</b>	<b>RALGA 's secretariat is supported in identified areas to deliver on its mandates</b>		
Ind.	3C.OP3	# of RALGA's technical and institutional capacity areas supported	
<b>OUTCOME 4</b>	<b>The effectiveness of Sector Coordination mechanisms is enhanced</b>		

102  
by



Ind.	4.Oca	Quality level of G&D sector documents as assessed by SWG/TWG members	Sector Coordination	PCU
Ind.	4.Ocb	Quality level of G&D sector coordination as assessed by SWG/TWG members		
<b>OUTPUT 1</b>		<b>Technical Support to SWG/TWG coordination provided</b>		
Ind.	4.OPa	# of JSR documents produced, validated and disseminated		
Ind.	4.OPb	# of recommendations by SWG implemented.		
Ind.	4.OPc	# of TWG activities supported		
Ind.	4.OPd	# of studies and policy reviews conducted		
Ind.	4.OPe	NTA is hired and paid to support the sector		
<b>OUTCOME 5</b>		<b>RDSP Performance enhanced and results communicated</b>	RBM and Communication	PCU
Ind.	5.OC	Rating of RDSP performance (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability) at mid-term and end-term review		
<b>OUTPUT 5.1</b>		<b>The PCU and IPs are able to apply a Results Based Management approach in their planning and reporting</b>		
Ind.	5.OP1	Degree to which annual action plans and annual reports comply with RBM-standards		
<b>OUTPUT 5.2</b>		<b>Program lessons learnt are identified, capitalized and shared</b>		
Ind.	5.OP2a	# of internal lessons learnt capitalization documents produced		
Ind.	5.OP2b	# of external lessons learnt capitalization documents disseminated		
<b>OUTPUT 5.3</b>		<b>RDSP activities and results are communicated</b>		
Ind.	5.OP3	Number of RDSP activities and results with external communication (workshops, launch events, publications, broadcasts, online posts...)		
<b>LONG-TERM OUTCOME 2</b>		<b>Districts' capacity to develop a sustainable environment for LED is enhanced</b>		
Ind.	LTO2	% multi-stakeholders satisfied with the quality and inclusiveness of LED processes in 8 pilot Districts		
<b>OUTCOME 6</b>		<b>LED infrastructure implemented in 30 Districts and the city of Kigali</b>	LED infrastructure investments	LODA
Ind.	6.OC	% of RDSP-supported LED infrastructure investment projects that are completed		
<b>OUTPUT 6.1</b>		<b>LED infrastructure projects funded</b>		
Ind.	6.OP1	% of RDSP LED-infrastructure funding that was delivered to the beneficiary Districts and city of Kigali		
<b>OUTCOME 7</b>		<b>Innovative economic partnership projects are implemented through LCF in 4 pilot Districts to enhance pro-poor LED</b>	LCF Funding	LODA
Ind.	7.OC1	# of people additionally employed in companies supported by LCF		
Ind.	7.OC2	# of companies which developed or manage at least one additional step in the value chain		
Ind.	7.OC3	# of new products, services, processes or capabilities developed in LCF funded projects		
<b>OUTPUT 7.1</b>		<b>Support to LCF projects provided in 4 pilot Districts</b>		
Ind.	7.OP1a	Number of economic partnership projects funded		
Ind.	7.OP1b	Number of companies involved in supported partnerships		

<b>OUTCOME 8</b>	<b>LODA external Grants to support DDP's implementation is executed in compliance with PFM regulatory framework</b>			
Ind.	8.OC1	The external joint audit annually commissioned by Belgium, EKN, KfW is unqualified		
Ind.	8.OC2	% of recommendations of LODA external audits that are fully implemented within 12 months following the publication of the audit reports		
<b>OUTPUT 8.1</b>	<b>LODA supported on enhancing oversight of audit recommendations and District compliance with guidelines</b>		LODA audits	PCU
Ind.	8.OP1	# of technical advices provided to LODA in view of enhanced oversight		
<b>OUTPUT 8.2</b>	<b>An analysis of 4 pilot Districts' weaknesses in PFM vs. existing improvement measures is performed and shared to guide LCF management</b>			
Ind.	8.OP2	# of information sharing sessions on Districts' weaknesses in PFM vs. existing improvement measures		

Handwritten initials or signature in blue ink, possibly "W" and "M".



#### 4.4 MoRe Results at a glance

Logical framework's results or indicators modified in last 12 months?	YES Cfr to the RDSP logical framework presented above
Baseline Report registered on PIT?	The RDSP Baseline Report is finalized and registered
Planning MTR (registration of report)	The RDSP Mid Term Review will be done after 2,5 years of implementation
Planning ETR (registration of report)	The RDSP End Term Review will be done after 4,5 years of implementation
Backstopping missions since 01/01/2016	The backstopping mission was done in May 2016



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

### Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month, Last 5 Years) of RWA1309011

Project Title : Financial Support to the District Development Plans and fiscal decentralization through the Rwanda Local Development Support Fund

Budget Version : E1

Currency : EUR

Y/M :

Year to month : 30/06/2017

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

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2013	2014	2015	2016	Expenses		Total	Balance	% Exec
								2013	2016			
<b>THE DISTRICTS CAPACITY TO DEVELOP A</b>												
01 Enhanced access to basic services, farm			11 150 000,00			4 353 880,21	2 190 571,93	2 310 631,73	8 661 083,87	2 208 916,13	79%	
01 Support to Capital Development investments		COGES	8 450 000,00			4 353 880,21	2 190 173,79	1 722 493,00	8 266 547,00	183 453,00	98%	
02 Working costs LODA		COGES	84 500,00					0,00	0,00	84 500,00	0%	
02 Innovative economic partnerships are			2 400 000,00					585 956,86	1 814 041,14	2 4%		
01 implementing economic partnerships		COGES	2 250 000,00					585 956,86	1 664 041,14	26%		
02 LCF Capacity Building of LCF beneficiaries		REGIE	150 000,00				6 399,14	2 179,87	8 578,01	291 421 99	3%	
03 LODA Support Programme and the DDPs			300 000,00				6 399,14	2 179,87	8 578,01	291 421 99	3%	
01 Joint annual value for Money Audit		REGIE	300 000,00								0%	
99 Conversion rate adjustment												
		REGIE	450 000,00				6 399,14	2 179,87	8 578,01	441 421 99	2%	
		COGEST	?			4 353 880,21	2 190 173,79	2 308 451,86	8 662 565,86	1 847 494,14	83%	
		TOTAL	?			4 353 880,21	2 196 571,93	2 310 631,73	8 661 083,87	2 208 916,13	79%	





## 4.6 Communication resources

As the short outcome 5 is not yet started to be implemented, no communication materials are yet available on the effects of the intervention. It will start with the year 2017-2018; the junior in charge of it started his functions in April 2016 and he started with the preparation of the action plan.

## 4.7. Main activities performed (RDSP-DDP)

### **Outcome 6: LED infrastructure implemented in 30 Districts and the city of Kigali**

- ✓ Disbursement of fund to the selected projects to be funded of the Districts and Kigali city (Year 2015-2016 & 2016-2017)

### **Outcome 7: Innovative economic partnership projects are implemented through LCF in 4 pilot Districts to enhance pro-poor LED**

- ✓ Many activities (awareness meetings on LCF, preparation of related documents and related software (MEIS)), were done in preparatory phase under the ECD (Outcome 2B) (Year 2016-2017)
- ✓ Signing of LCF grant Agreement with LODA to facilitate the implementation of this outcome under Outcome 7 (Year 2016-2017)

### **Outcome 8: LODA external Grants to support DDP's implementation is executed in compliance with PFM regulatory framework**

- ✓ A joint evaluation with KfW and EKN took place in October 2016.
- ✓ An analysis of the pilot district weaknesses in PFM was initiated in June 2017

