



# Mid Term Review IWRM Rwanda “Water for Growth”

## Rwanda - Netherlands Embassy

FINAL REPORT

---

Delft, November 13th 2017

---

# FINAL REPORT

de  
“Water for Growth”

# Rwanda - ds Embassy

Delft, November 13th 2017



ISO 9001:2008 certified

**Training & Consultancy BV**

HNK Horapark,

weg 41, 6717 LL Ede, The Netherlands  
tel.nr.: +31 318 650060  
e-mail: [mdf@mdf.nl](mailto:mdf@mdf.nl), website: [www.mdf.nl](http://www.mdf.nl)

## Table of Contents

<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Project Description	1
1.2 Background and objective of the Evaluation	1
1.2.1 Terms of Reference (ToR) and Success Factors	1
1.2.2 MTR Itinerary	2
1.3 Structure of the Report	3
<b>2 Methodology and approach</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Main evaluation approach	5
2.1.1 Introduction	5
2.1.2 MTR steps	5
2.1.3 The Evaluation Matrix and Success Factors	5
2.1.4 Assessment and Scoring	6
2.2 MTR Final Report	6
<b>3 MTR Findings</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 Introduction	7
3.2 Findings Focus Area 1: Attaining Programme Objectives	7
3.3 Findings Focus Area 2: Fulfilling Contractual Obligations and Collaboration	12
3.4 Findings Focus Areas 3 and 4	15
3.5 Findings Focus Area 5	17
<b>4 Recommendations</b>	<b>19</b>
4.2 Cooperation	19
4.3 Steering Structure	19
4.4 Process	20
4.5 Learning and Innovation	20
4.6 Strategy	20

## Annexes

<b>Annex 1</b>	<b>Terms of Reference</b>
<b>Annex 2</b>	<b>Evaluation Matrix</b>
<b>Annex 3</b>	<b>MTR presentations workshop 17th October</b>
<b>Annex 4</b>	<b>References and documents consulted</b>
<b>Annex 5</b>	<b>Discussion note High Level Water Panel Rwanda – the Netherlands</b>
<b>Annex 6</b>	<b>MTR scoring ToR Questions</b>

## Abbreviations

CMER	Commissie Milieu Effect Rapportage
CO	Catchment Office
CP	Catchment Plan
CTF	Catchment Task Force
DCA	Demonstration Catchment Areas
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GoR	Government of Rwanda
HLP	High Level Panel
ISU	IWRM Support Unit
IIF	IWRM Investment Fund
ID	Institutional Development
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
LWH	Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting and Hillside Irrigation Project
MCA	Multi Criteria Analysis
MIDIMAR	Ministry of Disaster Management and Refugee Affairs
MIGEPROF	Ministry of Family and Gender Promotion
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
MINALOC	Ministry of Local Government
MINILAF	Ministry of Lands and Forests
MoE	Ministry of Environment
MINIRENA	Ministry of Natural Resources
MININFRA	Ministry of Infrastructure
MINISANTE	Ministry of Health
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
RAB	Rwanda Agricultural Board
RNRA	Rwanda Natural Resources Authority
RWFA	Rwanda Water and Forest Authority
RSSP	Rural Sector Support Project
RNWP	Rwanda Netherlands Water Panel
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SPIU	Single Project Implementation Unit
TA	Technical Assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
TR	Technical Report
WASAC	Water and Sanitation Corporation (of Rwanda)
WR	Water Resources

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Project Description

The Netherlands-Rwanda Program for Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), later called “Water for Growth Rwanda” as a brand name, was started in May 2015 following the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Governments of Rwanda and the Netherlands. The “Water for Growth Rwanda” program has 3 elements: the IWRM Support Unit (ISU), the IWRM Investment Fund (IIF), and the external M&E and high-level panel Rwanda-Netherlands (HLP). The ISU and IIF have started, whilst the HLP is subject to this Mid Term Review (MTR).

The Technical Assistance (TA) contract for the implementation of the programme was awarded to the consortium led by Mott MacDonald, SHER and SNV. Implementation started after the signing of the MoU of May 8<sup>th</sup> 2015. The Final Inception Report was approved by the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) on the 31<sup>st</sup> of March 2016 (version 3). For the purpose of this MTR, the Inception Report is considered the key basic document.

In the Inception Report, 5 components are distinguished and 4 specific objectives, elaborated in a Logical Framework. The components are

- Component 1: Enhancement of Institutional Framework
- Component 2: Capacity strengthening of staff in key organisations
- Component 3: Demonstration of value of IWRM approach in four catchment areas
- Component 4: Support to IWRM Investment Fund
- Component 5: IWRM knowledge management”

The four specific objectives are:

1. IWRM governance framework is conducive to effectively and sustainably manage water resources;
2. IWRM approach, value, and ownership demonstrated in four catchment areas;
3. IWRM investments enhanced through a GoR managed fund;
4. IWRM knowledge enhanced, accessible, and applied.

### 1.2 Background and objective of the Evaluation

As indicated in the Project Document and Inception Report, external review would take place halfway the four year implementation period in the form of a Mid Term Review (MTR). This Report is the result of this external review. The review covers the performance of the ISU and IIF and suggestions for modifying and extending existing activities. It also provides advice on the HLP proposal and, if judged appropriate, on a proposal for widening the mandate of the IIF to include Landscape Restoration and the Water-Energy-Food Nexus.

The approach on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), advocated by the Dutch Commission for Environmental Impact Assessment (CMER) is integrated into the development of Catchment Plans (CP) for the 4 catchments. Given that catchment planning is a key part of the IWRM Programme, the MTR has paid particular attention to the Catchment Planning approach in the Programme.

#### 1.2.1 Terms of Reference (ToR) and Success Factors

The review is guided by the questions in the Terms of Reference (ToR) and the 5 Success Factors for cooperative systems that were outlined in the Evacuation Proposal and Final MTR Inception Report. According to the ToR, the MTR will evaluate progress of all components of the IWRM Programme, to:

1. Determine if sufficient progress is made, and can still be made;
2. If the reply to the first question is positive, formulate recommendations for follow-up of the Programme in the remaining lifetime (with maximum one year extension), including recommendations for its further integration in the Land and Water management institutions in Rwanda.

The ToR, which can be found in Annex 1 to this report, includes 22 includes specific questions, centred on 5 main focus areas:

- i) **Attaining programme objectives**, assessed according to the Program and Specific Objectives outlined in the Programme Document and other approved Programme documents;
- ii) **The fulfilling of the contractual obligations** and the performance of the Technical Assistance team and functioning of the Programme partners with respect to the contractual obligations and collaboration among parties directly concerned;
- iii) **The functioning of the IWRM Investment Fund (IIF)**;
- iv) An assessment of the need and rationale for **widening the scope of the IIF** to include funding projects for **Landscape Restoration**, to fit into Water-Energy-Food Nexus approaches, and stimulate Public-Private-Civil Society Partnerships;
- v) The need and/or a wish to create a **Rwanda – Netherlands Water Panel**, including the organisation of such a panel.

The Recommendations, derived from the findings generated from the ToR questions, are structured and analysed through the capacity WORKS framework. This framework was developed by GIZ for analysing programs that involve several partners (so-called cooperation systems). It identifies five Success Factors that any key for organisation or project/programme to successfully work in a cooperation system. These five success factors are:

1. **Cooperation**: The capacity to select and design healthy and vital cooperation between several actors (i.e. the vibrancy of the programme) is based on the connection of partners inside and outside/around (other stakeholders) the ‘cooperation system’;
2. **Steering structure**: The steering structure organizes predictable behaviour on communication and interaction between parties;
3. **Processes**: A clear process is followed to bring about the agreed joint activities of the programme and managing the organisation internally;
4. **Learning and Innovation**: The capacity for change, learning & innovation in the W4GR organization, cooperation network and individuals; and
5. **Strategy**: A result-oriented, clear and shared ambition is translated into a strategy that orients “Water for Growth” towards future trends;

### 1.2.2 MTR Itinerary

At the start of the MTR Mission, a kick-off and introductory meeting was held with the EKN and DG RWFA on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of October. Subsequently, the MTR team attended the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> October where the MTR objectives, approach and itinerary were presented. Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and site visits were carried out between the 4<sup>th</sup> and the 11<sup>th</sup> of October. Interviews were on-going throughout the mission, depending on key informant availability. The table below provides an overview of the field visits, focus group discussions and interviews held by the MTR team.

Activity	Date & Time
Arrival Mission	Sun 1
Briefing EKN	Mon 2, 10:00
Planning and further preparation MTR mission	Mon 2, 11:00
PSC	Tue 3, 9:00
Introductory Meeting RWFA and ISU	Tue 3, 14:00
FGD with CTF; field visit	Wed 4, all day
FGD with CTF; field visit	Wed 4, all day
Interview	Fri 6, 15:00
Interview	Fri 6, 9:00
Interview	Mon 9, 10:00
Interview	Mon 9, 12:30
Interview	Mon 9, 15:00
Interview	Mon 9, 16:00
Interview	Tue 10, 10:00
Interview	Tue 10, 13:30
Interview	Tue 10, 17:00
Interview	Tue 10, 15:00
FGD with CTF; field visit	Wed 11, all day
Interview	Thu 12, 10:00
Interview	Fri 13, 10:00
Interview	Fri 13, 15:00
Interview	Sat 14, 12:30
Interview	Sun 15, 14:00
Interview	Mon 16, 9:00
Interview	Mon 16, 15:00
Key findings workshop	Tue 17, 8:00
Reporting	Wed 18, all day
ISU Team Meeting	Thu 19, 8:30
Interview	Thu 19, 9:30
Reporting	Thu 11:00 onwards
Interview	Fri 20, 8:00
Debriefing	Fri 20, 14:30

### 1.3 Structure of the Report

In chapter 2, the MTR methodology and approach is described, as implemented during the in-country mission. The MTR followed to a large extent the approach set out in the Final MTR Inception Report, submitted to EKN on September 16<sup>th</sup>.

Chapter 3 addresses the ToR questions as organised in the 5 Focus Areas introduced above.

In Chapter 4, the MTR Mission outlines the Recommendations for the Water for Growth Programme. These are centred on the 5 Success Factor for Cooperative Systems outlined in the MTR Inception Report and Evaluation Proposal.

The ToR is included in Annex 1. The Evaluation Matrix, which guided the addressing of the ToR questions, is included in Annex 2 of this report. The presentation of the preliminary findings of the MTR, presented during the Workshop on the 17<sup>th</sup> of October in Lemigo Hotel, can be found in Annex 3. A list of references consulted, both formal Project Documents and background material, can be found in Annex 4. The discussion note on the High Level Water Panel Rwanda-the Netherlands, is included as Annex 5. The final Annex 6 includes the scoring table the MTR used to arrive at the final assessment included in chapter 3 of this Draft MTR Report.



## 2 Methodology and approach

### 2.1 Main evaluation approach

#### 2.1.1 Introduction

As outlined in the Proposal, a key principle that has guided the MTR approach is the learning focus. The team has carried out the evaluation with, rather than to the client but without losing its independent external perspective. This principle is fitting given the learning-orientation of the IWRM Programme and, by extension, this MTR. The MTR has been a mix of document review, interviews with decision-makers and stakeholders, and field visits to the four Catchments, including meetings with the Catchment Task Forces (CTF) and District officials. On the 17<sup>th</sup> of October, the MTR Mission presented its preliminary findings in a workshop with the key stakeholders and decision-makers involved in the Programme.

#### 2.1.2 MTR steps

After approval of the Final Inception Report, the MTR was structured into the following steps:

- Pre-mission data collection (desk study), of key Project documents, Technical Reports and background documents related to IWRM in Rwanda;
- Mission preparation, including logistics and communication with key stakeholders;
- A three week mission, including interviews, further data/information review that was made available to the mission in-country, field visits and interviews with a broad range of stakeholders, and the workshop; to share, discuss and refine the main findings and conclusions;
- Preparing the MTR draft report, partly in-country and partly after return of the mission;
- Receiving and incorporating comments and suggestions from the client and selected stakeholders, as agreed with EKN, laid down in the Final MTR report;

For the greater part, the 3-person MTR team carried out the interviews and field visits together. For efficiency sake, the team split up for a number of interviews. The findings and conclusions from each Interview and Field Visit were typically discussed the same evening or the following day. In addition, 2 intermediate feedback meetings were held with EKN, on the 6<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> of October.

#### 2.1.3 The Evaluation Matrix and Success Factors

The Evaluation matrix has guided the evidence gathering and assessment for the 22 evaluation questions. In the Matrix, the means of verification and sources are indicated for each question. The Matrix can be found in the Annex 2 for reference. In the Field Visit and Interview Reports, which were prepared after every field visit and interview, reference is also made to the Evaluation Matrix Question that is informed by the results.

During the mission, the team conducted semi-structured interviews with key informants representing the programme stakeholders. Field visits and focus group discussions were held to obtain perspectives of beneficiaries in the four catchments. The stakeholders included district officials, CTF members, community representatives, male and female farmers and farmer groups (cooperatives, water users association), local industry (Mining), the water supply, energy and agriculture sectors. A complete list of persons interviewed is included in Chapter 1.

The MTR applied the capacity WORKS framework to structure the Mission's recommendations. In line with the learning orientation of the MTR, the MTR presented its findings in a workshop on the 17<sup>th</sup> of October in the Lemigo hotel. The workshop, including decision-makers of the Ministry of Environment (Permanent Secretary), the Ministry of Lands and Forests (MINILAF, Permanent Secretary, Director General RWFA), the IWRM Department of RWFA, TA team, Focal points, stakeholders and the client EKN. The MTR presentations are included as Annex 3.

The results of the workshop of the 17<sup>th</sup> of October have informed the MTR team to shape this Draft MTR Report.

#### 2.1.4 Assessment and Scoring

To arrive at a summary assessment for each ToR question, the MTR team members assessed each outcome based on a four-point scale, with a colour coding to allow for a quick overview, as follows:

- Excellent: selling point; maintain at this level – communicate. **Colour code: Green**
- Good: in line with requirements & expectations; improve where possible and effective. **Colour code: Blue**
- Moderate: below requirements & expectations; improvement needed to achieve project outcomes. **Colour code: Orange**
- Poor: below expectations & requirements, at risk of jeopardizing project outcomes. **Colour code: Red**

Prior to the workshop the team carried out the assessment independently, and arrived at a summary score as an MTR team. In a number of cases, an intermediate score was agreed upon to portray the recent trends observed by the MTR Mission or where quick improvements are anticipated.

## 2.2 MTR Final Report

This Draft MTR report was prepared after the workshop. During the final wrap-up meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup> October at the EKN, the MTR team agreed to postpone circulation of the Draft MTR Report to PSC members until receiving suggestions from the ISU. The Draft MTR Report will therefore be sent on the 24<sup>th</sup> of October to the PSC, with comments due by Thursday the 26<sup>th</sup> of October. The final MTR Report will be delivered to EKN on the 31<sup>st</sup> of October.

## 3 MTR Findings

### 3.1 Introduction

The ToR includes 22 specific questions to be addressed by the MTR, centred around five main focus areas:

- Focus Area 1:* Attaining programme objectives;
- Focus Area 2:* The fulfilling of the contractual obligations;
- Focus Area 3:* The functioning of the IWRM Investment Fund (IIF);
- Focus Area 4:* An assessment of the need to widen the scope of the IIF to include Landscape Restoration;
- Focus Area 5:* The Rwanda – Netherlands Water Panel

In this Section, the findings for each ToR question are presented according to each the Focus Area. For every Focus area, the Question is included and the main findings are presented. Recommendations resulting from this analysis, many of which were discussed during the mission with the Programme partners and stakeholders, are re-grouped in Chapter 4.

#### **Summary Assessment**

For each ToR Question, an assessment is made based on the four-point scoring scale and colour code mentioned in the previous section. An overview of the score for the ToR questions by each MTR member is presented in Annex 6. This scoring was used as primary input for the final assessment presented in the following sections. Questions 21 and 22 are not assessed on this scale as these are not directly related to the performance of the Programme.

### 3.2 Findings Focus Area 1: Attaining Programme Objectives

*Question 1: Where does the Programme stand in comparison with the objectives and planning, is it still possible to attain the objectives, and if yes what needs to be improved to attain the objectives in the upcoming period?*

The programme has had a slow start with major personnel changes in the TA Team, a low pace of producing tangible outputs and insufficient focus on developing practical and long term IWRM approaches.

The pace has now picked up but care is needed to maintain the IWRM focus and view the EIP/CPIP both as viable investments and learning opportunities for later upscaling. When the programme finishes, the country needs to have gained experience with all aspects of operational IWRM, with an organisational structure and legal framework in place. Key IWRM issues such as Flood Risk Management, Water

Quality, Access to Potable Water and the Economics of Water Resources need greater attention, as does the creation of a long term knowledge base. The MTR is encouraged by the testimonies at Catchment and National levels with tangible achievements such as the adjustment of the National Irrigation Masterplan, the awareness at the level of implementing agencies such as RAB, REG and WASAC, the potential for learning from a range of catchment planning experiences in-country and in the Region<sup>1</sup>. The experience of the CTF is an example to be followed with powerful testimonies that can be communicated.

#### **Assessment: Orange – Blue**

- After the slow start, the program has picked up pace, is producing tangible benefits and showing potential for further upscaling
- The programme needs to develop beyond water allocation and watershed management to IWRM in all its facets and provide more hands-on planning and training support to Districts and Catchment Task Forces
- Real promise lies in the involvement of the private sector as leverage for IWRM. This includes Payment for Ecosystem/Water Services

<sup>1</sup> The Rwizi Catchment Management Plan (in Uganda) is a good example of how a multi-stakeholder catchment committee engages with the Directorate of Water Resources to organise allocation in a water scarce environment. In Kenya, catchment committees have contributed to the restoration of over 500 degraded watersheds and implemented flood protection measures.

*Question 2: Has the Programme succeeded to create Awareness of the need for Rwanda to manage its Water Resources in a more integrated manner in order to prevent problems of water shortage, flooding, water quality loss, and/or low water productivity in the near future?*

Awareness is increasing among national institutions as a result of W4GR training and other awareness interventions and a strong communication effort. Indications of raised awareness include information the review of the irrigation masterplan by MINAGRI and RAB resulting from a better understanding of the water resources availability, using the WEAP model. The MTR team was informed that WASAC has now applied for water permits and would like the IWRMD to coordinate reduction of siltation, pollution and water allocation planning at Catchment level. In this context, MIDIMAR has also requested for assistance to enhance preparedness and early warning for floods, droughts and landslides.

*Question 3: Has the Programme succeeded to create a shared Vision on: HOW to prevent such problems by an IWRM approach, and how such an approach should be organized?*

The level of awareness, at multiple levels, that was observed, has not yet translated to a Shared Vision on HOW to prevent the water challenges that Rwanda is facing by an IWRM approach. The Catchment Plans are a valuable starting point but need a more rigorous analysis of issues and options – and responsibilities of the involved agencies - to address these issues to promote the national growth objectives and contribute to balanced and equitable socio-economic development. There is a need to develop a strategic vision – at short notice - on how to organise IWRM beyond the programme period and assess which IWRM Functions need to be enhanced. The Programme needs to outline which critical IWRM functions are taken up at Central level, under which institution, at Catchment and District level. Moreover, the programme should then assess which capacities; including competences, information and powers, are needed to be able to carry out those critical IWRM functions, now and in the future. Examples of such IWRM functions are water allocation and permitting, pollution control (including technology development and permitting), flood risk management, conflict resolution, monitoring and resource assessment, water resource planning and development, and knowledge management and innovation.

An additional area where a clear and shared vision is needed is in Knowledge Development, Component 5 of the W4GR Programme. What is the current state of the knowledge regarding the IWRM functions mentioned here above, which knowledge development is needed at short, medium and long term level and how should that knowledge be built up and anchored in the IWRM Department, Universities, Private sector consultancy companies and key stakeholders in the private and public sector. The EIPs have been based on the need to respond to district demands for radical terracing rather than evidence based interventions to improve the water system and design the most effective measures. This aspect needs priority attention from the ISU/IWRMD team. Improvement is anticipated as the CP v2 is produced and incorporated into sector and district strategies. The MTR recommends internal review of the CPs making maximum use of the available knowledge and multitude of disciplines in the ISU Consortium and IWRMD. The MTR recommends developing an Integrated Assessment approach using a Scorecard based on accepted Policy Indicators that is replicable for the IWRM managers at Catchment and Central level. The Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) carried out in the CP v1 is a good starting point.

#### **Assessment: Blue**

Awareness is high at national level:

- MINAGRI and RAB reviewing the irrigation masterplan
- WASAC is now applying for water permits
- WASAC is eager for the IWRMD to assume water allocation and coordination role at Catchment level
- MIDIMAR is keen to develop its capacity in preparedness and early warning to floods, droughts and landslides

#### **Assessment: Orange**

- An operational vision on how the IWRM approach will be put in place is not yet developed. An integrated assessment of measures and plans is not yet present. There is therefore a risk that the programme will focus more on practical measures, which provide tangible short term benefits, than on long term IWRM capacity development
- More attention is needed on flood risk management, water quality, water technology, and training

*Question 4: Did the Programme contribute to the adoption of Policies and Institutions, and has it supported the creation/ reinforcement of the Institutional capacity of Rwanda to plan and manage its Water Resources in an efficient and effective way in terms of increased water productivity, guaranteed access to clean water and sanitation for all, flood control, and maintain ecological flows in compliance with SDG's and other international goals and standards to which the government of Rwanda has committed itself? Is the gender dimension taken into account?*

Much has been achieved in the Programme: the Water law has been revised, Ministerial proclamations to guide implementation are being prepared, the Water permit system is in place and becoming operational.

Moreover, the IWRMD is in better position to inform sector planning in other agencies and districts. The Inter-ministerial Committee and National Water Council have been established and the Catchment Task Force understands and involved District staff understand the need for an integrated approach at Catchment level. The vision differs however where the action is to be anchored, including the establishment of a Catchment Office.

Less has been achieved in developing applicable methods for ecological (environmental) flows and putting a gender approach into practice. The program can learn from other programs in the Region as well as broader international experience documented extensively by organisations such as the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and Wetlands International. Little experience has been developed in terms of safeguarding aquatic ecology and ecosystem services provided by wetlands. The mission recommends hands-on methodology testing and documentation to ensure that a tested approach is in place when the Program comes to an end.

However, the gender dimension now being addressed more intensively by the engagement of a skilled national gender expert and needs reinforcement in the coming implementation period.

*Question 5: Has the Programme succeeded in building Capacity for IWRM-catchment and watershed management, including staff capacity inside and outside RWFA, for planning and monitoring water use, and has it succeeded in putting in place such capacity and necessary equipment in existing structures in order to guarantee the sustainability of IWRM-catchment management? If not, which elements are still lacking?*

The WEAP model has provided building blocks across different technical departments on water planning, and is much appreciated beyond the IWRMD (RAB, WASAC). However, IWRM also involves water quality, flood risk management and economic analysis and further capacity development is urgently required on those topics. In addition, the potential for groundwater development is not yet well understood and the Programme, given the capacities of the Consortium Partners (SHER, Mott MacDonald), can provide strong added value in that respect. The 3R approach (Retain, Recharge and Reuse) is a promising concept that should be developed under the Programme. Given the issue of erosion and sedimentation, resulting from agriculture and mining activities, rigorous analysis of the cause and effectiveness of measures is needed. Training is picking up with most staff in IWRMD targeted for advanced training, and the Rwanda National University has opened up its MSc program in Kigali based on the demand from W4GR. This should be complemented with a continuation of the on-the-job training that is already going on and

#### **Assessment: Blue**

With the following observations:

- Development of the Legal and Policy Instruments should not be considered accomplished and continue to build on experience gained, e.g. in catchment planning, water allocation, water quality regulation, technology development, fostering innovation and refining tasks and responsibilities of catchment and national level institutions. A concerted training effort should underpin these activities

#### **Assessment: Orange – Blue**

- The on-the-job capacity building has led to a general level of IWRM capacity at various levels. Now, focused and more advanced training and capacity building is needed, covering all aspects of IWRM.
- The development of such capacity in the University of Rwanda is encouraging, with a niche for the Programme in Training of Trainers and practical modules development with real-life-cases from the Catchments and the Region
- The key is now to develop this capacity at District level though intensive involvement and training

IWRM induction training and modules to improve proficiency in specific technical fields. The IWRMD and CTF staff can then act as Trainers to develop the skills at CTF and District level, in other Ministries and Agencies and develop their own skills by delivering such training.

*Question 6: Has the Programme succeeded in setting up a Country wide Water Monitoring and Information System (Water MIS) and is it operational, effective and sustainable, among others for operationalizing the Water Permit system? Is it used as a management tool?*

The WMIS is in its initial stages, monitoring stations and equipment are now being installed across major rivers as basis for providing sustained information on water flows. The water permit system has started to operate but is not yet used as a management instrument. Moreover, the link with water quality and discharges from Municipal and Industrial sources is not yet in place. A focussed TA input is recommended to take stock of the IWRM permitting system in place (quantity and quality) and recommend actions with a view to operationalizing an integrated system during the lifetime of the project.

The MTR appreciates the energetic and hands-on input of the TA team in Monitoring and recommends that further on-the-job training, topical modules and courses, be continued. It is recommended to include staff and agencies outside the IWRMD as well, to enhance their functional monitoring role.

*Question 7: Has the Programme succeeded in enhancing Collaboration among Government agencies (Ministries, Districts), and other stakeholders, in view of promoting a participatory approach to foster improved Land and Water (Natural Resources) management?*

During the interviews, Ministries and technical Agencies dealing with water resource management demonstrated awareness and indicated appreciation for the W4GR activities. The enhanced collaboration for the studies and proposed interventions on Muhazi Multipurpose dam is an example. MINALOC at national level and Districts administration through Catchment Task Forces recognize their important roles in community and stakeholder mobilization for collaboration development and benefits of IWRM, but a more functional and effective collaboration needs to be developed.

There is more scope for collaboration however, as interviews at REG, RAB and WASAC indicated. Already now, water scarcity and allocation is a key issue in a number of locations for which the hands-on coordination function of the IWRMD is needed. One of the needs is the development of clear water allocation rules and the granting of permits for abstraction and discharge in catchments where multiple use of water is the case.

Stakeholder forums that include women organizations, Civil Society Organizations, cooperatives and other stakeholder entities convened by W4GR indicate high quality collaboration around IWRM. The Private Sector active in the W4GR Demonstration Catchment Areas including mining, tea, hydro and other sources of electricity generation and water supply are paying attention to legal and regulatory instruments for water resources management.

#### **Assessment: Orange – Blue**

- The on-the-job capacity building hassled to a general level of IWRM capacity. Now, focused and more advanced training and capacity building is needed, covering all aspects of IWRM.
- The development of such capacity in the University of Rwanda is encouraging, with a niche for the Programme in Training of Trainers and practical modules development with real-life-cases from the Catchments and the Region

#### **Assessment: Blue**

With the following observations:

- There is evidence indication that relevant ministries and technical agencies are taking proactive participation in IWRM
- Institutions are seeking greater collaboration efforts such as multi-purpose infrastructure Districts through Catchment Task Forces and MINALOC recognize their stakes in development and benefits
- Women councils, cooperatives are active in IWRM initiatives
- Private sector (mining/ tea/ hydropower/ electricity/ water supply) is paying attention to regulatory measures

*Question 8: Has the Programme succeeded in formulating comprehensive and realistic IWRM Catchment Plans for the four Demonstration Catchment Areas (DCAs), their formulation through a participatory Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) associating relevant stakeholders? Is the gender dimension taken into account?*

The first version of the Catchment Plans provides a good basis to move towards realistic and comprehensive CPs. The CPs built on the SEA exercise which was comprehensive, well thought out and implemented, including training on all the steps. A thorough stakeholder analysis was carried out as part of the SEA. As part of the same SEA, a series of participatory workshops and training was carried out, forming the basis for the CP v1. Rigorous follow-up and development is however needed to arrive at 'real' IWRM Catchment Plans, with a clear strategy based on an integrated assessment of priorities and measures. The Plan needs to include no-regret measures in the short term and a cohesive list of short, medium and long term measures, including prioritisation of funding and enforcement.

Modalities for practical implementation, monitoring and follow-up should be spelled out clearly in the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the plan.

The MTR is encouraged by the improvement in the set-up of the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the CP, with the agreed Table of Contents and the stepping-up of detailed planning. Doubts remain however that the four catchment plans will be in place by the end of 2017, with due consideration to the participation of District level staff and other agencies. The CPs will be legal documents and formal approval (validation) will take time and will lead to revisions and updating of the plan. This is a healthy and anticipated process, which leads to further institutionalisation of the CPs. As Districts, sector ministries and agencies have started their planning for the next financial year, there is a risk that key elements in CPs will miss anchorage in public institutions that are critical for implementation.

The MTR is further encouraged by the increased focus on a broad investment oriented program of measures incorporating measures in the Water-Food-Energy nexus to drive stronger involvement of private sector and cooperatives for economic impacts. A point of concern remains the lack of evidence gathering for the investments. Questions on impact and sustainability need to be addressed to derive lessons learnt and drive upscaling. The diversity of CPIPs is much greater than the first batch of EIPs, with scope for more innovation and competition between investors and beneficiaries.

Less has been achieved in putting a gender approach into practice. The program can learn from other programs in the country, not in the least through the experience of SNV in their WASH program. However, the gender dimension now being addressed more intensively by the engagement of a skilled national gender expert and needs reinforcement in the coming implementation period.

Last but not least, the MTR stresses that the CPs are guiding documents for the Districts, National Agencies and Stakeholders for the coming planning period (5 years) and not only a program of measures and a budget line provided through the project. In addition to implementation, the Program therefore needs to emphasize joint monitoring and evaluation, intensive training and capacity development and team building of the Catchment Task Forces.

#### **Assessment: Orange – Blue**

- The SEA approach has steered and led to a participatory planning approach which was new to Rwanda at this level
- The first CP have been produced which is a major achievement as such
- Now, the focus needs to be on comprehensive and operational CPs with a clear discussion and assessment of the strategic alternatives and measures on the short, medium and long term
- The link with impact assessment and monitoring needs strengthening with a view to learning from experience and designing an exit strategy for Catchment Planning and integration
- Knowledge tools beyond WEAP, available worldwide, should be pioneered and adapted to the conditions of Rwanda

*Question 9: Has the Programme succeeded in formulating and initiating relevant projects for improving water management in the four DCAs? What are the expected results of these projects, and are these results expected to be sustainable?*

The existing EIP were, for a variety of reasons, focussed on existing measures (Bench terracing) that fit with established policies and plans. A clear link with improving IWRM on a catchment level is therefore tentative and not based on evidence. The MTR appreciates the need for quick action at the time but stresses the need to move beyond such specialised interventions which have already been tested country-wide and add limited value to understanding the effectiveness of a broad range of IWRM measures. The CP v2, including the CPIPs, display an encouraging and broad range of measures and these are expected to be strengthened by the IIF combination of projects that address ecosystem services and promotion of private sector involvement. The focus on integration and joint assessment is however not yet sufficiently visible. It is appreciated that this is very much work in progress and the MTR expects further improvement to take place, resulting from the joint development by experts in the ISU and the IWRMD, and the planned consultation with the Districts: an encouraging development. The MTR stresses the need for (participatory) evidence gathering of all key measures, including their socio-economic impact. Due to the lack of evidence gathering for the first EIPs, and the tentative nature of the proposed CPIPs, the MTR cannot confidently say that the formulated and implemented projects will be sustainable if the maintenance, funding and socio-economic impact is not well understood.

*Question 10: Has the IWRM Programme contributed or has it led to initiatives in other catchments in Rwanda?*

W4GR has contributed to the formulation of the LVEMP program by sharing experience with the first generation of CPs. There is much more scope for learning between programs that have been active in Rwanda and the Region (Kenya, Uganda) for a number of years, including LVEMP, with involvement of Consortium partners. The Program should facilitate learning between the different programmes and organise the upscaling of the experience in guidelines, legal instruments and knowledge products.

#### **Assessment: Orange – Blue**

- The contribution to LVEMP is appreciated
- The programme could strive for a greater outreach however, with national level sharing of experience and development of standard best-practices and knowledge tools that the whole water sector can use

### **3.3 Findings Focus Area 2: Fulfilling Contractual Obligations and Collaboration**

*Question 11: Have Euroconsult Mott MacDonald (MM) and its IWRM Support Unit ISU in RNRA/RWFA performed according to the TA (ARVODI) contract?*

Key elements of the contract reviewed by the MTR are the 6 Services to be provided by the TA Team and the Deliverables: 1 provisional work plan, 1 annual plan including Inception report, 4 annual plans, 5 annual progress reports and 5 annual audit reports.

#### **Assessment: Blue**

With the following observations:

- Particular attention recommended on 2 Services: "Ownership" and the "High Level Panel"
- Improvement needed in Annual Plan and Progress Monitoring Reporting

Regarding the Services, under point 2 of paragraph 1.3, the following is included:

2. Reinforce the RNRA of the Ministry of Natural Resources in its coordinating role with a IWRM Support Unit (ISU) in such a way that its long term capacity is enhanced and "ownership" created.

The MTR assesses that this has not yet been achieved at all levels, as is further discussed under Question 13 below.

Regarding the Services under point 6 of paragraph 1.3, the following is included:

6. The active encouragement and facilitation of strategic long-term cooperation and partnership development between the Rwandan and Netherlands water sector organizations. This includes both ministries, professional organizations, knowledge and research institutions, non-government organizations and private sector parties.



Little activity has taken place by the TA Team in this regard. However, the MTR feels that developing long term strategic Rwanda-Netherlands cooperation should be a broad effort rather than consultancy service (see also response to Q22) and that the TA Team should not be responsible for this effort other than providing general support.

Regarding the Progress Reporting and Annual Planning, the MTR has the following observations:

- Progress reports 1 and 2 have considerable overlap and it is insufficiently clear what progress and bottlenecks are according to Components. Reporting on Component outputs and outcomes is reported as 'management response', which lack clarity. A simple structure with i) Plan; ii) Progress; and iii) Action next period (what, who, when...) would be preferable
- The Annual plan is complex to read, and does not invite sharing and work distribution. A straightforward structure is recommended with the Overall Plan at General level, for Component Leaders and Senior Management and detailed plans at Component level and for C3: Catchment level. It is recommended that detailing take place with an easily readable bar chart and table outlining deliverables, key events and meetings and work distribution between team members, updated on a regular basis by the Component Leader.

*Question 12: Has the IWRM Department of RNRA/RWFA performed according to expectations regarding ownership and the obligations as described in the MoU (7<sup>th</sup> May 2015)?*

Yes, with the observation that the MOU contains little specifics on the role of the IWRMD, illustrated by the two relevant clauses in the MOU copied here below:

**Paragraph 5: Establishment of an IWRM Support Unit (ISU)**

5.1 The Signatories will, in order to reinforce the Rwanda Natural Resources Agency (RNRA) of MINIRENA to take on board and manage/coordinate the Programme, upon coming into effect establish an IWRM Support Unit (hereinafter referred to as ISU).

5.4 RNRA will integrate ISU in its RNRA-IWRM staff and provide collaborators and office space in order to facilitate its functioning and benefit from its knowledge and skills transfer during the Programme.

This question does not lead to any MTR recommendations. Please refer to Question 11 and 13 for a further discussion on 'Ownership'.

*Question 13: Have ISU and IWRM Department been sufficiently and efficiently integrated to create synergy and increase the capacity of IWRM Department?*

The MTR had extensive discussions and exchanged views with Senior Management and Technical Staff and Advisors of the ISU and the IWRMD. There is strong personal and high level commitment to the Programme goals, which offers a good ground for improved integration. Moreover, at catchment level, effective cooperation exists, with a focus on achieving results and supporting the goals of the programme.

However, at present, integration is not yet sufficient / efficient, and capacity development is still much needed:

- The IWRMD and ISU operate in separate offices and do not have a joint planning with clear and agreed milestones/ deliverables in which every staff members understands their roles and contribution and commits to these;

**Assessment: Red - Orange**

- The IWRMD and ISU operate in separate offices and do not have a joint planning with clear and agreed milestones/ deliverables
- The ToR for specialist input is not clearly agreed upon and followed through
- The technical resources/ skills of the IWRMD seem underutilized
- Energy is lost on discussing roles, mandates and communication lines

*However:*

- At Catchment level, effective cooperation exists, with a focus on achieving results and supporting each other
- There is strong personal and high level commitment to the Programme goals, which offers a good ground for improved integration

- The ToR for specialist input is not clearly agreed upon and followed through, leading to misunderstandings and sub-optimal use of technical resources of the IWRMD;
- Energy is lost on discussing roles, mandates and communication lines, with deliverables not being finalised in time due to the lack of clarity on the final output;
- New and existing staff should receive adequate basic training in IWRM based on an agreed training needs analysis. Relevant outputs related to this ToR question are Outputs 1.1.3 and 2.1.3.
- The MTR recommends that the ISU and RWFA, to which the IWRMD pertains, draft a practical agreement on operational collaboration in terms of planning, reporting and deliverables and the authorities of each party in these

*Question 14: Has the consortium Mott MacDonald – SHER – SNV operated efficiently as a team?*  
and

*Question 16: Is there a need for changing the rules of cooperation between parties involved in order to attain the outcome of the Programme?*  
are assessed jointly, as the two are closely related.

At a number of levels, efficient team work has been observed between experts, in particular at the operational level, in the catchments, the application of WEAP modelling and water monitoring. The hands-on input in the monitoring program and IIF, and the current drafting of the 2<sup>nd</sup> version of the Catchment Plans are examples where effective team work takes place. However, the relative strengths of SHER in Water Resources and Land Management, and the key strength of SNV in Climate smart Agriculture, Small scale Hydropower and WASH do not come to the fore sufficiently, whilst these skills are highly relevant to improve the quality of the outputs and outcomes of the Programme. This need is discussed in detail as part of the assessment of the first Focus Area. Rules of Cooperation and a regular self-evaluation of the Consortium partner's contribution were not observed by the MTR, which would contribute to improving the effectiveness and strengths of the available expertise in the Consortium.

*Question 15: Has the support provided by ISU to RWFA SPIU for the management of IIF been effective?*

The MTR noted that, after a slow start, input by the ISU to SPIU has picked up speed and is contributing to an energetic and ambitious development of the investment program. Highly experienced TA – an international Fund Manager and a skilled M&E expert, has been mobilized in 2016. The potential for private sector involvement, as vehicle to spur growth and livelihood / water security for communities, is particularly valuable. There is a need for rapid recruitment of a skilled Fund Manager for the efforts of the TA to be focused on sustainable capacity development within the Fund. The latter constitutes a clear risk.

*Question 17: Which capacities have to be reinforced in order to attain the outcome of the Programme?*

This question does not involve assessment, with the following recommendations by the MTR:

- Capacities for planning and joint (participatory) planning are key, with clear Milestones and Deliverables. Joint planning includes the IWRMD, CTF/Districts + Stakeholders at very short notice. This includes the use of participatory techniques for analysis, planning, training and implementation;
- Reflection and upscaling the lessons learnt in Catchment Planning to arrive at replicable processes and capacities for Participatory planning at Catchment level and IWRM at National level;
- Standardizing and laying down experience and lessons learnt in guidelines which can be institutionalized;
- Training of Stakeholders, CTF, IWRMD in both IWRM technical and integration skills, including the building up of Training of Trainers skills and cadre.

#### **Assessment: Orange – Blue**

- At a number of levels, efficient team work is present between experts
- Enhancement of the relative strength and contribution of SHER and SNV is needed in Water Resources and Land Management, Climate smart Agriculture, Small scale Hydropower and WASH

#### **Assessment: Blue**

- Effective TA
- Potential for enhanced private sector involvement

### 3.4 Findings Focus Areas 3 and 4

*Question 18: Is the basket IWRM Investment Fund (IIF) functioning according to its Manual of Procedures, and has this led to an acceptable level of finance for IWRM investment plans in the DCAs?*

Oversight mechanism reports and other documents available to the MTR were reviewed including a follow up report on compliance with the recommendations a Code of Conduct Assessment (COCA) of Aug 2006. Reviewed reports also included an audit report over 10 months of fund operational activity and the IIF Strategy and Draft Operational Plan. The reports indicated inconsistencies between the IIF Manual of Procedures (MoP) and GoR laws and regulations for Project Financial Management and Procurement. The IIF applied the GoR legal provisions while alignment revisions were effectuated in the IIF.

The MTR noted that the financing of IWRM investments in DCAs through the IIF are not yet at “acceptable” levels. It was also noted from the 10-month audit that the IIF had a low programme expenditure rate. The audit indicated a budgeted investment amount of Rwf3,469,480,370 close to 3.5 billion Rwandan Francs or (€3,961,000) close to 4 million Euro but only spent half (51%) amounting to Rwf1,775,331,609 (€2,000,000). The budget utilization rate was at 11% considering the allocated seed fund of 18 million Euros over a 4-year period with a 1 year extension possibility. The MTR observed that levels of finance were mainly hampered by delays in tendering documentation and not so much due to the lack of an approved MoP. It was noted that the IIF Strategic and Draft Operational Plan is now available. Priorities include the urgent recruitment of a Fund Manager and a SME and Business Modelling Specialist as well as other essential fund management personnel. IIF financing levels are expected to rise to optimal levels with the implementation of the plan.

In the financing arrangement of the IIF, the Netherlands Government has accepted that Rwandan procurement procedures are applied assuming that this will lead in all cases to competitive bidding by relevant parties. In the case of the EIP's, competitive bidding was not applied due to time pressure. For the implementation of the catchment plans the Netherlands Embassy indicated that the argument of time pressure no longer applies and that therefore competitive bidding should always take place. The Netherlands Embassy also indicated that exceptions should be submitted to the Embassy for approval in order to avoid possible conflict with Dutch financial rules and regulations that apply for development cooperation.

#### Assessment: Blue

- Inconsistencies between MoP and GoR procurement law and regulations were reported in the audit report and follow in the follow up report on COCA recommendations of the IIF
- GoR procurement laws & regulations applied for IIF functioning while alignment revisions are effected on MoP
- Financing of IWRM investments in DCAs through the IIF are not yet at “acceptable” levels
- Low IIF budget execution rate was reported by the audit for the 10 past operational months
- The IIF Strategic and Draft Operational Plan now available and finance level expected to rise to optimal levels

*Question 19: Is the quality of the Investments through IIF assured and sustainable?*

The MTR team was impressed with the consistent appreciation of the Early Implementation Project (EIP) interventions both by members of the beneficiary communities and by catchment stakeholder officials including members of catchment task forces. The MTR team conducted Focus Group Discussions with key stakeholders EIP intervention catchments of Sebeya at Rubavu district offices and of the Upper Nyabarongo at Ngororero district both comprising district administration officials, district-based national officials (e.g. National Women's Council), water and electricity corporation representatives, local water resource dependent cooperatives, mining business representatives and others. FGDs indicated a good understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the Catchment Task Forces highlighting community mobilization in IWRM as the major responsibility.

The MTR team visited the two intervention catchments and had a positive impression of the quality of the physical works of the EIPs. The MTR team considers active beneficiary participation and appreciation of the EIP interventions in particular but of development interventions in general to be a critical and necessary aspect of benefit sustainability. Men and women beneficiaries provided spirited and articulate testimonies on how the EIPs have impacted positively on their household and individual lives. Contrasting views were expressed among technical advisors and national professional officials regarding vehicles or approaches investments in IWRM EIPs and the planned Catchment Plan Implementation Projects (CPIPs) going forward. The MTR team was made aware of the differences of opinion and recommend that compelling cases be made for planned EIP/CPIP investment regarding quality and sustainability with clear cost-benefit and best practice. Studies have been conducted which provide a more sound basis for analysis and approach and the MTR recommends that these be assessed in depth prior to finalising the next batch of CPIPs and setting up an impact assessment system for the CPIPs.

*Question 20: Has the IIF formulated a plan to attracting more funding for IWRM in and outside the 4 DCAs? What is the status of implementation of that plan? What are the prospects for further enhancing its functioning as a Basket fund? How can that process be improved?*

The IIF Strategic and Draft Operational Plan elaborates on sustainable financing of IWRM, Landscape Restoration and Value Chain development in all catchments of Rwanda. The Strategy and Draft Plan already indicated targeted international funding partners in a proposed sustainable funding framework. The plan features prospects for enhancing the IIF by proposing 2 additional investment windows to Window 1 for IWRM Investment Fund. Window 2 is introduced as a LR Investment Fund while Window 3 is introduced as a Private Sector Promotion Fund. The fund processes can be improved with open engagement with funding entities, private sector and other stakeholders including the Green Fund (FONERWA).

**Assessment: Blue - Orange**

- Overwhelming support for EIPs among beneficiaries in Sebeya & U-Nyabarongo DCAs

*However:*

- Contrasting views expressed among technical advisors and national professional officials on vehicles/approaches for IWRM EIPs/CPIPs
- Approaches for demo EIPs/CPIP do not make compelling cases re: quality & sustainability
- Cost-benefit/best practice needed: e.g. radical vs. progressive terracing etc.)
- Cases build on scientific reviews performance evaluations of IWRM approaches

*Recommendation:*

- IIF Strategy & Draft Operational Plan should feature unambiguous criteria for quality and sustainability assurance

**Assessment: Blue**

- Strategy and draft operational plan available (for comment/input?)
- Elaborates sustainable financing of IWRM, LR & Value Chain development in all catchments of Rwanda
- Basket fund enhancement: Window 1 – IWRM Investment Fund; Window 2 – LR Investment Fund; Window 3 – Private Sector Promotion Fund

*Question 21: Is there a need for, and good reasons for widening the IIF to include funding projects for Landscape Restoration with elements that go beyond the usual IWRM and catchment /watershed management measures, to fit into Water-Energy-Food Nexus approaches, and stimulate Public-Private-Civil Society Partnerships? If yes, how can/should it be managed?*

Justification for widening scope with Landscape Restoration and Value Chain Development is provided in the IIF Strategic and Draft Operational Plan. The plan elaborates Value Chain Development through the promotion of SMEs with Public-Private-Civil Society Partnership framework and Capacity Building. The plan also puts forward a Fund Management Framework modelled on international best practice. Discussions are on-going between RWFA and EKN on the possible widening of the scope of the IIF with additional funding support dedicated to seeding the additional Windows 2 (LR) and 3 (Private Sector Promotion). The MTR team finds the widening of the scope viable and important and sees good opportunities for private sector water investments. The MTR recommends maintaining the core focus of the IIF on water and demonstrating the linkage between landscape restoration and downstream water quantity and quality benefits with proposed investments. This would include evidence gathering to support this linkage.

**Assessment: Blue**

The Strategy and Draft Operational Plan provides:

- Justification for widening scope with LR and Value Chain development
- Public-Private-Civil Society Partnership framework & Capacity Building
- Fund Management Framework

### 3.5 Findings Focus Area 5

*Question 22: Is there a need and/or a wish to create a Rwanda – Netherlands Water Panel? If yes, what will the Platform look like in terms of mandate, membership and management?*

In the MOU (2015), the Rwandan – Netherlands High Level Panel (HLP) was elaborated in paragraph 8:

**Paragraph 8: Establishment of a High-level Panel on Water Management**

- 8.1 The Signatories will, in order to maintain a bi-lateral dialogue, promote the Programme and reap its benefits in terms of exchange of experiences, whenever judged appropriate, establish a Rwanda-Netherlands High Level Panel on Water Management (hereinafter referred to as High-level Panel).
- 8.2 The High-level Panel is foreseen to comprise at least four (maximum six) members nominated by each country and will consist of representatives of related Ministries, Agencies and Knowledge Institutions from both countries.
- 8.3 The High-level Panel will be chaired jointly by one delegate from each country, the names of whom will be communicated between the Signatories in writing through the Diplomatic Channel.

8.4 The High-level Panel may:

- a) Assess, review, discuss and act upon the progress in the implementation of joint projects and programmes in the field of water management and natural resources management.
- b) Consult with government, intergovernmental, inter-ministerial and non-governmental entities as and when it deems this necessary.
- c) Liaise between water sector organizations in Rwanda and the Netherlands and with international fora.
- d) Associate at its meeting, upon request of one of its members, resource persons of any nationality capable of bringing in relevant experiences related to the subject discussed.

8.5 The High-level Panel is foreseen to meet once a year at an alternating venue in Rwanda and the Netherlands, or occasionally at another place where relevant experiences and knowledge can be shared.

8.6 The High-level Panel will be supported by a secretariat, responsible for the following tasks:

- a) Preparation of the High-level Panel meetings
- b) Practical and administrative support
- c) Reporting, monitoring and evaluation.

8.7 The M&E organisation (Cf. Par.7) including members from the Netherlands and from Rwanda will be charged with the secretariat of the High-level Panel.

The MTR elaborated on two successful examples of High Level Panels during the workshop on the 17<sup>th</sup> of October; the Egyptian – Netherlands APP and the Indonesian – Netherlands Joint Cooperation Programme. The two models can both be seen as 2 viable options, for:

- Enabling intensive and flexible cooperation;
- Focus on peer-to-peer learning and partnership development at multiple levels.

A high level of interest and willingness was noted by the MTR mission by the Chair of the PSC (PS), with a focus on knowledge partnerships and peer-to-peer learning and development between implementing agencies. The head of the IWRM Department in RWFA and the Dean of Rwanda National University expressed a keen interest in knowledge cooperation between Rwandan and Netherlands knowledge organisations.

*MTR Recommendation:*

In the Annex (6), as separate note – to facilitate a dedicated discussion – on the HLP is presented, including knowledge partnerships, joint learning and project development between Rwandan and Netherlands partners at the Knowledge and Implementing Agency level.

## 4 Recommendations

### 4.1 Success Factors

The Recommendations, derived from the findings generated from the ToR questions, are structured and analysed through the capacity WORKS framework. This framework was developed by GIZ for analysing programs that involve several partners (so-called cooperation systems). It identifies five Success Factors (SFs) that any key for organisation or project/programme to successfully work in a cooperation system. These five success factors are:

1. **Cooperation:** The capacity to select and design healthy and vital cooperation between several actors (i.e. the vibrancy of the programme) is based on the connection of partners inside and outside/around (other stakeholders) the 'cooperation system';
2. **Steering structure:** The steering structure organizes predictable behaviour on communication and interaction between parties;
3. **Processes:** A clear process is followed to bring about the agreed joint activities of the programme and managing the organisation internally;
4. **Learning and Innovation:** The capacity for change, learning & innovation in the W4GR organization, cooperation network and individuals; and
5. **Strategy:** A result-oriented, clear and shared ambition is translated into a strategy that orients "Water for Growth" towards future trends.

Following this structure, and building on the analysis in Section 3. the MTR Recommendations are discussed the sections below.

### 4.2 Cooperation

**Cooperation:** *The capacity to select and design healthy and vital cooperation between several actors is based on the connection of partners inside and stakeholders of the 'cooperation system'*

*MTR Recommendations:*

1. Improve the communication and structural team working between ISU and the IWRMD; consider regular retreats and a clear and agreed set of operational rules on planning, meetings, deliverables and decision-making.
2. Support existing national mechanisms of cooperation such as TWG, JSR, Interministerial Committee on Water, National Consultative commission and the IWRM Annual Conference.
3. Prioritize high potential cooperation with key agencies such as WASAC, REG, RAB, REMA and Private Sector in the CPIP and use these as leverage to the local community based interventions.
4. Enhance and scale up cooperation and information sharing with NGOs/CSOs, both at National and at Catchment/District level.
5. Enhance the use of testimonials at all levels.
6. Explore and develop cooperation linkages between Rwandan and Netherlands water sector practitioners, policy makers and knowledge institutions, capitalizing on existing linkages and funding opportunities.

### 4.3 Steering Structure

**Steering Structure:** *The steering structure organizes predictable behaviour on communication and interaction between parties*

*MTR Recommendations:*

1. Agree and lay down rules for the ISU-IWRMD (RWFA) Management Team on shared planning, coordination and communication; making use of the retreats at General and especially Component level to reach an agreed vision and strategy on the activities and how these contribute to reaching the outputs and outcomes. The MTR recommends that planning should include clear milestones, monitoring, deliverables and distribution of tasks.
2. Strengthen inter-ministerial cooperation, and institutional embedding at District (JADF) and Catchment Level. Develop a strong case for the Catchment Offices focus on competence

development of existing District staff, the power to convene in addition to the basic requirements. Use international models to chart possible future CO models. Examples include the WMA in South Africa and examples from the region. Develop a discussion note for decision-makers comparing the different options.

#### 4.4 Process

**Processes:** *A clear process is followed for the agreed joint activities and managing the organization internally.*

*MTR Recommendations:*

1. Clear and regular joint planning, decision-making and monitoring with the Districts on the CP development, implementation and monitoring. The MTR recommends that planning should include clear milestones, deliverables and distribution of tasks between team members at central and catchment level.
2. Focus on detailed planning – easy-to-read; task distribution, on-the-job training and monitoring. Assign 1 TA and 1 IWRMD staff for this task.
3. Simplify and visualize annual planning and progress reporting; example is the IFAD AWP/B process adopted by MINAGRI.

#### 4.5 Learning and Innovation

**Learning and Innovation:** *Capacity for change, learning and innovation in the cooperation network, the program organization and individuals in the program and network.*

*MTR Recommendations:*

1. Develop a joint Training Course with the University of Rwanda and Dutch partners, with Certification and training evaluation.
2. Intensify on-the-job training of the CTFs and the IWRMD, and other involved agencies by actively looking for training opportunities during regular planning and implementation activities.
3. Organize lessons learnt-sharing workshops and look-and-learn visits between catchments, other programs and countries in the region.
4. Carry out participatory evidence gathering incl socio-econommic and environmental/water management impact.
5. Stimulate innovation through competitions and the W4GR Innovation Prize at National and Catchment level.
6. Enhance the use of the specific skills of the Consortium partners; SHER for water resources and land management and SNV for climate smart agriculture, small scale hydropower and WASH.
7. Explore and develop linkages between Rwandan and Netherlands knowledge institutions and innovators for IWRM and ICT/water technology.

#### 4.6 Strategy

**Strategy:** A result-oriented, clear and shared ambition is translated into a strategy that orients “Water for Growth” towards future trends.

1. Develop an exit strategy to focus on key actions and outcomes in the remaining 2-3 years, using the Log frame as guide. The Exit Strategy should chart how sustainable IWRM will take place in the future – including water allocation between socio-economic sectors, water quality management, flood risk management, water availability and security for communities and ecological goals. The focus of piloting and developing approaches should be on replicability, upscaling and future standardization.
2. Develop, at short notice and within the next 3 months, a practical, well readable and concise policy note outlining the critical IWRM functions and tasks that are vital for Rwanda’s growth and livelihood sector in the short, medium and long term. The note should include an analysis of tasks and required capabilities at Central level, under which institution, at Catchment and District level. Moreover, the programme should then assess which capacities; including competences, information and powers, are needed to be able to carry out those critical IWRM functions, now



and in the future. Examples of such IWRM functions are water allocation and permitting, pollution control (including technology development and permitting), flood risk management, conflict resolution, monitoring and resource assessment, water resource planning and development, and knowledge management and innovation.

3. Focus the next 2 to 6 months on the development and ownership building of high quality Catchment Plans (v2) which will act as guiding document for IWRM planning, implementation and regulation for the coming planning period (5 years).
4. Gender is an essential part of IWRM, catchment planning and sustainable growth. The program should engage experienced and practical gender expertise as part and parcel of the approach and the CP v2 and the MTR recommends to extend the input of the Gender expert till the end of the program.
5. Enhance the outreach of the program, building on the testimonials, the evidence gathered and guidelines, tools developed. The MTR recommends that senior management, together with the communication specialist identify the key IWRM practices and approaches that need to be sustained in the future and developing an intensive outreach program around these.
6. Visualize the Log frame to be able to view the contribution of components and activities towards the long term strategy and revisit prior to every progress report and annual plan.



## **ANNEX 1**

### Terms of Reference

## **Mid Term Review IWRM Rwanda “Water for Growth” (Act.26817)**

### **Background**

The bilateral Netherlands-Rwanda Programme for Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM), later called “Water for Growth”, started in May 2015. The Programme is based on a Memorandum of Understanding signed 07 May 2015, for a contribution of 35 million Euros by the Netherlands to Rwanda. The IWRM Programme consists of three elements:

1. Technical Assistance (TA), realized by an IWRM Support Unit (ISU) at the Rwanda Natural Resources Authority (RNRA), later transformed into Rwanda Water and Land Management Authority (RWFA). This ISU is put in place through a Technical Assistance (ARVODI) contract dated 07 May 2015 between the Netherlands Embassy (EKN) and the firm Euroconsult Mott MacDonald (MM, in association with SHER and SNV), for an amount of 15.4 million Euro and a duration of 4 years ending 30 April, 2019. The TA concerns among others awareness creation, trainings, setting up a Water Monitoring and Information System, and studies.
2. An Investment component through an IWRM Investment Fund (IIF). The contract for the Netherlands contribution to IIF (which is set up as a multi-donor Basket fund within the Rwanda Government budget) is contracted between EKN and the Ministry of Finance of Rwanda (MINECOFIN), co-signed by the Rwanda Ministry of Natural Resources. This contract, meant for financing investment projects in four Demonstration Catchment Areas (DCAs) for a total amount of 18.0 million Euro (plus 0.6 million Euro for IIF management cost) ends by the end of Rwanda fiscal year 2019/2020 i.e. by 30 June, 2020.
3. A provision for setting up a permanent structure for External Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of the Programme, and for setting up a Rwanda-Netherlands High Level Panel on Water (HLP). It was decided that the HLP will be realized later, based on findings and advice of this MTR.

By June 2017, the IWRM Programme has delivered and published a first generation of Catchment Plans (CP version 1) for the four DCAs, in which choices are made among alternatives with regard irrigation and other elements. During 2017, the preferred alternatives are being worked out more in detail, in order to incorporate the plans (CP version 2) in the 5 year District Development Plans. Up till June 2017, two Early Investment Projects (EIPS) for rehabilitation of sub catchments of two of the four DCAs have been started, financed and managed through IIF.

### **Objectives of the Mid Term Review**

The Mid Term Review will evaluate progress of all elements/components of the IWRM Programme, in order to:

1. Determine if sufficient progress is made, and can still be made;
2. If the reply to the first question is positive, formulate recommendations for follow-up of the Programme in the remaining lifetime (with maximum one year extension), including recommendations for its further integration in the Land and Water management institutions in Rwanda.

The Mid Term Review will also study a proposal for setting up a Rwanda-Netherlands Water Panel, and – if judged appropriate - a proposal for widening the mandate of the IIF, which would allow it to cover projects for Landscape Restoration with elements that go beyond the usual IWRM catchment /watershed management measures to fit into Water-Energy-Food Nexus approaches, and to stimulate Public-Private-Civil society Partnerships (PPCPs). The MTR will, based on its appreciation of the experience of the IWRM Programme and on the quality of the new ideas, make recommendations how to put these orientations in place.

## **Elements to be evaluated / evaluation questions**

The following questions will have to be answered by the MTR:

With respect to the Programme objectives:

- Overall: where does the Programme stand in comparison with the objectives and planning, is it still possible to attain the objectives, and if yes what needs to be improved to attain the objectives in the upcoming period?
- Has the Programme succeeded to create Awareness of the need for Rwanda to manage its Water Resources in a more integrated manner in order to prevent problems of water shortage, flooding, water quality loss, and/or low water productivity in the near future?
- Has the Programme succeeded to create a shared Vision on HOW to prevent such problems by an IWRM approach, and how such an approach should be organized?
- Did the Programme contribute to the adoption of Policies and Institutions and has it supported the creation/reinforcement of the Institutional capacity of Rwanda to plan and manage its Water Resources in an efficient and effective way in terms of increased water productivity, guaranteed access to clean water and sanitation for all, flood control, and maintain ecological flows in compliance with SDG's and other international goals and standards to which the government of Rwanda has committed itself? Is the gender dimension taken into account?
- Has the Programme succeeded in building Capacity for IWRM-catchment/watershed management, including staff capacity inside and outside RWFA, for planning and monitoring water use, and has it succeeded in putting in place such capacity and necessary equipment in existing structures in order to guarantee the sustainability of IWRM-catchment management? If not, which elements are still lacking?
- Has the Programme succeeded in setting up a Country wide Water Monitoring and Information System (Water MIS) and is it operational, effective and sustainable, among others for operationalizing the Water Permit system? Is it used as a management tool?
- Has the Programme succeeded in enhancing Collaboration among Government agencies (Ministries, Districts), and other stakeholders, in view of promoting a participatory approach to foster improved Land and Water (Natural Resources) management?
- Has the Programme succeeded in formulating comprehensive and realistic IWRM Catchment Plans for the four Demonstration Catchment Areas (DCAs), including their formulation through a participatory Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) associating relevant stakeholders? Is the gender dimension taken into account?
- Has the Programme succeeded in formulating and initiating relevant projects for improving water management in the four DCAs? What are the expected results of these projects, and are these results expected to be sustainable?
- Has the IWRM Programme contributed or has it lead to initiatives in other catchments in Rwanda?

With respect to the contractual obligations and collaboration among parties directly concerned:

- Have Euroconsult Mott MacDonald (MM) and its IWRM Support Unit ISU in RNRA/RWFA performed according to the TA (ARVODI) contract?
- Has the IWRM Department of RNRA/RWFA performed according to expectations regarding ownership and the obligations as described in the MoU?
- Have ISU and IWRM Department been sufficiently and efficiently integrated to create synergy and increase the capacity of IWRM Department?
- Has the consortium Mott MacDonald – SHER – SNV operated efficiently as a team?
- Has the support provided by ISU to RWFA SPIU for the management of IIF been effective?
- Is there a need for changing the rules of cooperation between parties involved in order to attain the outcome of the Programme?
- Which capacities have to be reinforced in order to attain the outcome of the Programme?

With respect to the IIF:

- Is the basket IWRM Investment Fund (IIF) functioning according to its Manual of Procedures, and has this lead to an acceptable level of finance for IWRM investment plans in the DCAs?
- Is the quality of the Investments through IIF assured and sustainable?
- Has the IIF formulated a plan to attracting more funding for IWRM in and outside the 4 DCAs? What is the status of implementation of that plan? What are the prospects for further enhancing its functioning as a Basket fund? How can that process be improved?

With respect to widening the scope:

- Is there a need for, and good reasons for widening the IIF to include funding projects for Landscape Restoration with elements that go beyond the usual IWRM and catchment /watershed management measures, to fit into Water-Energy-Food Nexus approaches, and stimulate Public-Private-Civil Society Partnerships? If yes, how can/should it be managed?

With respect to HLP

- Is there a need and/or a wish to create a Rwanda – Netherlands Water Panel? If yes, what will the Platform look like in terms of mandate, membership and management?

### **Methodology and time schedule**

MTR will be organized in Rwanda between 18 September and 12 October, during 20 days.

A draft report will be available, and discussed, before the departure of the mission. A final report will be available one week after having received the written comments by EKN on the draft version, in any case before 31 October, 2017.

Basic documents for the evaluation include the MoU between EKN and GoR concerning the IWRM Programme (dated 07 May 2015), the IWRM Programme Document (dated 15 October 2014), the ARVODI contract between EKN and Mott MacDonald (dated 07 May 2015), and the Arrangement between EKN and GoR for IWRM Investment Fund (dated 21 October 2016) including its Manual of Procedures. Furthermore, all Progress Reports, Catchment Plans (CP version 1), and reports of specific studies will be available for the MTR. These can be accessed on the following website:

[www.water.rw](http://www.water.rw) and [www.minirena.gov.rw](http://www.minirena.gov.rw)

Preceding the MTR, an audit of IIF will be executed, the findings of which will be available for the MTR team at the start of the MTR.

A concept note with arguments and modalities for a possible extension of IIF with a window for Catchment Landscape Restoration will be elaborated (by EKN and RWFA) and available for the MTR before the start of the MTR.

### **Required expertise**

The MTR team will be composed of three persons, including at least one senior independent Rwandan member.

Required competences in the team include:

- Expertise and experience with IWRM-catchment planning including SEA and EIA methodologies;
- Expertise and experience with Rural Development, Decentralization, Landscape Approach;
- Expertise and experience with Institutional Development and Capacity Building;
- Expertise in the domain of hydrology and water resources monitoring;
- Expertise in the domain of water use modelling and water productivity;
- Expertise and experience with Public Finance Management and Public-Private-Civil Society Partnerships;
- Knowledge of the local situation in Rwanda (physical, socio-economic, institutional)

### **Budget**

The maximum number of consultant days should not exceed 85 including preparation and report writing.



## **ANNEX 2**

### Evaluation Matrix

The Evaluation matrix includes the Evaluation questions as included in the ToR drafted by EKN, grouped into the 5 main focus areas mentioned in the ToR: i) Attaining *programme objectives*; ii) The fulfilling of the *contractual obligations* and performance of the Technical Assistance team and functioning of the Programme partners ; iii) The *functioning of the IWRM Investment Fund (IIF)*; iv) An assessment of the need and rationale for *widening the scope of the IIF*; and v) The need and/or a wish to create a *Rwanda – Netherlands Water Panel*, including the organisation of such a panel.

Focus Areas	Evaluation Questions	Means of verification / indicators	Sources
Attaining programme objectives	1. Overall: where does the Programme stand in comparison with the objectives and planning, is it still possible to attain the objectives, and if yes what needs to be improved to attain the objectives in the upcoming period?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Progress achieved, at outcome and output level, for the 5 Project Components</li> <li>- Progress achieved compared to time elapsed (months) and inputs deployed (TA/ISU resources, budget)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- M&amp;E system of ISU</li> <li>- Different versions of the 'Workplan Water for Growth Rwanda, 2015-2019'</li> </ul>
	2. Has the Programme succeeded to create <u>Awareness</u> of the need for Rwanda to manage its Water Resources in a more integrated manner in order to prevent problems of water shortage, flooding, water quality loss, and/or low water productivity in the near future?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dissemination/ awareness raising workshops, meetings and events organised, at central and catchment level, including the range of IWRM topics covered and sectors involved (including agriculture, mining, water supply, navigation, energy, environment)</li> <li>- Attendees, per event, per agency and level (decision-making, technical) and sector.</li> <li>- Publications (off- and on-line) on IWRM published and disseminated at National level.</li> <li>- Surveys on IWRM awareness conducted</li> <li>- Incorporation of IWRM in regular curricula in Universities/ Professional institutions and Staff Induction programmes (with a focus on MINIRENA, MINAGRI, MINALOC and other key agencies)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document review of the ISU/RNRA records</li> <li>- M&amp;E data ISU/RNRA</li> <li>- Interviews with selected attendees from representative agencies and sectors</li> <li>- Curricula of key universities- professional institutes and Staff induction materials</li> </ul>
	3. Has the Programme succeeded to create a shared <u>Vision</u> on HOW to prevent such problems by an IWRM approach, and how such an approach should be organized?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Documented vision on IWRM shared and agreed upon by key decision-makers and thought leaders on IWRM</li> <li>- Documented and shared approach on the implementation of IWRM in the country</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document and website review of key agencies and projects</li> <li>- Interviews with decision-makers in key agencies</li> </ul>
	4. Did the Programme contribute to the adoption of <u>Policies and Institutions</u> and has it supported the creation/ reinforcement of the Institutional capacity of Rwanda to plan and manage its Water Resources in an efficient and effective way in terms of increased water productivity, guaranteed access to clean water and sanitation for all, flood control, and maintain ecological flows in compliance with SDG's and other international goals and standards to which	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy documents on IWRM revised and developed</li> <li>- Contributions to policy documents outside 'regular' IWRM policy documents</li> <li>- Coverage of IWRM aspects in policy documents and statements</li> <li>- Coverage of required mandate for IWRM as per the objectives of the IWRM programme</li> <li>- Development of adequate legal instruments for sustainable IWRM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document review, at ISU/RNRA level</li> <li>- Document review of key Ministries/agencies</li> <li>- Progress reports on SDG's and international agreements related to IWRM</li> </ul>

	the government of Rwanda has committed itself? Is the gender dimension taken into account?		
5.	Has the Programme succeeded in building <u>Capacity</u> for IWRM-catchment/watershed management, including staff capacity inside and outside RWFA, for planning and monitoring water use, and has it succeeded in putting in place such capacity and necessary equipment in existing structures in order to guarantee the sustainability of IWRM-catchment management? If not, which elements are still lacking?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff deployed in IWRM positions as per the programme objectives and actual requirements that have become apparent during the implementation of the Programme</li> <li>- Staff skilled / trained in IWRM as per the programme objectives and actual requirements that have become apparent during the implementation of the Programme</li> <li>- Availability of IWRM planning, operational and communication tools such as modelling, GIS/Data Bases, monitoring and communication in key agencies at National and Catchment level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff rosters</li> <li>- Training records and evaluation forms/results</li> <li>- Interviews with trainees</li> <li>- Review of planning and operational tools, at National and Catchment level</li> </ul>
6.	Has the Programme succeeded in setting up a Country wide <u>Water Monitoring and Information System (Water MIS)</u> and is it operational, effective and sustainable, among others for operationalizing the <u>Water Permit system</u> ? Is it used as a management tool?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Availability, use and status of a WMIS, in view of sustainable operation and updating</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Visual and operational review</li> <li>- Interviews with operators and decision-makers on IWRM planning and permitting</li> </ul>
7.	Has the Programme succeeded in enhancing <u>Collaboration</u> among Government agencies (Ministries, Districts), and other stakeholders, in view of promoting a participatory approach to foster improved Land and Water (Natural Resources) management?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collaboration and policy making panels and platforms in place, at National and Catchment level, including number of meetings, attendance, level (policy making, technical), coverage of IWRM topics and participation of agencies and sectors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting records</li> <li>- Interviews with participants</li> </ul>
8.	Has the Programme succeeded in formulating comprehensive and realistic <u>IWRM Catchment Plans</u> for the four Demonstration Catchment Areas (DCAs), including their formulation through a participatory Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) associating relevant stakeholders? Is the gender dimension taken into account?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Records of CP formulation and decision-making process, including attendance / participation in relation to gender, agency, sector, decision-making level and geographical location</li> <li>- Incorporation of CP process and results in regular planning and implementation processes, procedures, budgets and operational work plans</li> <li>- Capacity to formulate, update and expand on CP beyond the lifetime of the Programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Catchment Plan reports</li> <li>- Meeting records</li> <li>- Interviews with communities, sector representatives, government agencies</li> <li>- Field visits</li> </ul>
9.	Has the Programme succeeded in formulating and initiating relevant <u>projects</u> for improving water management in the four DCAs? What are the expected results of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Relevance and impact (environmental, socio-economic, water resources, institutions) of the formulated projects in relation to the objectives and targets set out in the 4 CP</li> <li>- Implementation and monitoring records of each project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of records, monitoring data and reports</li> <li>- Interviews with stakeholders and implementing partners</li> </ul>



	these projects, and are these results expected to be sustainable?	- Review of Operation & Maintenance arrangements, sustainability assessment (financial, capacity)	
	10. Has the IWRM Programme contributed or has it lead to initiatives in <u>other catchments</u> in Rwanda?	- (Partial) replication and adaptation of CP formulation process and results in other catchments, projects, programmes and agencies	- Interviews with other agencies and Ministries - Field visit to selected 'non-IWRM programme' catchments <sup>2</sup> - Project and agency documents
<b>Focus Areas</b>	<b>Evaluation Questions</b>	<b>Means of verification / indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>
Contractual obligations and performance of the TA team and Programme partners	11. Have Euroconsult Mott MacDonald (MM) and its IWRM Support Unit ISU in RNRA/RWFA performed according to the TA (ARVODI) contract?	- Input, progress and implementation quality vis a vis contractual obligations	- ISU progress and technical reports - TA (ARVODI) contract - Interviews with EKN, MINIRENA and ISU
	12. Has the IWRM Department of RNRA/RWFA performed according to expectations regarding ownership and the obligations as described in the MoU?	- Input and progress of the MoU partners vis a vis the obligations defined in the MoU between the GoR and the GoN	- RNRA/RWFA and EKN records - MoU (May 2015) - ISU progress and technical reports - Other records and reports as appropriate in National/DCA level workshops, platform meetings, consultations - Interviews with RNRA/RWFA, EKN, ISU
	13. Have ISU and IWRM Department been sufficiently and efficiently integrated to create synergy and increase the capacity of IWRM Department?	- Integration of ISU and IWRM department in working processes, planning, decision-making, implementation and monitoring	- ISU and IWRM department records - Interviews with ISU and IWRM department head and key staff - Interview with RNRA/RWFA heads
	14. Has the consortium Mott MacDonald – SHER – SNV operated efficiently as a team?	- Decision-making and distribution of tasks - Level of cooperation at National and DCA level - Perception of consortium partners	- Interviews with consortium partner leaders and key staff, at National and DCA level
	15. Has the support provided by ISU to RWFA SPIU for the management of IIF been effective?	- Input provided to RWFA Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) - Capacity of the SPIU	- Interview with RWFA SPIU manager and key staff - Training and meeting records - Interview with relevant ISU expert(s)
	16. Is there a need for changing the rules of cooperation between parties involved in	- Rules of cooperation between the consortium partners and parties involved	- Interview with ISU team leader, RNRA/RWFA managers, key experts

<sup>2</sup> The MTR mission will, in consultation with EKN, also visit 1 or 2 other catchments/water resource management projects/programmes where catchment or watershed management plans are being undertaken. This could include the LWH/RSSP projects of MINAGRI.

	order to attain the outcome of the Programme?		and consortium partner leaders - Agreements and meeting records, insofar as these are accessible to the MTR Mission
	17. Which capacities have to be reinforced in order to attain the outcome of the Programme?	- Capacity (type and level) vis a vis the requirements for the remainder of the Programme - See also Questions 4 and 5 of the Focus Area "Attaining programme objectives"	- Program/plan of TA input, including expert profiles and level of effort - Training and capacity development plan of involved parties
<b>Focus Areas</b>	<b>Evaluation Questions</b>	<b>Means of verification / indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>
The functioning of the IIF	18. Is the basket IWRM Investment Fund (IIF) functioning according to its Manual of Procedures, and has this lead to an acceptable level of finance for IWRM investment plans in the DCAs?	- Physical and financial progress of IWRM investment projects in each DCA - Procedures and steps taken in implementation - Level of investment vis a vis requirements spelled out in the CPs for the DCAs	- IIF procedure manual - Financial and physical progress records - The report of the exceptional Audit of IIF - IWRM investment plan per DCA – CP - Interview with IIF manager, key staff and DCA managers
	19. Is the quality of the Investments through IIF assured and sustainable?	- Investment secured in short and medium term work plans and budgets - See also Question 9 of the Focus Area "Attaining programme objectives"	- Monitoring reports IIF and ISU - Annual and Medium term work plan and budget - Progress and project impact assessment reports - Interview with IIF manager, key staff and DCA managers - Field visit observations
	20. Has the IIF formulated a plan to attracting more funding for IWRM in and outside the 4 DCAs? What is the status of implementation of that plan? What are the prospects for further enhancing its functioning as a Basket fund? How can that process be improved?	- Fund generation plan by IIF - Role of the IIF vis a vis overall investment in WR in the 4 DCAs and in other catchments - Assessment of IIF functioning - See also Question 10 of the Focus Area "Attaining programme objectives"	- IIF policy documents, records and work plans - Interview IIF manager and key staff - Interview with key decision-makers (MINIRENA - to be defined)
<b>Focus Areas</b>	<b>Evaluation Questions</b>	<b>Means of verification / indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>
The scope of the IIF	21. Is there a need for, and good reasons for widening the IIF to include funding projects for Landscape Restoration with elements that go beyond the usual IWRM and catchment /watershed management	- Policy paper on Landscape Restoration, prepared by the ISU - Scope and impact of the investment projects and CPs in the DCAs in relation to the IWRM Programme objectives - Scope of Water-Energy-Food Nexus approaches, and Public-Private-Civil Society Partnerships, in attaining IWRM Programme	- Document review - Interview ISU team leader and others as appropriate

	measures, to fit into Water-Energy-Food Nexus approaches, and stimulate Public-Private-Civil Society Partnerships? If yes, how can/should it be managed?	objectives	
<b>Focus Areas</b>	<b>Evaluation Questions</b>	<b>Means of verification / indicators</b>	<b>Sources</b>
Rwanda – Netherlands Water Panel	22. Is there a need and/or a wish to create a Rwanda – Netherlands Water Panel? If yes, what will the Platform look like in terms of mandate, membership and management?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Willingness, goals and potential for a Rwanda Netherlands Water Panel (RNWP)</li> <li>- Review of existing models for water level panels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interviews with EKN and GoR – other Rwandan development partners (Ministries/ agencies/ institutions to be defined)</li> </ul>



## **ANNEX 3**

MTR Presentations Workshop 17<sup>th</sup>  
October





## **ANNEX 4**

### References and Documents Consulted

Integrated Water Resources Management Programme Rwanda, 2015 – 2019, Republic of Rwanda, Rwanda Natural Resources Authority, Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, 15 October 2014

Integrated Water Resources Management Programme Rwanda. Revised Inception Report and Programme Work Plan (incl. Annual Plan 2016), Coenraad Voorhuis + ISU Team (MottMcDonald, SHER, SNV), March 2016

IWRM Programme Rwanda, Annual Progress Report 2016, Rob Nieuwenhuis, May 2017

IWRM Programme Rwanda, Annual Progress Report July 2016 – June 2017, Rob Nieuwenhuis, August 2017

IWRM Investment Fund - Manual of Procedures, ISU team originator, author: Rwanda Natural Resources Authority, Republic Of Rwanda, 25th August 2016 (First draft 12-01-2016)

Technical Notes 1 – 37, ISU, Various (2016 – 2017)

Audit Report IIF, PWC, October 2017

Rwanda National Water Resources Masterplan (NWRMP), SHER, RNRA, 2014, including Appendices on WaterMIS and Water Permit System, 2013

Water Resources Management sub-Sector Strategic Plan (2011 – 2015), Ministry of Natural Resources

Five-year Plan for Water Resources Management 2013/14 – 2017/18, Ministry of Natural Resources

Name Economic Analysis of Natural Resource Management in Rwanda, Republic of Rwanda, Environmental Management Authority (2013)

Rwanda Integrated Water Security program (RIWSP). Capacity Situation Analysis and Capacity Development for Integrated Water Resources Management Sub-sector in Rwanda, USAID, 2012

Rwanda Integrated Water Security Program (RIWSP). Review of the National Hydrological Service in Rwanda, USAID, 2012

IWRM Investment Fund (IIF) implemented by Rwanda Water and Forestry Authority (RWFA): audit report and financial statements and management letter for the for the 10 months period ended 30 June 2017, Price Waterhouse Coopers & Follow up of the COCA Assessment of the IWRM Investment Fund (IIF) management Final report. 6 October 2017, Price Waterhouse Coopers

IWRM Investment Fund (IIF) – Strategic and Draft Operational Plan. September 2017. Water for Growth Programme



## **ANNEX 5**

Discussion Note  
High Level Water Panel  
Rwanda – the Netherlands



## DISCUSSION NOTE

### *High Level Water Panel Rwanda – the Netherlands*

Prepared by: Mid Term Review team for the Water for Growth Programme in Rwanda, based on interviews carried out in the period from 01 October to 20 October 2017.

#### **Introduction**

The MTR for the Programme Water for Growth was tasked with formulating a proposal for the set-up of a Rwanda – Netherlands Water Panel, if such a need and interest was expressed. If so, the MTR was asked to detail the set-up of such a panel.

The starting point for the proposal is the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed between the Governments of Rwanda and the Netherlands on the 8<sup>th</sup> of May 2015, which forms the framework for the implementation of the Water for Growth Programme (2015 - 2019). In the MoU (2015), the Rwandan – Netherlands High Level Panel (HLP) is elaborated in paragraph 8: Establishment of a High-level Panel on Water Management.

- 8.1 The Signatories will, in order to maintain a bi-lateral dialogue, promote the Programme and reap its benefits in terms of exchange of experiences, whenever judged appropriate, establish a Rwanda-Netherlands High Level Panel on Water Management (hereinafter referred to as High-level Panel).
- 8.2 The High-level Panel is foreseen to comprise at least four (maximum six) members nominated by each country and will consist of representatives of related Ministries, Agencies and Knowledge Institutions from both countries.
- 8.3 The High-level Panel will be chaired jointly by one delegate from each country, the names of whom will be communicated between the Signatories in writing through the Diplomatic Channel.
- 8.4 The High-level Panel may:
  - a) Assess, review, discuss and act upon the progress in the implementation of joint projects and programmes in the field of water management and natural resources management.
  - b) Consult with government, intergovernmental, inter-ministerial and non-governmental entities as and when it deems this necessary.
  - c) Liaise between water sector organizations in Rwanda and the Netherlands and with international fora.
  - d) Associate at its meeting, upon request of one of its members, resource persons of any nationality capable of bringing in relevant experiences related to the subject discussed.
- 8.5 The High-level Panel is foreseen to meet once a year at an alternating venue in Rwanda and the Netherlands, or occasionally at another place where relevant experiences and knowledge can be shared.
- 8.6 The High-level Panel will be supported by a secretariat, responsible for the following tasks:
  - a) Preparation of the High-level Panel meetings
  - b) Practical and administrative support
  - c) Reporting, monitoring and evaluation.
- 8.7 The M&E organisation (Cf. Par.7) including members from the Netherlands and from Rwanda will be charged with the secretariat of the High-level Panel.

During the start-up of the Programme in 2015, there was insufficient interest in forming such a Panel, due to a pronounced desire of the Government of Rwanda in implementing water development projects rather than high level policy dialogue. With the Water for Growth Programme being well underway, the MTR was tasked with re-examining the need and interest for such a High Level Water Panel and providing a proposal if such a need and interest did exist.

## Interviews and Needs Identification

To explore the need and interest, the MTR carried out interviews with the Chair of the Programme Steering Committee of the Water for Growth Programme, the Permanent Secretary (PS) for Environment; the Head of the IWRM Department (Deputy Director General) in the Rwanda Water and Forest Authority (RWFA) and the Dean of Rwanda National University. In addition, the MTR elaborated on two successful examples of High Level Panels during the MTR workshop on the 17<sup>th</sup> of October: the Egyptian – Netherlands Advisory Panel and the Indonesian – Netherlands Joint Cooperation Programme. The two models can both be seen as 2 viable options, for:

- Enabling intensive and flexible cooperation;
- Focus on peer-to-peer learning and partnership development at multiple levels.

During these interviews, a keen interest was expressed in enhancing regular and long term cooperation rather than project-based cooperation in:

- **Peer-to-peer learning and sharing of best practice between implementing and water management agencies and private sector organisations**, such as WASAC, REG, the IWRMD and their peers in the Netherlands, focussing on topics such as i) asset management; ii) service provision; iii) early warning for droughts and floods; iv) hydro-information systems; v) water technology and the use of ICT in water management. Agencies in the Netherlands such as Waternet and Vitens-Evides, active in Water Operator Partnerships in countries such as Egypt and Bangladesh; as well as the Dutch Regional Water Authorities (formerly called Water Boards) that are active in Kenya, Ethiopia and Uganda (as example) were earmarked as potential partners. The Regional Water Authorities have access to resources through the dedicated Water Board Bank which may be a source of co-funding for such collaboration or twinning. The Netherlands Water Partnership could provide a platform for the involvement of private sector organisations in the Netherlands, including Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs);
- **Joint knowledge development and sharing between knowledge institutions** in key areas such as: i) flood risk management; ii) drought forecasting; iii) water quality, ground- and surface water and sediment modelling; iv) water technology; v) participatory monitoring and integrated assessment; and vi) applied education and focussed courses. On the Rwandan side, the Rwanda National University, the IWRMD and Rwanda Meteorological Agency expressed keen interest in cooperation with Netherlands (based) knowledge organisations such as Deltares, ITC, IHE and Wageningen University. The JCP in Indonesia was discussed as highly attractive example to structure such knowledge cooperation, involving the Netherlands KNMI (Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute) as well.

The interviews also revealed that cooperation in terms of high level water policy were considered a second priority, as function of the above mentioned focus on Implementation, Water Management and Knowledge Development.

## Basic Structure

A basic structure for the High Level Panel could be considered as such:

- Joint Rwanda-Netherlands chairpersons, at the level of Permanent Secretary or comparable level;
- Annual Panel Meeting, alternating between the Netherlands and Rwanda, with a different thematic focus for each Annual Meeting. The first Annual Meeting would be the Construction Meeting in which the HLP governing document would be formally approved;
- Permanent secretariat in Rwanda, staffed by 1 Rwandan water management expert (part-time), with support from a (part time) Netherlands water management expert based in the Netherlands. It is proposed to house the secretariat in the Ministry of Environment;
- Basic operational funding for the Secretariat and Annual HLP Meeting, provided by the Governments of Rwanda and the Netherlands after a joint agreement;
- Two thematic Working Groups on i) Knowledge development and ii) Implementation and Water Management, the latter including Public and Private Sector interests and representation. Both working groups would have a 3-year rolling work plan, with the areas of interest defined during the Annual HLP Meeting based on a proposal from each Working Group. The Working Groups would be tasked with securing the necessary funds to carry out joint projects, studies and knowledge events that are considered. The Working Groups could, depending on the work plan and funding

secured, schedule more frequent Working Group Meetings, in Rwanda and the Netherlands. Themes of interest for each Working Group have been explored during the interviews and are mentioned above.

**Next Step**

As next step, after a confirmation of the interest by both Governments, it is proposed to field a joint Rwanda-Netherlands Formulation Mission for the HLP. The mission would explore the detailed needs and anticipated contributions of each country and: i) develop the proposed governance arrangement; ii) explore funding needs and opportunities; and iii) define a preliminary work plan for the HLP and Working Groups.

The formulation mission would be composed of joint Rwanda-Netherlands water management experts with a track record in water sector collaboration and international cooperation. The mission would meet with key high level decision-makers, operational water management organisations, SMEs and knowledge institutions in Rwanda and the Netherlands.



## **ANNEX 6**

### MTR Scoring ToR Questions

Terms of Reference (ToR) Questions		MTR Assessment			
		M1	M2	M3	Overall
<i>Focus Area: Attaining Program Objectives</i>					
1	Overall: where does the Programme stand in comparison with the objectives and planning, is it still possible to attain the objectives, and if yes what needs to be improved to attain the objectives in the upcoming period?	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow
2	Has the Programme succeeded to create <u>Awareness</u> of the need for Rwanda to manage its Water Resources in a more integrated manner in order to prevent problems of water shortage, flooding, water quality loss, and/or low water productivity in the near future?	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
3	Has the Programme succeeded to create a shared <u>Vision</u> on HOW to prevent such problems by an IWRM approach, and how such an approach should be organized?	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
4	Did the Programme contribute to the adoption of <u>Policies and Institutions</u> and support the creation/ reinforcement of the Institutional capacity of Rwanda to plan and manage its Water Resources in an efficient and effective way in terms of increased water productivity, guaranteed access to clean water and sanitation for all, flood control, and maintain ecological flows in compliance with SDG's and other international goals and standards to which the government of Rwanda has committed itself? Gender dimension taken into account?	Blue	Blue	Yellow	Blue
5	Has the Programme succeeded in building <u>Capacity</u> for IWRM-catchment/watershed management, including staff capacity inside and outside RWFA, for planning and monitoring water use, and has it succeeded in putting in place such capacity and necessary equipment in existing structures in order to guarantee the sustainability of IWRM-catchment management? If not, which elements are still lacking?	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
6	Has the Programme succeeded in setting up a Country wide <u>Water Monitoring and Information System (Water MIS)</u> and is it operational, effective and sustainable, among others for operationalizing the <u>Water Permit system</u> ? Is it used as a management tool?	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
7	Has the Programme succeeded in enhancing Collaboration among Government agencies (Ministries, Districts), and other stakeholders, in view of promoting a participatory approach to foster improved Land and Water (Natural Resources) management?	Green	Blue	Blue	White
8	Has the Programme succeeded in formulating comprehensive and realistic <u>IWRM Catchment Plans</u> for the four Demonstration Catchment Areas (DCAs), including their formulation through a participatory Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) associating relevant stakeholders? Is the gender dimension taken into account?	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
9	Has the Programme succeeded in formulating and initiating relevant projects for improving water management in the four DCAs? What are the expected results of these projects, and are these results expected to be sustainable?	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow
10	Has the IWRM Programme contributed or has it led to initiatives in other catchments in Rwanda?	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	White
<i>Focus Area: Contractual Obligations</i>					
11	Have Euroconsult Mott MacDonald (MM) and its IWRM Support Unit ISU in RNRA/RWFA performed according to the TA (ARVODI) contract?	Yellow	Yellow	Blue	Yellow
12	Has the IWRM Department of RNRA/RWFA performed according to expectations regarding ownership and the obligations as described in the MoU?	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
13	Have ISU and IWRM Department been sufficiently and efficiently integrated to create synergy and increase the capacity of IWRM Department?	Yellow	Red	Red	Red
14	Has the consortium Mott MacDonald – SHER – SNV operated efficiently as a team?	Yellow	Blue	Blue	Yellow
15	Has the support provided by ISU to RWFA SPIU for the management of IIF been effective?	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
16	Is there a need for changing the rules of cooperation between parties involved in order to attain the outcome of the Programme?	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
17	Which capacities have to be reinforced in order to attain the outcome of the Programme?	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
<i>Focus Area: IIF Functioning</i>					
18	Is the basket IWRM Investment Fund (IIF) functioning according to its Manual of Procedures, and has this led to an acceptable level of finance for IWRM investment plans in the DCAs?	Blue	Blue	Blue	Blue
19	Is the quality of the Investments through IIF assured and sustainable?	Yellow	Blue	Blue	Blue
20	Has the IIF formulated a plan to attracting more funding for IWRM in and outside the 4 DCAs? What is the status of implementation of that plan? What are the prospects for further enhancing its functioning as a Basket fund? How can that process be improved?	Yellow	Blue	Yellow	Yellow
<i>Focus Area: IIF Scope</i>					
21	Is there a need for, and good reasons for widening the IIF to include funding projects for Landscape Restoration with elements that go beyond the usual IWRM and catchment /watershed management measures, to fit into Water-Energy-Food Nexus approaches, and stimulate Public-Private-Civil Society Partnerships? If yes, how can/should it be managed?				
<i>Focus Area: Rwanda - Netherlands Water Panel</i>					
22	Is there a need and/or a wish to create a Rwanda – Netherlands Water Panel? If yes, what will the Platform look like in terms of mandate, membership and management?				