

**European Community's Poverty Reduction  
Effectiveness Programme (EC-PREP) research project:  
Streamlining poverty-environment linkages in the European  
Community's development assistance**

EP/R05/15

**National-level assessment of  
EC Country Strategy Papers:  
Rwanda follow-up CSP (2002-2007) review  
and institutional evaluation<sup>1</sup>**

*In partial completion of activities 5 – 10<sup>2</sup>*

August 2005

**1. Background**

This national-level assessment of the Rwanda Country Strategy Paper (CSP) is one of several activities being conducted under an initiative on “Streamlining poverty-environment linkages in the European Community’s development assistance” – an initiative aimed to provide to the European Commission and its development partners recommendations to improve poverty-environment integration in EC development assistance. This assessment builds upon results of a recently conducted multilevel evaluation in Rwanda that identified – from especially the local perspective – poverty-environment dynamics and the meso to macro level policy and institutional factors shaping these.

The recent multilevel analysis identified various environment-poverty issues associated with current EC support under the 9<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund (EDF) and more specifically highlighted environmental/livelihood issues linked with the Decentralized Programme for Rural Poverty Reduction (DPRPR) programme – a four year program supported under the “rural development” focal area that is focused on providing direct financial support to decentralized levels of government at cellule, sector, district, and national level. Results of the multilevel analysis emphasized the need to improve environmental mainstreaming in the current decentralization process – implemented since 2001 – and highlighted the need to support environmental management capacity at local to national levels.

This national/EC assessment was conducted:

---

<sup>1</sup> This report was written by Mathilde Snel (mathildesnel@hotmail.com), a consultant contracted by WWF. Overall supervision was given by Hervé Lefeuvre (WWF-EPO, Hlefeuvre@wwfepo.org) and Dawn Montanye (Dawn.Montanye@wwf.org). This work has been financed under an award granted to the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) by the European Community’s Poverty Reduction Effectiveness Program (EC-PREP’s), a program jointly defined by the EC and DFID and funded through DFID. This report includes extracts from an initial pre-CSP review on the Rwanda CSP (Snel, 2004) and a similar assessment recently conducted for the Tanzania CSP (Snel, 2005).

<sup>2</sup> Activities 5 – 10 in the EC-PREP include follow-up CSP review and institutional evaluation activities for both the Tanzania and Rwanda case studies. This report discusses results for only the Rwanda case study.

- 1) to further evaluate environment-poverty concerns associated with EC support in Rwanda to the “rural development” and other focal areas (e.g., “macro support”);
- 2) to assess if current CSP investment is addressing the identified environment-poverty issues;
- 3) to evaluate EC- and national-level processes that are currently being used to mainstream environment-poverty linkages; and
- 4) to identify long-term institutional and policy recommendations to help improve environment-poverty streamlining in EC development cooperation.

In addition to this report, this initiative relies on an additional case study of the Tanzania CSP – that similarly entails a multilevel and national-level assessment – as well as a Brussels level institutional evaluation – that focuses on identifying entry points to improve environment-poverty integration in future CSP design. Awareness building material will be developed on recommendations drawn from the multilevel, national, and Brussels-level evaluations towards enhancing the impact of EC’s development assistance on poverty through increased attention to the role that the environment plays to people living in poverty.

## **2. Overview of paper and methodology**

This national-level assessment of the Rwanda CSP relies on two key evaluations:

- a “follow-up CSP review” (section 4) that assesses:
  - environment-poverty issues linked to EC investment and
  - whether current CSP investment is addressing the environment-poverty concerns and
- an “institutional evaluation” that evaluates current EC and national processes used to mainstream environment-poverty linkages (section 5).

Lessons learned and best practices are drawn from the above evaluations to identify long term institutional and policy opportunities to improve poverty-environment integration in EC development strategies (“Recommendations” – section 6).

The study’s assessment relies on numerous interviews and an extensive review of documents. Interviews were conducted in July (2005) at various institutions including the EC country delegation in Kigali, national agencies (e.g., the Rwandan Environmental Management Agency, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, and Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines), NGOs (e.g., International Gorilla Conservation Programme), and other donors (e.g., UNDP) (see Appendix 1 for a list of individuals contacted). National respondents were asked on primarily environment-poverty issues linked to EC investment and current national-level processes to integrate environment-poverty issues. EC respondents were asked particularly about processes used and opportunities to improve mainstreaming of environment-poverty linkages in the CSP process (see Appendix 2 for copies of the questionnaires used for respectively the national- and EC-level respondents). The questionnaires were not used as a blue print but were rather referred to facilitate discussion. As mentioned previously, this evaluation fundamentally builds on results from a recently conducted multilevel evaluation that identified using a bottom-up analysis environment-poverty issues from a local perspective and the structural impediments shaping these (Bush et al., 2005)<sup>3</sup>. The paper furthermore draws on (and contains extracts from) a pre-CSP assessment conducted for Rwanda (Snel, 2004) and follows a similar format as used in the recent Tanzania CSP evaluation (Snel, 2005).

---

<sup>3</sup> The multilevel analysis relied on numerous interviews – with individuals and target groups – and an extensive survey of documents.

Prior to the follow-up CSP review and institutional evaluation (respectively sections 4 and 5), an overview is provided on current EC/CSP funding in Rwanda (section 3). Background information on Rwanda has furthermore been included in Appendix 3.

### 3. CSP investment in Rwanda (2002 – 2007)

Over the period 2002 – 2007 the EC is allocating under the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF a total amount of 186 million Euros to the Government of Rwanda<sup>4</sup>. Current EC/CSP spending in Rwanda – is focused on two primary focal areas: “rural development” and “macroeconomic support”. In addition, EC funding is being provided to fund primarily good governance initiatives that are centred about institutional and electoral support, justice, and reconciliation<sup>5</sup>. Following the mid-term review an amount of 176 million Euros has been allocated to support the following three core areas:

- *Rural Development*: 75 million Euros (43% of total);
- *Macro support*: 86 million Euros (49%); and
- *Other/non-focal support (namely good governance/institutional support)*: 15 million Euros (9%) (Delegation of the EC in Kigali and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda, 2003)<sup>6</sup>.

In addition to the above, 10 million Euros remain in the CSP budget (under Envelope B), envisioned to be used to fund rural development interventions especially related to issues on land reform, water, energy, and environment (Kalisa personal communication, 2005; Delegation of the EC in Kigali and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda, draft, 2004 ). EC support in the above indicated core areas are described in detail below.

#### 3.1. Rural development (75 million Euro)

Initiatives funded under the “*rural development*” core area are as follows.

- Support to the Government of Rwanda’s *decentralization process* through namely the Decentralized Programme for Rural Poverty Reduction (DPRPR) – a programme aimed at providing direct support to communities so that they can initiate and implement their own community development plans (32 million Euros)<sup>7</sup>.
- Ten million Euros will be allocated directly to the cellule level, the most local level of government (*Ubudehe*). As indicated in Rwanda’s PRPS, each cellule will under decentralization be allocated \$1000 each year to collectively identify priority problems and to develop community-led problem solving in action plans (incorporated into Community Development Plans (CDPs)) (Government of Rwanda, 2002).
- Most of the remaining DPRPR budget will be used to support sector and district development priorities (formalized in District Development Plans (DDPs)). Funds are being allocated to the impoverished southeastern regions of Kigali-Ngali and Kibungo province. Funds are being distributed to districts in these provinces to support projects and budget support through the Common Development Fund (CDF) – a funding facility managed by the Ministry of Local Governance, Community

---

<sup>4</sup> These are being provided under two envelopes – Envelope A (124 million Euros) and Envelope B (62 million Euros). Note that following Rwanda’s Mid Term Review most funds in Envelope B – allocated to cover unforeseen expenses – were reallocated to support Envelope A activities (Delegation of the EC in Kigali and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda, 2003).

<sup>5</sup> Spending for good governance/institutional support initiatives is under “non-focal” support.

<sup>6</sup> This entailed reallocations of 62 million Euros from Envelope B into Envelope A. Prior to the mid-term review allocations for rural development, macroeconomic support, and non-focal area support were at respectively 62 million Euros (50% of the Envelope A budget), 50 million Euros (40%), and 12 million Euros (10%) (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenne, 2003; Kalisa personal communication, 2005).

<sup>7</sup> An additional 4.5 million Euro outside of the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF is also being used to cover the cost of the DPRPR programme (estimated at 36.5 million Euro) (EU and the Republic of Rwanda, 2004).

Development, and Social Affairs (MINALOC)<sup>8</sup> (Bush et al., 2005; Villa personal communication, 2005; EC and the Republic of Rwanda, ). An emphasis in the DPRPR programme is being placed on supporting – especially during initial years of implementation – labour intensive initiatives (e.g., through restoration of rural road network and conservation of soils).

- A substantial percentage of funds under the “rural development” focal area are furthermore earmarked for the development of a *transportation* network to improve rural access, especially in northwest Rwanda. Priority is being given to the rehabilitation of the primary road between Ruhengeri and Gisenyi. Funds are furthermore being provided to support a roads maintenance fund (Fonds d’entretien routier - FER) (33 million Euro) (Neubert personal communication, 2004)<sup>9</sup>.
- The remaining amount of 10 million Euros under the “rural development” focal area will be used to implement *other* rural development interventions including water and sanitation programs, land reform, environmental initiatives, and the development of agricultural information systems.

### 3.2. Macroeconomic support (86 million Euro)

EC funds under “macroeconomic support” in Rwanda are being used to meet the objectives of the current PRPS/PPARP (Programme Pluriannuel d’Appui a la Réduction de la Pauvreté [still add accent grave on “a”, etc.]) (Government of Rwanda, 2002) which are categorized under the following six broad areas:

- 1) *rural development and agricultural transformation*: that focuses on improving the ability of people to increase their income (e.g., through the modernization of agriculture, non-agricultural employment, and improved credit access).
- 2) *human development*: that seeks to improve quality of life (e.g., through strengthened health and education programmes, improved water supply and sanitation facilities, and voluntary relocation of people to *imidugudu*<sup>10</sup>).
- 3) *economic infrastructure*: which includes the development of energy, communications, and other infrastructure in rural and urban areas.
- 4) *governance*: that supports decentralization, constitutional reform, reconciliation, criminal justice, transparency, civil service reform, etc.
- 5) *private sector development*: to promote investment in the private sector, export growth, etc.
- 6) *institutional capacity building*: that focuses on strengthening institutions and facilitating the development and retention of skills.

Since EC financing under “macro support” are – as with other donors budget support funds – transferred directly into the national treasury, tracking how EC funds are specifically used towards meeting the above noted objectives is not possible<sup>11</sup>.

### 3.3. Other (non-focal)/ good governance/institutional support (15 million Euro)

Non-focal EC support in Rwanda concentrates primarily on supporting good governance and institutional support. This entails:

- supporting institutions (such as statistics);
- financing rule of law initiatives (e.g., justice, reconciliation, and civil society);

<sup>8</sup> Ten percent of Rwanda’s government revenue will eventually be committed to fund the CDF.

<sup>9</sup> An amount of 2.1 million was furthermore recently allocated to the finance the Gitarama-Akanyaru road.

<sup>10</sup> The development of *imidugudu* (grouped settlements) is intended to encourage off-farm employment and the commercialization of farming, while facilitating market access and security.

<sup>11</sup> Although budget support funds are being used to support various PRSP objectives, the EC assesses its performance in this focal area by using indicators in the health and education sectors (Leeming personal communication, 2005).

- integrating and mobilizing vulnerable groups in urban districts;
- supporting electoral processes (channelled through UNDP’s basket fund for the National Electoral Commission and a number of NGOs);
- funding a Technical Cooperation Facility; and
- possible co-financing of NGOs (Delegation of the EC in Kigali and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda, draft, 2004).

#### **4. Follow-up CSP review**

The subsequent “follow-up CSP” review evaluates:

- 1) environment-poverty concerns associated with current CSP investment (namely under the “rural development” and “macro support” focal areas) (section 4.2) and
- 2) whether current 9<sup>th</sup> EDF funding in Rwanda is addressing the identified environment-poverty issues (section 4.3).

Since the following review fundamentally relies on environment-poverty concerns assessed in the multilevel evaluation, these are foremost summarized (section 4.1). This follow up review – along with this paper’s institutional evaluation (section 5) – will be used to provide recommendations to not only improve the integration of environment-poverty issues in subsequent CSP funding in Rwanda (e.g. under the 10<sup>th</sup> EDF), but will furthermore provide practical suggestions to EC headquarters/Brussels towards improving environmental mainstreaming in EC development assistance.

#### **4.1. Summary of environment-poverty concerns identified in the multilevel evaluation**

The recently conducted multilevel evaluation identified various environment-poverty concerns particularly regarding EC investment that is helping finance Rwanda’s current decentralization effort, supported under the Decentralized Programme for Rural Poverty Reduction (DPRPR) (Bush et al., 2005). The multilevel evaluation selected the Kibungo Province – one of the two provinces in which the DPRPR programme is focusing – as its case study due to its diversity of environmental issues<sup>12</sup>. Three districts with unique characteristics were identified within this province for further assessment: the Cyarubare, Rusumo, and Mirenge districts<sup>13</sup>. The multilevel evaluation highlighted both key environment-poverty concerns linked to rural development (section 4.1.a.), as well as policy challenges and opportunities to mainstream environmental issues in Rwanda’s current decentralization effort, particularly in the Common Development Fund through which central government funds are being allocated to the decentralized network of government (section 4.1.b.).

##### *4.1.a. Key environment-poverty issues linked to rural development*

The multilevel evaluation foremost highlighted key environment-poverty concerns linked to rural development as summarized below.

- *Land scarcity and decreasing parcel size:* The three evaluated districts indicated significant land scarcity due in large part to unprecedented resettlement and increasing population pressure. National programmes to resettle returning refugees from neighbouring countries following the 1994 genocide have been especially concentrated in the Kibungo province. In the Rusumo district alone plot size is currently estimated at 0.5 hectares per family, down from 3 hectares in the 1970s. Land scarcity remains a serious

<sup>12</sup> The DPRPR also focuses on the Kigali-Ngali province. Note that there are a total of eleven provinces in Rwanda plus the City of Kigali: Butare, Byumba, Cyangugu, Gikongoro, Gisenyi, Gitarama, Kibungo, Kibuye, Kigali Ngali, Ruhengeri, and Umutara.

<sup>13</sup> Various sectors (units in which districts are disaggregated in Rwanda) within each of the three districts were further evaluated.

issue throughout Rwanda as population increases and as parcel size continuously reduces (see also Appendix 3).

- *Degradation in soil quality and soil erosion and deterioration of agro-pastoral land:* Land scarcity is in turn forcing poor rural farmers to cultivate more intensely on already marginal land. Less land is furthermore available for pasture leading to overgrazing. Intensive farming is resulting in severe and accelerated soil erosion and salination of water bodies (see also Appendix 3).

- *Low land productivity:* Intensive cultivation and grazing on marginal land coupled with significantly restricted use of very little or no fertilizers is keeping land productivity low, leading to food insecurity and further impoverishment.

- *Overdependence on agriculture and natural resources:* More than 95% of the inhabitants of the Kibungo province live from agriculture and the rearing of livestock, reflective of trends elsewhere in Rwanda (where 90% of the population currently relies on subsistence agriculture). The rural population in Kibungo – as in other Rwandan provinces – significantly depend on environmental resources including forest products (fuelwood for cooking and energy, timber for construction, etc.) and water resources (e.g., for drinking and washing) (see also Appendix 3).

- *Increasingly scarce forest resources:* Exploitation of forest resources – used for firewood, construction material, etc and to make way for human settlements and agriculture land – has been massive and unregulated. Only one percent of the surface area in the evaluated districts remain covered with woodlots.

- *Degradation of water bodies and destruction of ecosystem services from wetlands:* Frequent and prolonged droughts – exacerbated by deforestation and wetland reclamation – have been observed in this region over the past five years. The droughts have significantly negatively impacted agricultural activity and basic water needs. Women and children have been especially affected manifested in increased time spent to search for water (vs. to cultivate fields or go to school). The degradation of water bodies especially wetlands and lakes have furthermore contributed to the loss of habitat and biodiversity.

- *Increased vulnerability to disasters and conflict:* Continued intensification of agro-pastoral activity and severe destruction of watersheds is exacerbating risk to natural disasters including land slides, drought, and floods. Furthermore, as natural resources become scarcer, social insecurity and conflicts over limited environmental resources may increase.

#### *4.1.b. Key environment-poverty concerns linked to the CDF/ decentralization process*

The multilevel evaluation furthermore identified challenges and opportunities to mainstream the environment in Rwanda's decentralization effort, particularly in the CDF facility through which the central government finances the decentralized network.

- *Lack of capacity – in terms of human, institutional, and technical – to integrate environment in the decentralized process:* It was underscored that significant capacity will need to be built at all levels (from the cell, sector, district, provincial to national levels) towards helping ensure that the environmental dimension is integrated in Rwanda's current decentralized process. This includes strengthening environmental capacities in local government at the cell, sector, district, and provincial levels: such as by supporting the placement of district environmental officers and improving the provision of technical information at the district level. At the national level this includes supporting the newly developed Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA) mandated to control, monitor, and evaluate environmental integration in all development projects and activities. It was noted that in the evaluated districts, only one (or less)

agronomist and forester (mandated to provide technical advice including on environmental issues) is currently available.

- *Need to mainstream environment in Community Development Plans (CDPs)*: While Community Development Plans (CDPs) – through which communities identify and propose projects under current decentralization – are required to make some mention of potential environmental impacts, there is a lack of extensive environmental impact assessment for the community-based projects. It was recommended that REMA – as well as other relevant institutions (e.g., Ministry of Local Government, Information and Social Affairs - MINALOC) – take a lead in developing relevant environmental management tools and guidelines that may be used at the community level.
- *Mainstreaming environment in the CDF*: The multilevel assessment underscored that although environmental considerations have not yet been mainstreamed in the CDF at the project and programme levels (see respectively points above and below), the CDF *does* currently require that 5% of its finances are directed to environmental initiatives<sup>14</sup>. Furthermore, the EC requires that all projects supported through the CDF undergo environmental screening. Guidelines and procedures for environmental screening, however, still need to be developed (see point above).
- *Integrating environment in DDPs*: As the CDF moves away from a project approach to budget support – in which districts will receive direct funds to support District Development Plans (DDPs) – integrating environmental considerations in the broad district development plans will become increasingly important. Already 20 districts this year are being given direct budget support, including the Rusumo and Mirenge districts assessed in the multilevel evaluation.
- *Lack of financing to the CDF*: While in theory the CDF should obtain at least 10% of annual government revenue, in practice funds have been much lower. Funds for the current budget year were, for example, dramatically cut by 50% due to financial constraints as a result of the current energy crisis (see Box 2 in section 5 on the energy crisis). It was noted that low financing to the CDF will affect performance in all sectors, including environmental.
- *Integration of environment concerns in national strategies, policies, etc.*: Integrating environmental-poverty linkages in national policies, plan, and programmes – upon which the decentralization process significantly depends – was underscored. This in particular includes environmental integration in the PRPS.

#### **4.2. National level evaluation of environment-poverty concerns of CSP investment**

Based on the above multilevel evaluation, a national-level assessment was conducted to further evaluate environment-poverty concerns linked to EC/CSP investment being used to finance Rwanda's current decentralization process (section 4.2.a), as well as to fund transportation (under "rural development") and macro support initiatives (respectively sections 4.2.b and 4.2.c).

##### *4.2.a. Environment-poverty concerns linked to decentralization/rural development (32 million Euro)*

Discussions with respondents regarding current decentralization similarly noted insufficient capacity in environmental management at local to national levels to mainstream environmental considerations in the decentralization process. It was noted that while important initial steps have been made to strengthen environmental management capacity – namely through the recent

---

<sup>14</sup> More specifically, the CDF requires that public utilities (e.g., schools and hospitals) construct a water tank as well as sanitation facilities (Gahamanyi personal communication, 2005).

development of REMA and enactment of environmental legislation (i.e., the Environmental Bill and Environmental Policy) – much needs to be done to ensure implementation of the new environmental regulations (Mukankomeje personal communication, 2005; Hajabakiga personal communication, 2005; Mashinga personal communication, 2005; Gahamanyi personal communication, 2005). It was emphasized that local governance will especially need strengthening and that sufficient support will be required for the newly established REMA to fulfil its broad mandate to control, monitor, and evaluate the integration of environmental concerns in all development projects or activities. A number of specific entry points to strengthen environmental integration in the current decentralization process were also noted.

- *Improved awareness on sustainable agriculture techniques:* A review of current District Development Plans – upon which the decentralization process heavily relies – indicated that most districts did not prioritize sustainable agriculture initiatives (e.g., terracing or agro-forestry). Rather the development plans underscored the need for infrastructure (e.g., schools and hospital) and road development (Ruzindaza personal communication, 2005). While this may reflect current community needs, it was noted that this may also indicate a general lack of awareness (e.g., by villagers) of the importance of sustainable agricultural techniques: a villager may be more apt to request a school than to ask for terracing, soil conservation, etc. about which little is known (Buckara personal communication, 2005). Respondents indicated that it will be important to raise awareness on sustainable agriculture – especially prior to the development of the community and district development plans – so that villagers are aware of available options/techniques (e.g., to improve crop/agricultural productivity). Synergies with existing activities (e.g., NGOs and private initiatives) need to continue to be sought and extension needs to be strengthened (Buckara personal communication, 2005).
- *Lack of prioritization of environmental and related initiatives:* A preliminary review of the DDPs furthermore indicated that environmental and related projects were not prioritized in the development plans. A pilot study is currently being conducted on three districts to evaluate entry points to improve environment-poverty streamlining in future DDPs (Innocent personal communication, 2005). This initiative is being implemented by the Decentralization and Environmental Management Project (DEMP), a project aimed at strengthening the integration of environmental and natural resources issues in current decentralization<sup>15</sup>. Synergies with the DEMP initiative will be essential.

#### *4.2.b. Environment-poverty concerns linked to transport/rural development (33 million Euro)*

As previously mentioned, a significant amount of EC funding under the “rural development” focal area is being provided to improve rural access. These funds are predominantly being used to support the rehabilitation of the primary road between Ruhengeri and Gisenyi and to a lesser degree to support the Road Maintenance Fund (RMF) (refer back to section 3.1 for detail).

##### *4.2.b.i. Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road:*

EC funds will be used to rehabilitate the Ruhengeri and Gisenyi primary road in northwest Rwanda, a road previously developed in the 1980’s. This road is currently in fair/poor condition<sup>16</sup>. Due to delays in implementing this initiative the condition of this road has further deteriorated (Delegation of the European Commission in Kigali and The Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda draft, 2004; Neubert personal communication). Although

<sup>15</sup> Key activities and outcomes of the DEMP include raising awareness to individuals involved in spearheading the development of DDPs, developing a practical guide for the integration of environmental issues in DDPs, and developing a popular version of current environment policies and legislation (UNDP, 2004; Rudasingwa personal communication, 2005).

<sup>16</sup> The road has various potholes and stretches of the road are inaccessible during the rainy season.



improving roads such as the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road will be critical towards ensuring improved market access and in turn economic growth in Rwanda, respondents noted various environment-poverty issues relating to its rehabilitation as described below. It is anticipated that the EIA for this road – that should be available soon – will highlight similar issues. Under the newly enacted Environmental Policy (2005), EIAs are required for all development projects including road works. This will be the first road in Rwanda for which an EIA is developed (MINITERE, 2005; Rugumire personal communication, 2005; Mugambira personal communication, 2005)

*Soil erosion:* Northwest Rwanda – the region in which the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road is located – is noted for its high relief, porous (and fertile) soils, intensive cultivation (often on steep slopes), and dense populations (Garadi and Twesigye-Bakwatsa, 2005). A recurrent problem to the existing Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road has been its exposure to sand banks resulting from excessive soil erosion. The sand banks have made vast sections of the road inaccessible during especially the rainy season (Neubert personal communication, 2005; Rudasingwa personal communication, 2005). The EC is seeking to help address this issue by developing income generating activities that will support soil conservation works especially about areas of the road susceptible to the sand banks. This effort seeks not only improve market access and restore soils (e.g., through grass and tree planting), but furthermore to provide communities with off-farm employment alternatives (Neubert personal communication, 2005).

*Compensation/widening of road:* The rehabilitation of the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road works will entail repaving and widening of the primary road. A widening by one meter along the entire traverse is anticipated: in urban areas, however, the road may need to be further widened (Neubert personal communication, 2005; Rugumire personal communication, 2005). Owing to dense population along significant sections of the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road, a widening of one or more meters will likely entail relocation and in turn compensation. Verifying that appropriate capacity exists to provide fair and timely compensation for those required to resettle will be imperative. In addition to the above noted one meter widening of the road, under a recently enacted Land Policy (Republic of Rwanda, 2004) national roads and their “edges” – a ten meter buffer about both sides of the road – have been officially designated as government land. No houses and businesses will in the future be allowed to exist in this ten meter buffer (Rurangwa personal communication, 2005; Rudasingwa personal communication, 2005)<sup>17</sup>. While the ten meter buffer has not yet been enforced, its future enforcement will obviously have major implications for populations residing along densely populated road stretches. An evaluation of the social impacts of this decree, especially on the poorest segments of society that may be more likely to reside closer to existing roads, is vital.

*Tourism:* The area about the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road is endowed with various important tourist destinations including the Virungu National Park and Lake Kivu. The Volcanoes National Park is habitat to one of the world’s few remaining mountain gorilla populations, while Gisenyi – situated on the eastern shore of Lake Kivu – is a lakeside resort town that currently attracts wealthier Rwandans, expatriates, and travellers. The new tourism strategy that aims to substantially increase the number of tourists visiting the country – to almost double tourism visitor numbers since peak levels in 1984 – is promoting the building of new tourist accommodation in the Ruhengeri and Kivu areas, as well as in Butare and Akagera (ORTPN, ). While the tourism strategy is focused on avoiding mass tourism and targeting high valued ecotourism customers, hotels may in periods of economic difficulty offer lower prices and in turn (albeit unintentionally) induce lower paying (as well as higher numbers of) tourists to visit. While tourism can generate much needed foreign income, its development needs be

---

<sup>17</sup> It is anticipated that trees will be planted in this buffer.

adequately controlled to mitigate negative environment/livelihood impacts. Furthermore it will be vital that local communities – especially those that neighbour protected areas and other tourism attractions – benefit from tourism growth ( such as through revenue sharing schemes - see section 4.2.c.ii under “Growth in tourism sector”).

*Human settlement:* Although the area about the current Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road is already very densely populated, high fertility coupled with easier accessibility may induce further human settlement in this region. Human settlement may be especially prompted if secondary roads are improved and/or developed in this region, as may be financed through the Road Maintenance Fund (see next section 4.2.b.ii) (Rurangwa personal communication, 2005; Behm-Masozera personal communication, 2005). Increased human settlement may lead to increased land scarcity that in turn may compel farmers to cultivate more intensively on already marginal land. Furthermore, escalated land scarcity may increase the risk of land/resource-based conflict.

*Regional trade:* The Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road is considered to be a part of the core road network of Rwanda and is anticipated to help facilitate regional trade and the country’s integration into international markets. Regional instability – such as in the DRC – are however currently limiting such improved trade prospects. Future trade may include increased imports and exports of minerals, agricultural crops, and forest resources. While such improved trade is key to regional and national economic growth, if unsustainably managed the increased exploitation of natural resources in Rwanda and neighbouring countries may significantly damage the environment and in turn poor peoples’ livelihoods.

*HIV:* Improved regional trade prompted by the development of the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road may place populations – especially at road junction towns – at higher risk to contracting HIV/AIDS<sup>18</sup>. Synergies with initiatives already involved in HIV/AIDS awareness and education campaigns are essential.

#### 4.2.b.ii. Road fund

The Roads Maintenance Fund (RMF/FER – Fonds d’entretien routier) is a national financial facility that was recently set up to maintain all roads including for primary and secondary roads. The fund is currently financed by a fuel levy, as well as supported by donor support such as the EC (Delegation of the European Commission in Kigali and the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda draft, 2004). While few environment-poverty concerns are currently associated with the road fund (in large part due to its recent establishment), the future maintenance and upgrading of especially secondary roads is cause for concern. While in no doubt improving rural access will be critical towards ensuring improving market access and economic growth, the rehabilitation of secondary roads (especially if upgraded to paved status) may prompt human settlement that in turn may induce further intensive cultivation on marginal lands, exacerbate soil erosion, etc. (see also section 4.2.a under “human settlement”). It is imperative that EIAs – as recently required in Rwanda – are conducted on all road works projects including the rehabilitation and development of secondary roads.

#### 4.2.c. Environment-poverty concerns linked to macroeconomic support (86 million Euro)

As previously noted, the EC is in addition to supporting “rural development” initiatives is providing substantial financing to “macroeconomic support” – funds allocated towards meeting the objectives of the current PRPS (Government of Rwanda, 2002) (refer back to section 3.2 for detail). While the current PRPS (2002-2007) is supporting various noteworthy initiatives to

---

<sup>18</sup> HIV prevalence is currently at 11.2% nationally and 10.8% in the rural areas (Government of Rwanda, 2002).

improve socio-economic conditions – such as through education, health, and good governance/justice initiatives – it is widely agreed that the current PRPS does not adequately mainstream environment-poverty linkages (TOR for task team, 2005; Garadi and Twesigye-Bakwatsa, 2005; Rwamucyo personal communication, 2005; Usengumuremyi personal communication, 2005; Innocent personal communication, 2005). A Poverty Environment Integration (PEI) task team has recently been developed to help ensure that environment-poverty considerations are better mainstreamed in the next PRPS (planned for 2007-2010) (see section 5.2). Owing in part to poor environment-poverty integration, various initiatives in the current PRPS are associated with environment-poverty concerns as described subsequently.

#### *4.2.c.i. Modernization of agriculture:*

The transformation and modernization of agricultural stands central to the objectives of the PRSP. This includes increasing input use (e.g., fertilizers and pesticides), the regionalization of crops (e.g., the (re)planting of cash crops where they can be competitive), encouraging cash crop exports, strengthening extension, improving access to seeds, and endorsing sustainable agricultural techniques (Government of Rwanda, 2002). While these initiatives are intended to improve food security and manage soils, several of these activities may concurrently (albeit unintentional) be associated with environment-poverty issues as noted below.

*Food insecurity:* Although the current agricultural strategy is intended to improve food security – by improving crop productivity through higher input use, better access to seed, etc., – the current emphasis on increasing agricultural exports of cash crops, coupled with the regionalization of crops, may have the opposite unintended effect of decreasing domestic food supply and in turn food security. Higher supplies of domestically produced cash crops may, for example, be exported while farmers are simultaneously encouraged to abandon the cultivation of staple crops that are traditionally used to secure nutrition needs.

*Increasing input use:* Increased input use (e.g., fertilizers) is emphasized in the current PRSP: current levels of agricultural yield are very low in Rwanda and declining (MINAGRI, 2004). While fertilizer and pesticide use in Rwanda is currently very limited (almost insignificant) and unlikely to cause environmental problems in the near future, intensive future input use (e.g., of chemical fertilizers) may pose environmental threats if unsustainably and unsafely used. Environmental threats include contamination of ground and surface water and may, more specifically, contribute to the current water hyacinth problem<sup>19</sup>. The leaching of agrochemicals in surface and ground water is of particular concern to Rwanda's wetlands and aquatic lands that represent about 15% of the national territory (MINITERE, 2005). Fertilizer application by especially poor illiterate farmers is furthermore problematic. While standards do currently exist in Rwanda to control the quality of commodities, standards on the application and use of fertilizers and pesticides have not yet been developed (Behm-Masosera personal communication, 2005; Buckara personal communication, 2005).

*Regionalization/Promotion of rice production in wetlands:* A major crop targeted for expansion in the PRPS is rice: other targeted crops include tea, coffee, maize, potatoes, soya and beans. While rice was grown on approximately 6,000 hectares in 2003, the recently developed “Strategic plan for agricultural transformation in Rwanda” notes of intentions to increase “new rice perimeters” to 11,800 hectares by 2009 (MINAGRI, 2004). Furthermore, a “marshlands utilization plan” identifies an estimated 48,000 hectares of marshland that can be

---

<sup>19</sup> Water hyacinth have thrived in many of Rwanda's rivers due to high levels of siltation. This has lowered fish supplies and in some cases affected nutritional intake (Mwanafunzi personal communication, 2005; Mashinga personal communication, 2005).

used for rice production. The conversion of wetlands into rice paddies, coupled with anticipated increases in input use to boost rice production, is worrying. A recent environmental decree has, however, severely restricted the use of wetlands by banning activities in wetland areas unless approved by the Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water, and Miners (MINITERE) (Mashinga personal communication, 2005). Evaluating how this decree will affect plans to convert wetlands into rice paddies – as well as influence poor peoples’ livelihoods that critically depend on the wetlands (!) – is vital (see Box 1 in section 4.2.c.ii on the effect of this decree on brick makers).

#### *4.2.c.ii. Privatization/Macroeconomic reforms*

In addition to the modernization of agriculture, another key objective of the PRPS with which environment-poverty concerns are associated entails the privatization and liberalization of various sectors including agricultural, tourism, mining, and industrial.

*Privatization of agricultural crops:* Growth of coffee and tea plantations, as well as other agricultural and related markets (e.g., pyrethrum<sup>20</sup>, rice, bananas, tanneries, and diaries), is actively being promoted through privatization and other macroeconomic reforms. Already numerous tea factories have been privatised including Sorwathé, while various agribusinesses – such as tanneries, diaries, and pyrethrum, maize, sugar factories – have been sold (Privatisation Program, 2004). Although the promotion of agribusinesses is anticipated to provide much needed foreign revenue, their growth is associated with environmental/livelihood concerns. Increased cultivation of cash crops may, for example, place an increasing strain on already depleting water resources, especially as private companies are more likely (due to higher revenues) to invest in irrigation facilities. Furthermore, the drying of tea and pyrethrum has traditionally used large quantities of fuelwood (Villa personal communication, 2005; Delaunay-Belleville personal communication, 2005). Fortunately substantial amounts of fuelwood used in these sectors comes from well managed commercial woodlots (Weber and Vedder, 2001 ).

*Growth in the tourism sector:* The PRPS considers the tourism sector to be a vital “new engine of growth” (Government of Rwanda, 2002). The Rwandan government is working on a new tourism strategy that aims to almost double tourism since peak levels in 1984 to 70,000 annual visitors by 2010<sup>21</sup> (see also section 4.2.b.ii. under “Tourism”). While tourism can provide an important source of foreign income, its sustainable development hinges on the support and involvement of local communities, as well as the development of an effective regulatory framework to minimize potential environmental/livelihood damage.

Ensuring that local communities benefit from tourism growth is critical in Rwanda where many key tourism destinations (e.g., protected areas) are encircled by densely populated agrarian communities. Rwanda recently developed draft guidelines for tourism revenue sharing – spearheaded by the ORPTN (Office Rwandaise du Tourisme et des Parcs Nationaux) – towards helping ensure that local communities neighbouring protected areas benefit from tourism revenue<sup>22</sup>. While the details of the revenue sharing programme have not yet been

---

<sup>20</sup> Pyrethrum comes from dried chrysanthemum flowers which when refined can be used to produce natural and environmental friendly insecticides (Kayigamba, 2001). Pyrethrum provides highly effective protection against mosquitoes and in turn against such diseases as Malaria and Yellow Fever.

<sup>21</sup> Prior to the genocide of 1994, tourism was a major foreign currency earner in Rwanda - while the number of visitors to Rwanda peaked in 1984 at 39,000, tourism numbers fell to 16,000 visitors in 2001 (Environmental News Network, 2003).

<sup>22</sup> This concerns Rwanda three protected areas: the Volcanoes National Park, Akagera National Park, and Nyungwe forest.

worked out, a percentage of total tourism income will go to a “national pool” which will then be allocated to communities neighbouring the protected areas (ORTPN, 2005; Ruzigandekwe and Ngoga personal communication, 2005). The initiation of a tourism revenue scheme is a critical development in Rwanda where many local communities have been (and continue to be) adversely affected by park activities – such as through crop destruction by wildlife, restricted access to important natural resources, and increased exposure of infectious disease carried through wildlife to humans and livestock (Kock, 2004; Ruzigandekwe and Ngoga personal communication, 2005). Making sure that these communities benefit from and help support the conservation of these protected areas is essential towards the long term viability of tourism in Rwanda.

Aside from revenue sharing, it is equally important that Rwanda continue to develop an effective environmental management framework to help ensure that tourism growth minimizes environmental damage. Rwanda’s current tourism policies already emphasizes various sustainable practices including a focus on low environmental impact tourism and high value (v.s. mass) tourists (cited in ORTPN, ). Policies oriented towards visiting mountain gorillas in the Volcanoes National Park – a key tourism attraction in Rwanda – similarly underscores environmental safeguards including strict restriction on the number of visitors allowed to visit the gorillas. Such policies have helped sustain mountain gorilla population which despite the challenges of political turmoil have shown to have increased during the past 15 years (WWF news, 2004; Rurangwa personal communication, 2005b; Kalpers personal communication, 2004; New York Times, 2004)<sup>23</sup>.

*Growth of the mining sector:* Rwanda is striving towards diversifying its exports, including the export (and re-export) of minerals such as cassiterite, wolfram, colombo-tantalite (coltan), gold, and sapphires. The mining sector in Rwanda is being promoted through privatisation and liberalization (e.g., through tariff reductions and export tax removals). Most mining in Rwanda is currently small scale – sufficient deposits have yet to be located to support large-scale commercial operations (Government of Rwanda, 2002; Privatisation Secretariat,). Nonetheless the search for minerals and development of small scale mining industries has led to some environment-poverty concerns. The search for gold and for coltan particularly in the Nyungwe forest has, for example, led to the degradation of forests and protected areas (MINITERE, 2005). In addition, quarries for brick making and the exploitation of lime, sand, and stones has increased erosion throughout Rwanda, especially where pits have been left open (MINITERE, 2004). Brick making has, however, recently been significantly curbed through an environmental decree that has banned the indiscriminate cutting of trees. While the intentions of this environmental decree are laudable, the impact on especially poor peoples’ livelihoods that significantly rely on access to natural resources needs be evaluated (see Box 1 on the “effects of the environmental decree on brick makers”).

Aside from small-scale mining, the Government of Rwanda is seeking to promote value added activities, including the processing of minerals extracted in Rwanda, as well as those legitimately imported (Munyanganizi personal communication, 2005; Uwizeye personal communication, 2005; MINITERE, 2004b). While value-added processing of minerals in Rwanda currently does not entail chemical processing, if in the future other minerals are imported that do require chemicals for processing (e.g., gold), appropriate environmental safeguards will be needed.

---

<sup>23</sup> Five groups of gorillas may be visited a day by no more than eight tourists in each group.

**Box 1: Effects of the environmental decree on brick makers**

As construction demands have increased in Rwanda, so too has the demand for bricks: quarry production's contribution to the GDP increased by more than five-fold between 1995 to 2004 in large part due to the development of construction materials (MINITERE, 2004b). Until the current environmental decree – that among other things banned the use of firewood for brick making and construction – thousands of rural poor Rwanda people were involved in and employed through brick making. The environmental decree has affected especially thousands of unskilled youth in the Kigali rural province who depended on making bricks for their livelihoods (Garadi and Twesigye-Bakwatsa, 2005 [p. 49]). In addition to the banning of the indiscriminate cutting of fuelwood, the decree has placed significant restrictions on the use of wetlands and limits agricultural and related activities about water bodies (Mashinga personal communication, 2004; Mwanyanginzi personal communication, 2005).

*Other industrial growth:* Although industrial activity is currently limited in Rwanda, it is assumed that existing industries such as located in Kigali's Gikondo industrial zone – a wetland area designated as industrial in the 1960's – are contributing to pollution (Hajabakiga personal communication, 2005; Mashinga personal communication, 2005). Levels of industrial effluent as well as their affect on Rwanda's wetlands (where most industries are currently located) have, however, not yet been monitored. Monitoring in Rwanda, as in other developing countries, is confounded by a general lack of data collection and analysis in the environmental and related sectors. There is, for example, currently no systematic data collection to monitor water quality in Rwanda (Mwanafunzi personal communication, 2005).

**4.3. CSP investment to address the environment-poverty concerns**

A follow-up CSP review was conducted to assess if: 1) the above-noted environment-poverty issues are identified in the current Rwanda CSP and 2) if current CSP investment is being used to address the environment/livelihood concerns.

*4.3.a. Recognition of environment-poverty issues in the CSP*

*Rural development*

Although the CSP does indicate that “Poverty in Rwanda is tightly linked to... interdependent questions, namely of land, demography, environmental degradation, poor management of public affairs, and insufficient growth” (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenné, 2003, p. 8) and indicates numerous constraints facing the country including “demographic pressure, low agricultural productivity, ...and progressive deterioration of the environment” (p. 3), the CSP does not highlight environment-poverty considerations in specifically describing its support to the decentralization process and transportation initiatives.

*Decentralization:* While the CSP does indicate that financing to support decentralization will build upon national efforts to “reinforce institutional capacities to protect the environment” (p. 27/28), there is no mention on how environment-poverty considerations will be integrated in Rwanda’s decentralization process. Entry points to ensure the integration of the environmental dimension in the decentralisation network – as identified by the multilevel evaluation (Bush et al., 2005) and this national assessment – are not noted.

*Transportation/Improved rural access:* The CSP does not mention possible environment/livelihood impacts due to the proposed rehabilitation of the primary road between Ruhengeri and Gisenyi. As noted previously (see section 4.2.b), although improved market access is an important means to alleviate poverty, this may be associated with the displacement of people, settlement of humans on already marginal lands, and other environment-poverty concerns. It is anticipated, however, that the EIA for the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road – the first road for which an EIA is required in Rwanda – will capture various environment-poverty issues.

#### *4.3.a.ii. Macro support*

*Modernization of agriculture:* Although the CSP makes ample reference on how the modernization of agriculture is intended to improve food security (e.g., through increased input use) and export growth, specific reference is not made on possible negative environment/livelihood consequences. As noted in section 4.2.b (under “Modernization of agriculture”) the promotion of export crops, regionalization of cash crops, and increased input use may – albeit unintentional – lead to food insecurity, wetland degradation (to make way for rice paddies), and adverse human health effects.

*Macro reforms/Privatization:* Despite much needed economic growth, as indicated in section 4.2.b. (under “Privatization/Macroeconomic reforms”) the development of the agricultural, tourism, mining, and other industrial sectors may without appropriate environmental safeguards lead to adverse environment/livelihood impacts. While the CSP emphasizes the positive impact macro economic reforms will have in reducing poverty, the adverse environment/livelihood effects prompted by privatization and rapid economic growth are not thoroughly discussed.

#### *4.3.a.iii. Good governance*

While the CSP generally notes of the need to “reinforce institutional capacity in the environmental sector” (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenné, 2003, p. 24), the CSP in its discussion of the non-focal area on “good governance and institutional support” does not specifically indicate the need to strengthen good *environmental* governance. Furthermore, the CSP does not highlight that environmental management in Rwanda is at its infancy: EIAs were, for example, only recently required, environmental quality standards will soon be developed, and REMA was only recently institutionalized.

#### *4.3.b. CSP investment to address the environment-poverty concerns*

The Rwanda CSP was furthermore reviewed to assess if current CSP investment is addressing the identified environment-poverty concerns (as noted in sections 4.1 and 4.2).

#### *4.3.b.i. Rural development*

*Decentralization:* While CSP funding to support decentralization may indirectly address environment/livelihood concerns, this assumes that such concerns are integrated in the community and district development plans. As noted in section 4.2.a, preliminary reviews of the district development plans indicate that insufficient emphasis has been placed on requesting environmental and agricultural initiatives.

*Transport:* Although not mentioned in the CSP, the Rwandan delegation is seeking ways to address soil erosion issues (especially about stretches of the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road that are currently prone to sand banks) by supporting labour intensive initiatives to restore soils. It is envisioned that this initiative will entail employing community members to plant grass and trees, as well as working jointly with neighbouring communities to promote agro-forestry and soil conservation (Neubert personal communication, 2005).

#### *4.3.b.ii. Macro support*

The CSP does not specifically indicate how 9<sup>th</sup> EDF funds will be used to address environment-poverty concerns associated with economic liberalization, the modernization of agriculture, and other initiatives funded through “macro support” (as noted in section 4.2.b.). The EC is, however, financing under another budget line an initiative to help address environmental concerns linked with the processing of pyrethrum – one of the crops targeted for expansion in the current PRSP (see next section on “Other – environmental budget lines...”).

#### *4.3.b.iii. Good governance/institutional support*

While no specific mention is made in the CSP regarding how 9<sup>th</sup> EDF funds will support “good environmental governance”, the delegation is looking into supporting the strengthening of environmental management capacity in Rwanda. This will likely be financed through the rural development focal area (vs. the non-focal areas on “good governance/institutional support”) (Villa personal communication, 2005; Delaunay-Belleville personal communication, 2005).

#### *4.3.b.iv. Other – environmental budget lines, previous CSP investment, etc.*

Although current CSP investment does not underscore addressing environment-poverty issues (see above section), the EC has been involved in a number of environmental and related initiatives supported namely under other budget lines.

*Solar drying of pyrethrum (currently 200,000 Euro with an additional 500,000 Euro planned, STABEX funds):* STABEX funds have in Rwanda since 2003 been used to help promote environmental friendly ways of drying pyrethrum<sup>24</sup>. Traditionally pyrethrum has been dried in ovens requiring fuelwood. In an effort to curb deforestation this initiative is supporting the distribution of drying tables upon which pyrethrum may be dried in the sun (vs. in ovens using wood). This initiative has not only resulted in decreasing fuelwood cost - both in terms of money to buy and time required to collect firewood – but has furthermore decreased transportation costs: the dried flowers – that weigh one-fifth the weight of wet flowers – can now be transported directly (Delaunay-Belleville personal communication, 2005). The Rwanda delegation is furthermore looking into opportunities to support energy alternatives to dry tea. As with pyrethrum the drying of tea requires firewood. While solar energy has not been proven effective to dry tea, the use of gas methane that may be extracted from Lake Kivu is an alternative. Synergies with initiatives to extract gas methane from the lake are currently being explored (Villa personal communication, 2005).

*Support to Non-State Actors (8 million Euro, EC budget lines):* A total of 8 million Euros is being allocated by the EC to finance Non State Actor activities in different areas including democracy, food security, and the environment. Although the majority of projects address human rights – mainly to support Rwanda’s national reconciliation activities – some funds are

---

<sup>24</sup> EC STABEX funds have been established to compensate farmers for losses due to low and falling international prices for cash crops (e.g., tea and coffee).



being allocated towards environmental related initiatives such as in the Agricultural Production and Education for Sustainability (APES) programme.

*Agricultural Production and Education for Sustainability (APES) programme (2001-2004, approximately 295,000 Euro in EC funds, EC budget lines<sup>25</sup>):* This programme – that is funded in large part by the EC – aims to contribute to the sustainable conservation of biodiversity in the Volcanoes National Park (PNV) by improving agricultural practices and building environmental awareness. The programme through a “trickle-down training” approach has resulted in the training of 13,310 farmers in sustainable agricultural practices and has helped to – among other things – control erosion and improve crop yields and family nutrition. In addition to the training of farmers, the programme has raised environmental awareness amongst people living around PNV through the creation of environmental clubs. Awareness raising has entailed: distributing environmental education material on wildlife, soil, and water conservation; providing club leaders with training to establish other similar environmental clubs; and promoting participation in the annual environmental week (Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund Europe, 2005).

## 5. Institutional evaluation

Although the EC is financing a number of environmental and related initiatives in Rwanda, the current CSP (and in turn its investment) is shown to insufficiently underscore environment-poverty linkages (see previous section 4.3). EC respondents interviewed generally acknowledged a lack of environment-poverty mainstreaming in the CSP and national strategies (e.g., PRPS) and indicated substantial interest to improve environment-poverty integration in subsequent CSP programming. Furthermore, it was emphasized that given the current energy crisis – and in turn increased national awareness on the importance of sustainable development – ample opportunities exists to improve environmental integration (see Box 2 on the current “energy crisis”). The subsequent review assesses current institutional processes that are being used to integrate the environmental dimension in the CSP programming towards seeking entry points/opportunities to strengthen environment-poverty integration in future CSP/EDF programming (section 5.1). Since the Rwanda CSP (as in other CSPs) heavily relies on national strategies, efforts to mainstream environment-poverty issues in the Rwanda PRSP has also been evaluated (section 5.2). The following evaluation – as with the previous “follow-up CSP review” – relies on interviews (conducted with EC- and national-level stakeholders) and an extensive document review (refer back to section 2).

**Box 2:** Energy crisis: increased recognition on the linkages between environment, poverty, and economic development

There is increasing recognition in Rwanda that population pressure on natural resources coupled with environmental mismanagement are substantially adversely affecting key economic sectors such as energy, agriculture, and water. Rwanda’s recent hydroelectric power problems - that resulted in the decline of almost 50% of the national electricity supply – was, for example, caused by a decline in water flows between Lakes Bulera and Ruhondo. Low water levels were in turn a consequence of poor upstream wetland and watershed management, including upstream deforestation, wetland degradation, and intensive cultivation. Other hydroelectric power stations that depend on other water bodies (e.g., the Rusizi and Gihira rivers) seem to similarly be affected by dropping water levels and siltation (UNDP and Republic of Rwanda, 2005; Karani et al., personal communication, 2005). Environmental integration in policies and the next national strategy are being prioritized. A Poverty Environment Initiative was, for example, recently developed to help ensure that environment-poverty considerations are better mainstreamed in the next PRPS II.

### 5.1. EC-level processes to integrate environment-poverty issues

EC-level respondents were asked on how environmental considerations were mainstreamed in the current CSP and opportunities to strengthen environment-poverty integration in future country programming. More specifically EC respondents were asked:

- how the CSP was developed and reviewed in light of environmental integration (section 5.1.a);
- whether existing environmental guidelines/tools were used in developing the CSP (e.g., Country Environmental Profiles<sup>26</sup> and Strategic Environment Assessments<sup>27</sup>) (section 5.1.b.);
- awareness on existing environmental integration procedures (section 5.1.c.); and
- opportunities to strengthen environment-poverty integration in future CSP programming (section 5.1.d.).

#### 5.1.a. CSP process

The Rwanda CSP was developed through a dialogue-driven process between the partner countries (e.g., government and civil society), the European Commission (e.g., country delegations and headquarters), and EU member states. More specifically:

- a draft CSP was initially developed based on discussions with the National Authorizing Officer (NAO), EC (entailing the Rwanda country delegation and Brussels), and national-level stakeholders (namely government agencies);
- a seminar was subsequently held to get input from civil society on the draft CSP in which (invited) member from NGOs, government agencies (e.g., MINITERE), and other institutions participated;
- comments from the seminar were integrated in the CSP; and
- a draft was sent to the Commission for approval (Kalisa personal communication, 2005).

Regarding CSP reviews, it was noted that activities financed through CSP are evaluated periodically through a “rolling programming” of annual, mid-term, and end of the term reviews (Kalisa personal communication, 2005; EC 2000). The Mid-Term Review (MTR) – entailing a more extensive strategic/performance review – was recently conducted for the Rwanda CSP in 2003/2004 (Delegation of the EC in Kigali and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda, 2003). As with the development of the CSP, the MTR solicited input from civil society by inviting namely representatives from national government agencies (e.g., MINITERE), local government (e.g., MINALOC and provincial leaders), private agencies, NGOs, and other donors. Comments were subsequently integrated into the MTR (Kalisa personal communication, 2005).

#### 5.1.b. Use of environmental tools/guidelines

In theory, environmental considerations are currently mainly integrated in EC country programming – in Rwanda and elsewhere – through the development of a Country Environmental Profile (CEP) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). As in many other countries, the Rwanda CSP did not include a CEP or request a SEA: a study of 60 CSPs indicated that only six countries included a CEP while only three countries made reference to a SEA (and only one integrated a SEA) (Davalos, 2002). EC respondents in Rwanda noted that the CEP was not included in part because of a lack of capacity at the delegation to integrate environmental

---

<sup>26</sup> A Country Environmental Profile (CEP) includes a brief overview of the country (physical, economic, social, etc. conditions); summary of the state of the environment; overview of the environmental policy, legislative, and institutional framework; and recommended priority actions (Davalos, 2002).

<sup>27</sup> A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is an overarching assessment at programming level that integrates environment and development issues, provides information on alternative options, and identifies potential environmental impacts of proposed policies and plans (Davalos, 2002).

considerations, as well as due to a general lack of awareness on existing environmental tools and requirements (Villa personal communication, 2005; Kalisa personal communication, 2005; Leeming personal communication, 2005). A CEP was, however, included in the recent MTR (Delegation of the EC in Kigali and The Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, 2003; Leeming personal communication, 2005). While the CEP provides a good summary of key environment-poverty issues currently facing Rwanda – including soil erosion, low crop productivity, land scarcity, population pressure, deforestation, loss of wildlife habitat, and overgrazing – the environmental profile does not specifically indicate how CSP investment (e.g., under the “rural development” and “macro support” focal areas) is seeking to address these concerns.

#### *5.1.c. Awareness on environmental tools/helpdesk and environment-poverty linkages*

While most of the EC respondents were aware of the Commission’s environmental helpdesk, this has not often been consulted (Kalisa personal communication, 2005; Villa personal communication, 2005). One respondent did, however, recently receive a training through the EC helpdesk which was considered to be very useful. Emphasis was placed on the need to more generally raise awareness on environment-poverty linkages (e.g., at the delegation and headquarter level) and on the need to get more specific information on environment-poverty issues facing Rwanda’s poor. It is noted that such information is currently lacking in Rwanda and that without it environment-poverty linkages cannot be effectively integrated in future CSPs as well as in national strategies, programmes, etc. (Delaunay-Belleville personal communication, 2005).

#### *5.1.d. Opportunities to strengthen environment-poverty integration*

Respondents noted that it would be useful to employ an environmental advisor within the country delegation (as done by other donors such as the World Bank). A key mandate of such an advisor would be the responsibility to follow up on environmental integration in delegation documents, including CSPs (Villa personal communication, 2005). Furthermore, it was noted that specific guidelines to mainstream the environmental dimension in CSPs programming, as well as further training on environmental tools and environment-poverty linkages, would be useful (Kalisa personal communication, 2005; Delaunay-Belleville personal communication, 2005). Emphasis was placed on the need to integrate environmental issues throughout CSP programming and not to reserve environmental mainstreaming to solely the development of the CEP: as one respondent put it there is a need to “green the EDF” (Villa personal communication, 2005).

## **5.2. National processes and capacity to address environment-poverty issues**

Since CSPs heavily rely on national strategies such as PRSPs, evaluating how environment-poverty issues (and concerns) are integrated in national strategies is vital. This is particularly important as donors - including the EC - are increasingly seeking to harmonize donor funds with national frameworks and considering to increase levels to direct budget support. While it is currently widely agreed that the current PRPS (2002-2007) does not adequately incorporate environment-poverty linkages, efforts are underway to help ensure that the environment is mainstreamed in the next PRPS (to be finalized in 2007) (TOR for task team, 2005; Garadi and Twesigye-Bakwatsa, 2005; Rwamucyo personal communication, 2005; Usengumuremyi personal communication, 2005; Rudasingwa personal communication, 2005; Innocent personal communication, 2005). A Poverty Environment Integration (PEI) task team was recently developed towards improving environment-poverty integration in the next PRPS II<sup>28</sup>. The overall

---

<sup>28</sup> This UNDP/UNEP initiative is funded by Belgium and Norway and is referred to as the “Capacity Building Programme for the Integration and Institutionalization of Environmental Management into National Poverty Reductions Programmes and Related Activities”.

objective of the task team is to develop and manage the implementation of a strategy and to integrate environment-poverty issues into the preparation of PRPS II. More specifically, the team will be involved in: reviewing the current PRPS on environment-poverty gaps; developing recommendations and guidelines to improve environmental streamlining in the next PRPS II; evaluating the economic importance of environmental resources; and raising awareness and building political support on the importance of environmental integration in the PRSP II. Recommendations will furthermore be drawn upon to help identify and integrate poverty-environment indicators in the next PRSP – indicators that will be used to monitor and evaluate performance of the PRPS II.

## **6. Recommendations/Opportunities to improve environment-poverty mainstreaming**

Based on the above institutional evaluation (section 5) and follow-up CSP review (section 4) various lessons learned and best practices have been drawn to develop long-term institutional and policy recommendations to improve environmental-poverty mainstreaming in EC development assistance. Emphasis is placed on recommendations to improve environment-poverty integration in future CSP programming and design. Recommendations are foremost directed to the EC (delegation and headquarter level – section 6.1), followed by practical suggestions to national and EC/delegation stakeholders (section 6.2).

### **6.1. EC delegation and headquarters**

1) As donors seek to increase budget support – towards improving harmonization with national strategies and processes (e.g., decentralization) – environmental performance (e.g., of EC funds) increasingly depends on in-country environmental management capacity. While Rwanda has made important initial steps towards improving environmental management – such as through the enactment of the recent Environmental Policy and development of REMA – significant support (including from the EC) is needed to strengthen environmental management capacity at national to local levels. In the case of Rwanda, this will entail at the national level strengthening capacity at REMA and other relevant institutions (e.g., MINITERE and MINALOC), while at the local levels this includes supporting district environmental officers (as proposed under REMA’s institutional structure) and reinforcing local extension.

2) Although environment-poverty issues may be addressed (albeit indirectly) through support of decentralization processes – as being funded by the EC in Rwanda – this may not be assumed. As noted for Rwanda, preliminary assessments indicate that current district development plans, upon which Rwanda’s decentralization process heavily relies, do not underscore environmental and agricultural concerns. Rather the development plans highlight the need for infrastructure development (such as schools, hospitals, and roads). While this may reflect current village/community needs, this may also indicate a general lack of awareness: it may be more evident for villagers to request for schools than to ask for soil restoration/environmental techniques about which little is known. It will be essential that where the EC finances decentralization, environmental management capacity is sufficiently supported to help facilitate environmental integration in the decentralization process (see also point 1 above). More specifically, it is recommended that the EU take a lead in supporting evaluations to identify entry points to strengthen environmental mainstreaming in decentralization – as conducted by this initiative’s multilevel analysis (Bush et al., 2005) and national assessment. Synergies will need to be sought: in the case of Rwanda, collaboration with the Decentralization and Environmental Management Project (DEMP) – a project aimed at strengthening the integration of environmental and natural resources issues in Rwanda’s decentralization process – will be essential.

3) There is increased recognition in Rwanda that the first PRSP (2002-2007) – whose objectives are being funded by the EC under “macro support” – did not adequately incorporate environment-

livelihood considerations. As indicated in this report, in part due to such poor environmental integration current PRPS initiatives may be associated with wetland degradation, water depletion, food insecurity, and other environment/livelihood concerns. Prior to funding budget support, it is vital that the EC – ideally in collaboration with other donors – evaluate how/if national strategies (e.g., PRSP) have mainstreamed environment-poverty issues. A Strategic Environmental Assessment – an overarching assessment that helps identify potential environmental (and social) impacts and alternative options – may be useful. Supporting environmental management capacity at national to local levels is instrumental towards strengthening environmental integration in future national strategies, programmes, processes, etc. (see also points 1 and 2). Synergies are again essential, such as in the Rwanda context collaboration with a UNEP/UNDP initiative that is aimed at integrating and institutionalizing environmental management in Rwanda’s next PRSP.

4) Although there is substantial interest to improve environment-poverty mainstreaming in future CSP programming in Rwanda, current environmental capacity at the delegation-level was noted to be insufficient. EC respondents indicated that environmental mainstreaming may be facilitated by employing an environmental advisor at the delegation level (as done by other donors such as the World Bank), improving awareness on environment-poverty linkages, and developing guidelines to mainstream environmental issues in CSP programming vs. solely in the CEP (see also point below). It is recommended that needs assessments are conducted in Rwanda and other delegations to evaluate and respond to delegation-level environmental related capacity constraints and needs.

5) While a CEP is a useful tool to help identify environmental issues, a CEP such as included in the recent mid term review in Rwanda did not make clear linkages to initiatives being proposed in the CSP. There is a need to strengthen EC environmental guidelines so that environment-poverty issues are integrated throughout CSPs. Such guidelines should explicitly link to focal area development, identify environment-poverty concerns related to focal area development, and indicate how CSP investment will help address these environment/livelihood concerns. The revised guidelines need to fundamentally underscore environment-poverty linkages (see also Snel, 2005b).

6) The Rwanda CSP – as in many other CSPs - did not include a CEP or request a SEA. Ambiguity on the need to include CEPs is challenging the inclusion of environmental profiles in CSPs (see also Snel, 2005b). It is recommended that clear policy requirements are made regarding the need to integrate environment-poverty linkages throughout CSPs (see also point above).

7) Although the EC requires that EIAs are developed for all large scale development projects and infrastructure, it has supported initiatives in countries where EIAs are not mandatory. Until recently, for example, Rwanda did not require EIAs. More specifically EIAs were not required for the development or rehabilitation of roads – a sector that has been heavily supported by the EC. It is recommended that the EC take an active involvement in supporting the development of EIA legislation and guidelines and their implementation.

8) Evaluating environmental as well as *social* impacts of road development and/or rehabilitation – a sector heavily supported by the EC – is crucial. As indicated for Rwanda, the rehabilitation of a primary road in northwest Rwanda may entail displacement of people and increase human settlement on already marginal land. Livelihood impacts are especially anticipated when/if a new decree is enforced stipulating that ten meters about each side of roads is government land. While not yet enforced, due to Rwanda’s high population density implementation of such a decree may significantly adversely affect especially poor peoples’ livelihoods who may more likely reside

next to existing roads. Verifying that appropriate national capacity exists to provide fair and timely compensation for those required to resettle is also imperative.

9) Despite EC requirements, environmental assessments for select roads already developed and rehabilitated under previous EDFs were not found at the Rwanda delegation. While this may be due to poor archiving (or reflect national requirements that until recently did not require EIAs – see point above), sufficient support is needed at the delegation-level to make sure these assessments are appropriately archived (and retrievable). Posting environmental assessments on the internet, such as done by the World Bank, is encouraged.

10) The Rwanda EC delegation is considering to fund labour intensive works to address soil erosion in the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi region – the area in which the Commission is currently supporting the rehabilitation of a primary road. It is anticipated that such works will not only improve soil conservation and promote non-farm income, but will furthermore reduce the incidence of sand banks that has already affected stretches of the primary road. Jointly addressing livelihood, environmental, and economic issues is a noteworthy best practice.

11) While the development and review of the Rwanda CSP currently involves various stakeholders including national institutions, NGOs, and other donors, individuals are currently *invited*. Due attention needs to be given to involve environmental stakeholders during the development and review of CSPs – including from conservation interest groups, environmental and related NGOs. etc. Opening reviews to the general public at large – as done in other delegations/countries (e.g., Tanzania) – helps further facilitate participation.

12) Lack of environmental baseline data in Rwanda – as in many other developing countries – will challenge the integration of environment-poverty linkages in CSPs, as well as in national strategies, programmes, processes, etc. It is vital that strengthening environmental management capacity includes supporting significant improvements in environment-poverty monitoring (data collection, analysis, etc.) (see also points 1 and 2).

## **6.2. National and EC respondents**

13) Although current efforts in Rwanda to modernize agriculture – a key objective in the current PRPS and supported by the EC through “macro support” – are oriented towards increasing crop productivity and in turn food security, such efforts may concurrently have the opposite (and unintended) effect of degrading the environment and in turn peoples’ livelihoods. For example, the regionalization of crops coupled with the promotion of export cash crops, may encourage the production of cash crops over staple food crops (that are used to meet domestic food supplies). Due consideration needs to be made to promote the sufficient production of staple food crops to ensure that export cash crops do not compromise domestic food needs.

14) A major crop targeted for expansion in the PRPS is rice. If wetlands are converted for rice production, EIAs – as recently required in Rwanda – will need to thoroughly evaluate the environmental as well as *social* and *economic* impacts associated with such wetland conversion<sup>29</sup>.

15) While fertilizer and pesticide use in Rwanda is currently very limited (almost insignificant) and is unlikely to cause environmental problems, intensive future input use – as being promoted by the current PRSP – may pose environmental threats if unsustainably and unsafely used.

---

<sup>29</sup> The recent drainage of the Rugezi swamp that made way for agricultural land has, for example, been associated with significant economic cost: the drainage of the swamp disrupted water holding capacity that in turn contributed to low water levels and the recent power deficit.

Special provisions need to be made to ensure that safety standards and application instructions are accessible to illiterate farmers. Poor illiterate farmers in many other countries have succumbed to injuries due to their inability to read and understand such instructions.

16) Increased cultivation of cash crops, as being promoted by the PRPS and financed by the EC through “macro support, may place an increasing strain on already depleting water resources as private companies may spend higher revenues on irrigation facilities. It will be crucial that private companies are provided incentives to use water saving technologies.

17) While tourism growth in Rwanda – a key objective of the PRPS – is focused on avoiding mass tourism and targeted at high valued ecotourism customers, hotels may in periods of economic difficulty offer lower prices and in turn induce visits (albeit unintentionally) of lower paying and higher numbers of tourists. As Rwanda seeks to diversify its tourism attractions environmental safeguards to minimize tourism related environmental damage will become increasingly important. Sufficient support – including by the EC – is vital to ensure that REMA not only develop environmental standards and guidelines, but have sufficient capacity to implement these new standards and guidelines (see also point 1).

18) The recent development of a revenue based scheme in Rwanda is a key effort geared towards helping ensure that local communities benefit from tourism revenue/growth, as being promoted by the current PRSP. Similar approaches are needed in other sectors (e.g., energy) towards helping ensure that local communities benefit from sectoral growth and are compensated for negative externalities.

19) While intentions of recent environmental decrees enacted in Rwanda are laudable in seeking to address the current energy crisis and related environmental problems, recent reports indicate that the decrees are jeopardizing poor peoples’ livelihoods, including of thousands of brick makers. It is recommended that prior to the enactment of future policies and decrees that an evaluation is conducted (such as through a SEA) on potential *environment* and *livelihood* impacts. Furthermore, EIA guidelines – as will soon be developed for Rwanda – should similarly highlight assessing both *environmental* and *social* impacts.

## Bibliography

- Behm-Mazozera, A., personal communication, 2005. Consultant: Kigali.
- Buckara, D., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (Extension): Kigali.
- Bush, G., A. Kanobayita, E. Rukingama, A. Behm-Maxozera, G. Wamukoya, 2005. *Multilevel Poverty-Environment Analysis: Streamlining Poverty-Environment Linkages in the European Community's Development Assistance*. WWF Macroeconomic Program Office (MPO) and Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA): Kigali.
- Davalos, M.E., 2002. *Mainstreaming environment in the Country Strategy Papers: A review of 60 countries*. November 2002. EC DG-Development, Brussels.
- Delegation of the EC in Kigali and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda, 2004. *Draft: Joint Annual Report*. European Union-Rwanda Co-operation.
- Delegation of the EC in Kigali and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning of Rwanda, 2003. *Joint Annual Report*. European Union-Rwanda Co-operation.
- Delaunay-Belleville, E., personal communication, 2005. Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda (Rural Economy, Food Security, Decentralization and Environment Section): Kigali.

- Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund Europe, 2005. *Technical and financial report to the European Commission: Agricultural production and education for sustainability*. May 2005.
- EU and the Republic of Rwanda, 2004 *Financing agreement: Decentralized Programme for Rural Poverty Reduction (DPRPR)*.
- Environmental News Network, 2003. *Primates and culture: Rwanda tries to lure tourists*. By Fiona O'Brien. September 12, 2003. Available on-line:  
[http://www.enn.com/news/2003-09-12/s\\_8321.asp](http://www.enn.com/news/2003-09-12/s_8321.asp)
- Gahamanyi, V., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Local Government, Community Development & Social Affairs (Common Development Fund): Kigali.
- Garadi, A., and C. Twesigye-Bakwatsa, 2005. *Pilot project on poverty-environment mapping (phase II): Poverty-environment indicators and policy options for possible intervention under the PRPS*. June 2005. Republic of Rwanda and UNDP: Kigali.
- Government of Rwanda, 2002. *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning: National Poverty Reduction Programme.
- Innocent, B., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines, Lands and the Environment (Planning): Kigali.
- Hajabakiga, P., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines, Lands and the Environment (Lands and Environment): Kigali.
- Kalisa, G., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (EDF National Authorizing Officer's Support Unit): Kigali.
- Kalpers, J., personal communication 2004. Office Rwandais du Tourisme et des Parcs Nationaux: Kigali.
- Karani, A. and Sekata, A., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Infrastructure (Energy Directorate): Kigali.
- Kayigamba, J. B., 2001. *Rwanda banks on Pyrethrum to diversify exports*. Available on-line at: <http://www.bostongardens.com/bostongardens/detail.cfm?id=2639&catid=1&webid=1>
- Kock, M., 2004. *Ecosystem health in Akagera National Park: Health and disease issues at the interface*. Wildlife Conservation Society, Field Veterinary Program.
- Leeming, T., personal communication, 2005. Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda (Macro support): Kigali.
- Mashinga, T., personal communication, 2005., Rwandan Environmental Management Authority: Kigali.
- MINAGRI, 2004. *Strategic plan for agricultural transformation in Rwanda*. October, 2004. Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources: Kigali.
- MINITERE, 2005. *Environmental Policy*. Kigali: Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines (MINITERE): Kigali.
- MINITERE, 2004. *Environmental bill*. March 2004. Kigali: Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines (MINITERE): Kigali.
- MINITERE, 2004b. *The mining and geology policy*. October 2004. Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forests, Water and Mining: Kigali.
- Mugambira, J., personal communication, 2005. Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda (Transport): Kigali.
- Mukankomeje, R., personal communication, 2005. Rwandan Environmental Management Authority: Kigali.
- Munyanganizi, B., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines, Lands and the Environment (Water and Mines): Kigali.
- Mwanafunzi, B., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines, Lands and the Environment (Water): Kigali.
- Neubert, J., personal communication, 2005. Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda, (Transport): Kigali.



- New York Times, 2004. *Rwanda's tourism rebounding*. By Marc Lacey. June 9, 2004. Available on-line at: <http://www.chron.com/cs/CDA/ssistory.mpl/travel/jump/2618995>
- ORTPN, 2005. Workshop on national policy and implementation guidelines for tourism revenue sharing in Rwanda. July 7<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup>, 2005. Office Rwandais du Tourisme et des Parcs Nationaux: Kigali.
- ORTPN, [year]. *Rwanda tourism strategy*. Office Rwandais du Tourisme et des Parcs Nationaux: Kigali.
- Privatisation Program, 2004. *Privatised companies and companies to be privatised: Major opportunities for 2004*. Available on-line at: <http://www.privatisation.gov.rw/eng/entreprisesen.htm>
- République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenné, 2003. *République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenné: Document de stratégie de coopération et programme indicatif pour la période 2002-2007*.
- Rudasingwa, L., personal communication, 2005. United National Development Programme: Kigali.
- Rugumire, P., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Infrastructure (Public Works): Kigali.
- Rurangwa, E., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines (Lands): Kigali.
- Rurangwa, R., personal communication, 2005b. International Gorilla Conservation Programme: Kigali.
- Ruzigandekwe, F and Ngoga, T., personal communication, 2005. Office Rwandais du Tourisme et des Parcs Nationaux: Kigali.
- Ruzindaza, E., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock: Kigali.
- Rwamucyo, E., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Strategic Planning Unit: Kigali.
- Snel, M., 2005. *Poverty-environment analytical framework in EC Country Strategy Papers: Rwanda evaluation (2002-2007)*. WWF European Policy Office (EPO) and WWF Macro Policy Office: Brussels and Washington DC.
- Snel, M., 2005. *National-level assessment of EC Country Strategy Papers: Tanzania follow-up CSP (2002-2007) review and institutional evaluation*. WWF European Policy Office (EPO) and WWF Macro Policy Office (MPO): Brussels and Washington DC.
- Snel, M., 2005b. *Institutional and policy opportunities to improve environment-poverty streamlining in the CSP process: institutional evaluation at EC level*. WWF European Policy Office (EPO) and WWF Macroeconomic Policy Office: Brussels and Washington DC.
- Snel, M., 2004. *Poverty-environment analytical framework in EC Country Strategy Papers: Rwanda evaluation (2002-2007)*. WWF European Policy Office (EPO) and WWF Macro Policy Office (MPO): Brussels and Washington DC.
- TOR for task team, 2005. *Draft: Terms of Reference for the task team on mainstreaming environment into Rwanda's PRSP II*: Kigali.
- UNDP, 2004. *Project profile: Decentralization and Environmental Management Project (DEMP)*. United Nations Development Program: Kigali.
- Usengumuremyi, M., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Directorate of Strategic Planning and Poverty Reduction Monitoring: Kigali.
- Uwizeye, F., personal communication, 2005. Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines, Lands and the Environment (Mines): Kigali.
- Villa, A., personal communication, 2005. Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda (Rural Economy, Food Security, Decentralization and Environment): Kigali.
- Weber, B. and A. Vedder. *In the kingdom of gorillas: Fragile species in a dangerous land*. Simon and Schuster: New York.

- WWF news, 2004. *Twin mountain gorillas born in Rwanda*. May 21, 2004. Available on-line at: [http://www.panda.org/about\\_wwf/where\\_we\\_work/africa/news/news.cfm?uNewsID=13452](http://www.panda.org/about_wwf/where_we_work/africa/news/news.cfm?uNewsID=13452)



## Appendix 1: List of individuals contacted<sup>30</sup>

- Behm-Mazozera, Anna (consultant) (anna\_behm@yahoo.com)
- Buckara, David, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (Director of Extension) (tintindavid@hotmail.com)
- Boucey, Marc, European Commission, Development Directorate-General (Desk officer) (marc.boucey@cec.eu.int)
- Delaunay-Belleville, Eddy, Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda (Rural Economy, Food Security, Decentralization and Environment Section) (eddy.delaunay-belleville@cec.eu.int)
- Gahamanyi, Vincent, Ministry of Local Government, Community Development & Social Affairs (Common Development Fund) (gahamanyi2000@yahoo.com) Environment (Director of Planning) (
- Hajabakiga, Patricia, Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines, Lands and the Environment (Secretary of State in charge of lands and environment) (phajabakiga@minitere.gov.rw)
- Kalisa, Guy, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (EDF National Authorizing Officer's Support Unit – director a.i.) (guy.kalisa@minecofin.gov.rw)
- (\*) Kalpers, Jose. Office Rwandais du Tourisme et des Parcs Nationaux (Technical advisor) (jkalpers@compuserve.com)
- Karani, Alexis, Ministry of Infrastructure (Energy Directorate) (alkar@mininfra.gov.rw; alkar\_2@yahoo.fr)
- Leeming, Thomas, Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda (Macro support)
- Mashinga, Teobald, , Rwandan Environmental Management Authority (mashingateo@yahoo.com) (or mashingatheo@yahoo.com)
- Mugambira, Jules, Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda (Transport)
- Mukankomeje, Rose, Rwandan Environmental Management Authority (rmukankomeje@yahoo.com)
- Munyanganizi, Bikoro, Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines, Lands and the Environment (Minister of State in Charge of Water and Mines) (bikoro@gov.rw; bikoro@yahoo.fr)
- Mwanafunzi, Bruno, Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines, Lands and the Environment (Director of Water)
- Ngoga, Telespore, Office Rwandais du Tourisme et des Parcs Nationaux (Community conservation manager) (tngoga@rwandatourism.com)
- Neubert, Joel, Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda, (Transport) (email)
- Republic of Rwanda, 2004. *Rwanda Draft Land Bill*. May, 2004. Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines: Kigali.
- Rudasingwa, Laurent, United National Development Programme (Laurent.rudasingwa@undp.org)
- Rugumire, Patrick, Ministry of Infrastructure (Director of Public Works) (diroute@rwanda1.com)
- Rurangwa, Eugene, Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines (Director of Lands) (erburabyo@yahoo.fr)
- Rurangwa, Raphael, International Gorilla Conservation Programme (igcp@rwanda1.com; rrurangwa@igcp.co.rw)
- Ruzigandekwe, Fidele, Office Rwandais du Tourisme et des Parcs Nationaux (Executive Director) (fruziga@rwandatourism.com)

---

<sup>30</sup> (\*) - indicates individuals that were contacted previously (e.g., for a pre-CSP assessment)

- Ruzindaza, Ernest, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock ([ruzindaza.ernest@yahoo.fr](mailto:ruzindaza.ernest@yahoo.fr))
- Rwamucyo, Ernest, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Strategic Planning Unit (Director) ([ernest.rwamucyo@minecofin.gov.rw](mailto:ernest.rwamucyo@minecofin.gov.rw); [Rwamucyo@hotmail.com](mailto:Rwamucyo@hotmail.com))
- Sekata, Aimable, Ministry of Infrastructure ([sekataa@yahoo.fr](mailto:sekataa@yahoo.fr))
- Usengumuremyi, Maximilien, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, Directorate of Strategic Planning and Poverty Reduction Monitoring (Planning officer) ([usengumuremyi@yahoo.fr](mailto:usengumuremyi@yahoo.fr))
- Uwizeye, Fidele, Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines, Lands and the Environment (Mines) ([uwizeyefid@yahoo.fr](mailto:uwizeyefid@yahoo.fr))
- Villa, Alessandro, Delegation of the European Commission in Rwanda (Rural Economy, Food Security, Decentralization and Environment – head of section) ([alessandro.villa@cec.eu.int](mailto:alessandro.villa@cec.eu.int))

## Appendix 2: National- and EC-level questionnaires

**National-level questionnaire:**  
**Questionnaire: Streamlining poverty-environment linkages in the European Community's development assistance**

### **Follow-up CSP review**

- *Rural development (62 million Euro EC funds):* A recent multi-level evaluation (March/April, 2005) highlighted numerous environment-poverty concerns associated with rural development including land scarcity, water degradation, soil erosion, and deforestation. How is modernization of agriculture (e.g., increased fertilizer use/application) anticipated to affect the environment and people? How is the rehabilitation of the primary road between Ruhengeri and Gisenyi (also supported by the EC under the "rural development" focal area) envisioned to impact key economic sectors and in turn the environment (e.g., about parks and protected areas) and poor peoples' livelihoods (improved market access, income generation, etc.)? What are opportunities/synergies to address the environment-poverty concerns?
  
- *Macro support (50 Million Euro EC funds):* How are macroeconomic reforms (privatization, liberalization, etc.) that are supporting (anticipated) growth in the tourism, mining, and other economic sectors (e.g., coffee, tea, pyrethrum, livestock, and textiles) affecting the environment (freshwater, fish, forests, etc.) and the livelihoods of especially the rural poor (their access to natural resources, health, employment, etc.)? Which geographic areas and peoples are affected most? How are people living in poverty benefiting from such (anticipated) growth? Initiatives needed to address the environment-poverty concerns? Possible opportunities/synergies?

### **Institutional evaluation:**

- *Governance (31.9 Million Euro EC funds):* The multi-level analysis (2005) underscored environmental management capacity constraints at the local to national levels and the importance of using the PRPS as a fundamental tool to mainstream environment-poverty issues in national priority setting/planning. How is the PRSP II envisioning to integrate environment-poverty issues (e.g., in programming, budgeting, and monitoring)?

Case studies?

Other contacts?

**EC-level questionnaire:**

**Questionnaire: Streamlining poverty-environment linkages in the European Community's development assistance**

**Follow-up CSP review**

- *Governance (12 Million Euro EC funds – update?):* A recent multi-level analysis (March/April 2005) highlighted environmental management capacity constraints at the local to national levels. How is CSP investment helping address environmental management capacity in Rwanda? Opportunities? Synergies?
- *Rural development (62 million Euro EC funds – update?):* The multi-level evaluation identified various environment-poverty concerns linked to rural development (including land scarcity, water degradation, soil erosion, and deforestation) and underscored the need to increase local to national capacity to promote sustainable agriculture development. How is CSP investment helping address the environment-poverty concerns? How is CSP investment strengthening environmental management capacity in the agricultural sector? How are environment-poverty concerns being considered in rehabilitating the primary road between Ruhengeri and Gisenyi (EIA, environmental screening notes, etc.)?
- *Macro support (50 Million Euro EC funds – update?):* How is CSP investment helping address environment-poverty concerns associated with the (anticipated) growths of tourism, mining, and other key economic sectors (e.g., coffee, tea, pyrethrum, livestock, and textiles)?

**Institutional evaluation:**

- *EC-level:* What types of opportunities exist to improve environment-poverty streamlining at EC-level?
  - *CSP Process:* How was the Rwanda CSP developed? Was representation from the environmental lobby present? If so, who? How were environment-poverty issues integrated in the Country Strategy? Are efforts underway to include a Country Environmental Profile (CEP)<sup>31</sup> in the Rwanda CSP following the mid term review? Why was a CEP not developed for the initial Rwanda CSP (2002)? What tools were used (or would be useful) to help mainstream environment-poverty concerns in the CSP and raise awareness on environment-poverty issues? Level of awareness on environment-poverty issues in the country delegation? What type of follow-up has there been by EC (Brussels) to facilitate environmental streamlining in the CSP? Would this help facilitate environment-poverty streamlining in the CSP process? Have Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) been developed in Rwanda? What CEP and SEA<sup>32</sup> guidelines were used? Opportunities at programming level to improve environment-poverty integration? Possible synergies?
  - *EC involvement in PRSP Process:* Was the EC involved in reviewing the Tanzanian PRPS upon which the CSP heavily relies (e.g., regarding macroeconomic policies' impact on the environment)? Does the Poverty Reduction Budget Support Facility – to which EC funds are channeled under macro support/budget support – check on

---

<sup>31</sup> A CEP provides an overview of: the state of the environment; environmental policy, legislation, and the institutional framework, and recommended priority actions.

<sup>32</sup> A SEA is an overarching assessment at programming level that integrates environment and development issues, provides information on alternative options, and identifies potential environmental impacts of proposed policies and plans.

environmental impacts of proposed investment? Opportunities to improve environment-poverty integration? Synergies?

- *EC investment/project-level*: Are the environmental impacts of projects/programmes financed under the current CSP sector assessed and being monitored? If so, how (EIA, environmental screening notes, etc.)? By whom? Opportunities to strengthen? Possible synergies?

Case studies?

Other contacts?

**Appendix 3:** Background on Rwanda (includes extracts from Bush et al, 2005; other sources – TOR for task team, 2005; Garadi, A., and C. Twesigye-Bakwatsa, 2005; MINITERE, 2005). For more detail refer to Bush et al., 2005 – pp. 1-3.

Rwanda is a small country in the Great Lakes Region of Africa with a population of approximately 8 million inhabitants. Rwanda's population density and growth rates are among the highest in Africa at respectively 321 persons per sq. kilometer and 3.1% (population has nearly quadrupled in the last four decades). Increasing population pressure coupled with a predominance agrarian economy – in which 90% are employed through agriculture – has led to serious land scarcity. An estimated 75% of households currently subsist on 1 hectare or less (of which 54% own 0.5 hectares or less). Rwanda is one of the poorest countries in the world ranking 159 out of 177 countries on the 2004 Human Development Index.

Since the 1960's Rwanda's human environment has been punctuated with violence, immigration, and emigration. During the 1994 genocide up to 1 million individuals were killed, while approximately 3 million fled to neighboring countries. Despite speedy recovery, the country continues to face challenges in the legal system, institutional restructuring, shelter, and demobilization. The conflict has left a very complex legacy of questions including on the assignment of property rights (Government of Rwanda, 2002).

Environmental resources (primarily land, wetlands, forests, and water) continue to support the welfare of the majority of poor Rwandese in which 90% of the population depends on subsistence agriculture, 99% rely on biomass for cooking, 90% depends on biomass for energy, etc. Intensive agriculture, extensive deforestation, and land degradation (caused by significant population pressure) is deteriorating livelihoods especially of the rural poor. The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MINAGRI), for example, estimates that Rwanda loses the capacity to feed 40,000 people each year due to extensive soil erosion, estimated at an annual loss of 945,000 tonnes of organic matter.

Environmental damage has been exacerbated by the resettlement of returning refugees. After the 1994 genocide the government of Rwanda was forced to resettle people into formerly uninhabited natural areas, including the former Gishwati forest and Akagera National Park. This has inevitably led to the overexploitation of natural resources. Resettlement has not only led to deforestation and conversion of natural parks, but has furthermore accelerated deforestation outside of reserves and parks.

Destruction of environmental resources including watersheds and wetlands are having significant economic repercussions. The current energy crisis – that has resulted in the decline of almost 50% of the national electricity supply – has been directly linked to declining water flows at the hydroelectric power station (between Lakes Bulera and Ruhondo) that in turn has been caused by upstream deforestation and wetland degradation (refer to Box 2 – section 5).