



**Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/CP/RWA/NOTE/4

31 March 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-third session
2-27 June 1986, Geneva
Item 5 (b) of the provisional agenda

PROGRAMME PLANNING

COUNTRY AND INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS

FOURTH COUNTRY PROGRAMME FOR RWANDA

Note by the Administrator

I. PROCESS OF THE PROGRAMMING EXERCISE

1. In February 1985, the Resident Representative and the Minister of Planning established a joint working group composed of members from their respective offices and gave the task of the country programming exercise to that team. The team from the Ministry was responsible for initiating and co-ordinating inputs from various Government sectors into the exercise. The UNDP team was responsible for initiating and co-ordinating inputs from the United Nations system. Simultaneous with their respective tasks, the working group carried out a systematic review and evaluation of the current country programme. This review took several months and proceeded from a project to a sectoral basis, and finally to the national macro-economic level. The working group met on a weekly basis. The Minister of Planning and the Resident Representative met monthly to assess and agree on the progress of the working group. The latter was authorized to go beyond merely establishing the facts of the ongoing country programme or collating sectoral proposals for the next cycle: it was to make firm proposals on how to orient the fourth country programme in order to overcome any shortcomings that had come to light during the implementation of the third country programme.

2. The lengthy assessment of the third country programme revealed, inter alia, that the plethora of small projects was neither cost effective nor development oriented and had to be reduced. In line with the new UNDP programming guidelines, IPF resources needed further concentration on rural productivity, food self-sufficiency and economic management. The review also

/...

made it clear that projects too often tended to go on for too long, by being extended into successive phases. The high cost of foreign experts and slow delivery of other external inputs were further highlighted by the review.

3. The methodology of the working group greatly facilitated the preparation of, and mutual agreement on, the Resident Representative's note which, after consultation with the Regional Bureau for Africa in UNDP headquarters, was formally communicated to the Government in August 1985. The note reconfirmed the findings and recommendations of the working group. More specifically, it highlighted the need to reduce the number and lifespan of projects, to concentrate UNDP assistance to jointly selected priority areas, to double efforts towards the participation and training of national experts, to encourage Government execution, and to increase the use of United Nations volunteers. The limited nature of IPF resources was emphasized and a recommendation made to promote its use as a catalyst to attract more external assistance. This point was particularly relevant and opportune, since the fourth cycle period of 1987 to 1991 coincides with the duration of the Fourth National Development Plan of the Government. The programming exercise was therefore simultaneous and formed part of the Plan preparations.

II. THE FOURTH COUNTRY PROGRAMME

4. The first observation to make on the content of the fourth cycle country programme of Rwanda is the appropriate selection of the concentration areas of rural productivity and food self-sufficiency, with over 30 per cent of the IPF; economic planning and management, with over 27 per cent; and education and human resources development with over 15 per cent of the IPF. All these projects address areas that are critical to the solution of the ongoing socio-economic crisis in Rwanda. The UNDP Governing Council has specifically urged close collaboration between UNDP and Governments in their efforts to overcome similar crises prevailing in Africa.

5. A strong feature of the new country programme is the central role envisaged for using UNDP resources to attract and co-ordinate other external assistance. Hence, whereas the total IPF is \$30,852,000, the total external financing available for areas of assistance targeted for UNDP funding during the fourth cycle is over \$63 million. Joint and parallel financing sources include the World Bank, with over \$20 million; United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) with about \$10 million; a combined total of over \$10 million from other United Nations agencies such as United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), World Food Programme (WFP), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); the African Development Bank (AFDB) with some \$2 million; and bilateral contributions from countries such as Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United States of America, and Austria.

6. Worthy of mention is the fact that some 15 of 23 projects of the current programme would have been phased out by the end of 1987, and over 68 per cent of the new IPF would have been allocated to new projects in the fourth cycle. Similarly, the number of projects in the new programme has been limited to 19 as opposed to 23 in the current programme.

7. Whilst it may be premature to give specific details of Government execution and other approaches favoured by the new dimensions, the new programme document indicated that the Government and the UNDP field office plan to take concrete steps to increase and improve involvement by the Government and nationals in programme delivery and implementation during the next cycle. As an effort to further reduce the costs of external inputs, a considerable increase in the use of United Nations volunteers is envisaged during the fourth cycle. The third cycle began in 1982 with only six United Nations volunteers in the country, while the new cycle will begin with over twenty. There are also plans to associate non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in programme delivery, especially at village level in rural production and income-generating activities.

8. Taking into account that Rwanda is a land-locked country with the nearest port some 1200 kilometres away, the importance accorded to transport and communications by the new programme must be welcomed. About \$2 million IPF funding is envisaged for this sector. Most significantly, however, UNDP funds are at the centre of a very large multi-donor assistance of over \$82 million to this sector. Other partners include the World Bank, the European Development Fund (EDF), the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa (BADEA), the Kuwaiti Fund, WFP, and the Federal Republic of Germany. The UNDP projects concentrate on planning, technical and feasibility studies, as well as training and the strengthening of institutional capacities to successfully manage and utilize the large external assistance.

9. In order to enhance the flexibility and continuous programming approach during the fourth cycle, the new programme provides over \$4 million and \$3 million respectively for programmed and unprogrammed reserves from the IPF.

III. MANAGEMENT OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAMME

10. As mentioned in paragraph 3, the fourth country programme covers the same period as the Fourth National Development Plan of Rwanda, January 1987 to December 1991. The Ministry of Planning, which is responsible for the preparation and co-ordination of the implementation of the Plan, will share responsibility for the management of the country programme implementation. For instance, in partnership with the UNDP Resident Representative, it will decide on the timing of annual country programme reviews. Likewise, it will jointly agree on project or sectoral evaluation and monitoring activities after consultation with sectoral ministries and the UNDP field office. The UNDP Resident Representative will agree on the timing and scope of these programme management activities after taking into consideration the expected contributions and convenience of UNDP and executing agency headquarters.

11. The Government and the UNDP field office have agreed in principle to hold a mid-term review of the country programme in 1989. There is already a proposal that a National Technical Co-operation Assessment and Programmes (NATCAP) exercise be a part of that mid-term review. The mid-term and annual country programme review are expected to keep the programme up to date with the dynamics of the country's technical assistance needs during the programmed cycle. The programmed and unprogrammed reserves of the IPF will be utilized towards the stated objectives of the country programme.

IV. RECOMMENDATION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

12. The Administrator recommends that the Governing Council approve the country programme for Rwanda.
