

**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

**Poverty-environment analytical framework in  
EC Country Strategy Papers:  
Rwanda evaluation (2002 – 2007)<sup>1</sup>  
Activity 1.1 – 1.4**

July 2004

**1. Background and methodology**

This report reviews environment-poverty concerns of EC funded initiatives proposed in the Rwanda Country Strategy Paper (CSP) for 2002 - 2007. The study uses a previously developed methodology that was recently used to assess environment-poverty concerns for the EC funded Tanzania and Madagascar CSPs (Snel, 2004). This study may be considered an addendum to this previous evaluation.

As with Snel (2004), this evaluation uses a two-tiered approach to assess environment-poverty weaknesses and to identify possible response strategies and interventions.

- 1) The first tier uses a qualitative assessment to evaluate whether key environment-poverty links and environmental considerations were acknowledged in the CSP.
- 2) The second tier evaluates environment-poverty weaknesses – that have been identified based on the above review - in more detail.

A recent award granted to the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) by the European Community's Poverty Reduction Effectiveness Program (EC-PREP's) - composed of a steering committee with DFID and EC officials - will provide funds to conduct this environment-poverty evaluation of the Rwanda CSP in greater depth. The follow up detailed assessment – involving in-country fieldwork - will be conducted 2004 and 2005. Results of this follow up research will be available December 2005. This current evaluation is considered a preliminary evaluation upon which the subsequent assessment will be based.

---

<sup>1</sup> This report was written by Mathilde Snel ([mathildesnel@hotmail.com](mailto:mathildesnel@hotmail.com)), a consultant contracted by WWF. This report is based on a methodology previously developed to evaluate "Environmental mainstreaming in EC Country Strategy Papers: An evaluation of the Tanzania (2000) and Madagascar (2001) Country Strategies" (Snel, 2004). Overall supervision was given by Hervé Lefeuvre (WWF-EPO, [Hlefeuvre@wwfepo.org](mailto:Hlefeuvre@wwfepo.org)), Dawn Montanye ([Dawn.Montanye@WWFUS.ORG](mailto:Dawn.Montanye@WWFUS.ORG)), David Reed (WWF-MPO, [Reedd@wwfus.org](mailto:Reedd@wwfus.org)), and Jenny Springer (WWF-MPO, [jenny.springer@wwfus.org](mailto:jenny.springer@wwfus.org)).

## 2. Overview of paper

This paper is divided into the following sections:

- a background discussion of the Rwanda CSP (Section 3);
- an evaluation of environment-poverty integration in the Rwanda CSP (Tier 1 evaluation) (Section 4);
- identification of environment-poverty weaknesses in the Rwanda CSP (Tier 2) (Section 5);
- case studies/descriptions of the environment-poverty gaps of the Rwanda CSP (Section 6);
- response strategies and opportunities to address the environment-poverty concerns (Section 7).

Recommendations on response strategies have been developed to be of relevance to WWF – specifically to WWF’s Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office (EARPO) responsible for Rwanda – as well as to the EC Rwanda country delegation, and other Rwandan stakeholders (e.g., government agencies, private institutions, and other NGOs). It is recommended that WWF seek alignment with initiatives in Rwanda’s focal ecoregions to address the environment-poverty concerns: for Rwanda, **the Albertine Rift Montane Forests, East African Moorlands, and Rift Valley Lakes ecosystems**.

## 3. Review of the Rwanda CSP

Over the period 2002 – 2007 the EC is allocating under the 9<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund (EDF) a total amount of 186 million Euro to the Government of Rwanda. An amount of 124 million Euro (Envelope A) is being allocated to support the following three core areas:

- *Rural Development*: 62 million Euro (50% of Envelope A budget);
- *Macro support*: 50 million Euro (40%); and
- *Good governance/institutional support*: 12 million Euro (10%).

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

- Support for a community development program that emphasizes modernization of the agricultural sector (e.g., increased fertilizer use, dissemination of seeds, provision of credit, etc.) (25 million Euro).
- Development of a transportation network to improve rural access especially in northwest Rwanda. This emphasizes the rehabilitation of a primary road between Ruhengeri and Gisenyi (25 million Euro) (Aubry, personal communication, 2004)<sup>2</sup>.
- Implementation of water and sanitation programs, with an emphasis on northwest and central provinces (e.g., Ruhengeri and Gitarama) (10 million Euro).
- Dissemination of information on current land reform (1 million Euro).
- Development of an agriculture information system to support food security (1 million Euro).

*Macro support* promotes the current Structural Adjustment Program (SAP III) (50 million Euro) and funds in particular current macro economic reforms for Rwanda. Seventy percent of the *macro support* budget is being used to support macro economic reform initiatives described in Rwanda’s Poverty Reduction Growth Facility (e.g., privatisation), while the remaining 30% of

---

<sup>2</sup> During the Mid Term Review there was discussion of possibly transferring the rehabilitation of these roads under the administration of a “transport” core area (Pillet, personal communication, 2004).

the macro support budget is being used to support non-targeted health and educational programs<sup>3</sup> (Thiollier, personal communication, 2004).

EC funding for *good governance* in Rwanda is under the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF: supporting institutions (including support for democratisation and reconciliation initiatives) (6 million Euro); integrating and mobilizing vulnerable groups in urban districts (3 million Euro); supporting civil society participation and programs (2 million Euro); and promoting regional integration efforts (e.g., improving regional and domestic trade) (1 million Euro).

In addition to the above Envelope A funding, an amount of 62 million Euro (under Envelope B) is being allocated to cover unforeseen expenses. Such unforeseen expenses include emergency assistance, debt relief, and export stabilization. The current Mid Term Review of the Rwanda CSP is considering to shift Envelope B funding to support Envelope A activities. This funding reallocation will likely emphasize rural development and macro support initiatives under Envelope A (Krissler, personal communication, 2004).

#### **4. Environmental-poverty integration in the Rwanda CSP (Tier 1)**

This section provides an overview of the extent to which environment-poverty issues have been mentioned and integrated in the Rwanda CSP. This evaluation is structured about key environment-poverty questions previously identified in the methodology of Snel (2004):

1. Were environment-poverty linkages mentioned in the CSP? Does the CSP acknowledge that:
  - i. Poor people disproportionately depend on natural resources for their livelihood (livelihood dependence on environmental resources)?
  - ii. People living in poverty are more likely to be disempowered through poorly defined land rights, inadequate access to information, and legal rights (access to environmental resources, justice, and information)?
  - iii. Poor people are more likely to be exposed to deteriorating environmental conditions (health and environmental quality)?
  - iv. People living in poverty are at higher risk to be exposed to – and have fewer means to cope with – natural and man-made disasters (vulnerability to environmental disasters)?
  
2. Are environmental-poverty issues integrated in the discussion of the relevant core areas, e.g.,
  - i. Rural development?
  - ii. Macro support (e.g., privatisation of mining, tourism, etc.)?
  - iii. Good governance?
  - iv. Etc.
  
3. How were environmental issues integrated in the CSP?
  - i. Was a Country Environmental Profile (CEP)<sup>4</sup> developed for the CSP?
  - ii. Was a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)<sup>5</sup> requested or developed?

---

<sup>3</sup> The macro economic reform initiatives will use IMF benchmarks, while the health and education programs will rely on performance based indicators (e.g., primary school and health indicators).

<sup>4</sup> A CEP is a brief overview of country conditions (physical, economic, social, etc.); summary of the state of the environment; overview of the environmental policies, legislative, and institutional frameworks; and recommended priority actions (Davalos, 2002).

iii. Other?

#### **4.1. Rwanda CSP: environment-poverty integration**

##### *4.1.a. Livelihood dependence on environmental resources*

**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 Européenne, 2003, p. 8)<sup>6</sup>. Furthermore, the CSP indicates that the civil war of 1994 led to “loss of ...livestock”, decline of agricultural productivity, deterioration of trade, the “progressive deterioration of the environment” and made “living conditions of the population, already precarious [worsen]” (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenne, 2003, p. 3).

##### *4.1.b. Access to environmental resources, justice, and information*

**The CSP highlights** – as does the Rwanda PRSP – **the importance of land as an asset to rural populations**: “Land is the most important productive asset owned by most Rwandese households” (Government of Rwanda, 2002, p. 41). In many instances, following the civil war the only asset many poor rural families had was land, albeit small parcels: livestock, crops, and other material assets were usually damaged, vandalized, or stolen during the war.

The importance of land has made land reforms a particularly important, albeit controversial, issue in Rwanda. A Land Policy and Land Law are currently in draft. The draft land policy and law attempt to resolve land disputes by – among other things – requiring land registration (based on a reformed cadastral system), imposing a land tax, and allowing transfer of title deeds (with prior consent of all family members). Furthermore, under the draft Land Law, land that has been undeveloped for more than three years reverts to the State’s private domain (Government of Rwanda, 2002).

While the current land reforms are in principle oriented towards improving land management, the possibility of transferring title deeds coupled with Rwanda’s current emphasis on privatisation may open up areas to rapid exploitation and significantly restrict access of land and natural resources by especially the rural poor. **There is no discussion in the CSP on how the current land reforms coupled with privatisation** -including that of natural resource assets such as crops and minerals - **will affect the environment and poor people’s future access to land and natural resources.**

**Concerning access to information and justice, the Rwanda CSP does highlight** - in light of the 1994 genocide in Rwanda - **the need to support democratisation, national reconciliation, and decentralization initiatives.** EC funds are in part being used to address the backlog of individuals involved in the genocide - an estimated 107,000 people are in prison on suspicion of genocide-related crimes – and to promote information dissemination, such as on current land reforms.

##### *4.1.c. Health and environmental quality*

By mentioning that “integrated water resources management [is a] strategy to reduce poverty”, **the CSP suggests that water degradation affects in particular poor people. Specific mention**

---

<sup>5</sup> A SEA is an overarching assessment that at the programming level integrates environment and development issues, provides information on alternative options, and identifies potential environmental impacts of proposed policies and plans (Davalos, 2002).

<sup>6</sup> All subsequent quotes from the Rwandan CSP have been translated from the original French version.

**of the degradation of other natural resources – such as of land due to increased fertilizer use – and its impact on the rural poor is** however **not discussed.**

#### *4.1.d. Vulnerability to natural and human-induced disasters*

Given Rwanda's recent history of civil war and the 1994 genocide – that resulted in the deaths of more than 1 million people and the displacement of more than 40% of the population - **special attention is given throughout the Rwanda CSP on the need to address conflict resolution, reconciliation, justice, and democratization.** The CSP indicates that, “The genocide exacerbated [poverty incidence]... climbing to 70%” (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenne, 2003, p. 9): prior to the war in 1993 poverty incidence stood at 53%. The CSP furthermore indicates that conflict has led to the appearance of “new vulnerable groups”, namely widowed women, wives of prisoners, and child-headed households (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenne, 2003, p. 8).

**While the CSP makes clear links between the impacts of conflict on people's livelihoods, specific impacts of the war on the environment are not articulated.** The civil war's impact, such as on forest encroachment and increased poaching, are not explicitly mentioned in the Rwanda CSP.

Although the CSP makes little reference to natural disasters, **the CSP generally indicates that especially poor segments of society's are vulnerable to natural disasters such as drought.** EC funds, under the “Rural Development” core area, are being used to develop an agricultural information system to among other things help monitor agricultural productivity and improve food security.

#### *4.2. Environmental/poverty integration in the core areas*

This section specifically evaluates the extent to which each core area – in the case of the Rwanda CSP rural development, macro support, and good governance – integrates and acknowledges environment/poverty concerns.

##### *4.2.a. Rural development: Rwanda CSP*

EC funds in the “rural development” core area are being used to support increased agricultural production, improved market access, raised awareness on land reform, and provision of potable water and sanitation.

##### *Increased agricultural production*

**Despite aiming to increase fertilizer use by almost eight-fold between 2001 and 2005, the Rwanda CSP does not mention the possible environmental and human health consequences of such intensive input use.** Although fertilizer use in Rwanda is currently limited and unlikely to cause environmental problems in the near future (Delaunay-Belleville, personal communication, 2004), intensive future fertilizer may pose environmental threats if unsustainably used over a long period of time. Such threats include ground and surface water contamination, algae growth, fish population decline, and human health consequences (see also Section 6.1.a). Owing to the rural poor's dependence on natural resources, such environmental risks are likely to bear greater negative consequences on the poor peoples' livelihoods.

##### *Improved market access*

**The CSP does not mention possible environment impacts due to improved market access – namely through the proposed rehabilitation of a primary road between Ruhengeri and Gisenyi.** Although improved market access can be an important means to alleviate poverty,

opening up rural areas – especially in countries with weak environmental regulatory frameworks - may have significant environmental impacts and in turn harm especially the livelihoods of poor people. Environmental impacts due to improved access may include increased forest encroachment, land clearing for agriculture, and rapid (and often uncontrolled) extraction of natural resources.

#### *Land reform*

While the CSP does mention that land reforms will be critical towards securing people's rights, **there is no discussion on how the contentious land reforms - coupled with current privatisation in Rwanda - could restrict the rural poor's access to land and natural resources** (see Section 6.3.b. for more detail on Rwanda's land reforms). The CSP does, however, mention that the 1994 Rwanda civil war led to significant movements of people who were displaced from their land: approximately 40% of the population were displaced during the conflict.

#### *Water access and sanitation*

**The CSP does mention that improving water access and sanitation** - a key goal of the Rural Development core area - **are needed to improve water quality and in turn poor people's living conditions.** Under the Rwanda CSP 10, million Euro will be allocated towards the implementation of water and sanitation programs, particular in the Ruhengeri and Gitarama provinces (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenne, 2003).

#### *4.2.b. Macro support: Rwanda CSP*

As previously mentioned the Government of Rwanda will use EC funds under the macro support core area to promote macro economic reforms and improve education and health services. While various initiatives under the macro support core area are specifically geared towards alleviating poverty - such as by improving health and education facilities - **the environmental implications of various macro support initiatives that support the privatisation of the agricultural, mining, tourism, and other potential growth sectors are not discussed.** In many other countries with poor environmental regulatory frameworks, rapid privatisation has significantly deteriorated natural resources upon which poor people's livelihoods significantly depend (Reed, 2001). **In Rwanda rapid expansion of the coffee, tea and pyrethrum, tourism, and mining sectors could pose significant environmental threats, in turn damaging livelihood of especially the rural poor.** As discussed in detail in Section 6.2, **expansion of the mining sector alone is already attributable for forest degradation, water pollution, and erosion in Rwanda.**

#### *4.2.c. Good governance: Rwanda CSP*

While the CSP generally notes of the need to “reinforce institutional capacity in the environmental sector” (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenne, 2003, p. 24), **the CSP in its discussion of the good governance core area does not specifically indicate the need to strengthen good environmental governance in Rwanda.** Furthermore, although the CSP mentions the need “to stop the illegal exploitation of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of Congo” (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenne, 2003, p. 8) - where Rwanda troops were stationed in the late 1990s and early 2000s and withdrawn in 2002 - **no specific reference is made on the need to improve transparency to deter similar future illicit exploitation of natural resources.**

#### *4.3. Other (CEP, SEA, etc.)*

##### *4.3.a. Country Environmental Profile (CEP)*

**The Rwanda CSP does not include a Country Environmental Profile (CEP)** (see footnote #4 on a definition of a CEP). A CEP was, however, included in hindsight in the 2003 Joint Annual Report (Krissler, communication, 2004).

#### *4.3.b. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)*

**No Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) were included or requested in the Rwanda CSP** (see footnote #5 for an explanation on SEA). In the Rwanda CSP, SEAs would likely have been useful to assess environment/livelihood impacts due to road rehabilitation (e.g., of the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi primary road) and privatisation of industries (e.g., in the mining, agriculture, and tourism sectors).

#### *4.3.c. Other*

**General reference is made throughout the Rwandan CSP e.g., on the need to “systematically integrate environmental impacts”** (République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenne, 2003, p. 24) and to develop environmental, conservation, and land policies (e.g., the National plan for the Environment, the Action Plan for Biodiversity Conservation, and Land Law). Nonetheless, as indicated above, no SEAs were requested at programming level in the Rwanda CSP.

### **5. Environment-poverty weaknesses in the Rwanda CSP (Tier 2)**

In this section - the Tier 2 evaluation - environment-poverty weaknesses have been identified based on the above review and evaluated in more detail to identify possible intervention strategies to address the environment-poverty concerns. The assessment specifically evaluates how EC investment in the relevant core area (e.g., rural development, macro support, etc.) is affecting (or anticipated to affect):

- The quality of environmental resources upon which poor peoples heavily depend (e.g., income streams from natural resources, revenue sharing, etc.);
- Poor people’s access to land and natural resources, information, and justice (e.g., their rights to use and own land);
- Their health – particularly if environmental quality is deteriorating or anticipated to deteriorate (e.g., water and air degradation); and
- Their means to cope to environmental disasters (e.g., to floods, droughts, famine, conflicts, etc.).

Based on the above review, various questions have been identified highlighting environment-poverty weaknesses for each EC funded core area described in the Rwanda CSP. **It should be emphasized that the below indicated questions are specifically interesting in quering on environmental/livelihood challenges. This is not to say that the Rwanda CSP is not supporting various initiatives that are promoting poor people’s livelihoods and the environment.** As previously noted, the EC is funding, for example, various initiatives - including to improve water access and sanitation - that are explicitly geared towards ameliorating the environment and poor people’s livelihoods.

- Rural development
  - *Environmental consequences:* How is modernization of agriculture – including a proposed eight-fold increased use in fertilizers – anticipated to affect the environment? How will this impact forests, fish, fresh water, biodiversity, etc.? How is the rehabilitation of a primary road between Ruhengeri and Gisenyi (60km) envisioned to impact the environment?

- *Livelihood consequences*: How is modernization of the agricultural sector and road rehabilitation envisioned to impact poor people's lives? Their income generation, employment opportunities, market access, health, access to resources and land, etc.?
- *Response strategies*: What interventions are needed to deal with the anticipated environment/livelihood concerns?
- Macro support
  - *Environmental consequences*: How is growth (current or anticipated) in the following sectors impacting/anticipated to impact the environment – forests, fresh water, fish, etc?
    - Agriculture (e.g., coffee, tea, pyrethrum<sup>7</sup>, rice, maize, potatoes, soya, and beans)
    - Livestock
    - Mining (e.g., of coltan<sup>8</sup>, gold, and sapphires)
    - Tourism
    - Other?
  - *Livelihood consequences*: How will growth of the above sectors impact poor people's livelihoods? Their access to resources and land, employment opportunities, human health, etc.? Who are currently benefiting (or anticipated to benefit) from growth in these sectors?
  - *Response strategies*: What interventions are needed to help ensure that poor people benefit from growth in the above noted sectors?
- Good governance
  - *Environmental consequences*: To what extent has Rwanda developed a regulatory environmental management framework?
  - *Livelihood consequences*: How will land reforms (the new Land Policy and Land Law) affect poor people's rights and access to land and natural resources?
  - *Response strategies*: What interventions are needed to improve good *environmental* governance in Rwanda?

## **6. Case studies/description of environment-poverty weaknesses of the Rwanda CSP**

Various documents concerning the above noted environment-poverty weaknesses have been used in the subsequent review. These documents were solicited from staff (e.g., at the Rwanda EC country delegation and WWF EARPO - see Annex 1 for a list of individuals contacted) and downloaded off the web. Due to time constraints, follow up with EC and WWF staff was kept to a minimum. It is recommended that additional information is solicited from various individuals when this research is conducted in more detail with EC-PREP funding (see asterices next to names of individuals in Annex 1 for which further follow-up is needed). While many of the subsequent case studies do not always specifically refer to EC funded initiatives, they do indicate how EC funding for similar projects may lead to comparable environment/livelihood concerns.

### **6.1. Rural development, environment, and livelihoods**

#### **6.1.a. Modernizing the agricultural sector**

As previously mentioned, the Rwanda CSP and PRSP emphasize modernizing agriculture, including extensively increasing fertilizer use. While fertilizer use – currently low - does not pose

---

<sup>7</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>8</sup> Coltan, also referred to as colombo-tantalite, is an expensive metal that is used in mobile phones (The Guardian, 2004). Tantalum oxide – a heat resistant powder that can hold high electric charges - is extracted from coltan (Knight Ridder Newspapers, 2003).



an environmental threat in Rwanda, its rapid and unsustainable use may entail future environment risks that in turn threaten livelihoods. If poorly regulated intensive input use can lead to agro-chemical leeching in ground and surface water, deteriorate biodiversity in surrounding rivers and lakes, and increase occurrence of disease.

**Areas considered to be especially vulnerable to the consequences of extensive fertilizer use in Rwanda** - should its use be rapid and unsustainable - **are namely, although not exclusively, concentrated in the northwest.** More specifically, such areas include:

- regions where tea and coffee are grown - for the most part scattered throughout the country (although coffee plantations are particularly found in the Gitarama, Kibuye, and Butare provinces);
- regions with high pyrethrum potential - currently geographically concentrated in Ruhengeri and Gisenyi; and
- areas where other agricultural crops such as potatoes, fruits and vegetables are cultivated - grown primarily in Ruhengeri, Gisenyi, and Kigali-Ngali (Government of Rwanda, 2002; Delaunay-Belleville, personal communication, 2004).

Of the above noted crops, the crops most likely to benefit from fertilizer use, and in turn at highest risk to its intensive use, are Rwanda's main export crops - tea and coffee – in addition to pyrethrum (Delaunay-Belleville, personal communication, 2004)<sup>9</sup>. Regulatory frameworks need to be developed and/or strengthened to ensure that fertilizer use, especially in coffee, tea, and pyrethrum plantations, is kept to sustainable levels.

#### *6.1.b. Road development*

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 very poor condition, in which stretches are dirt road and inaccessible during the rainy season. Road works will likely entail rehabilitating the entire road to bituminous/gravel status and may (or may not) entail widening the road (Aubry, personal communication, 2004).

The EC will conduct a study in a couple of months concerning the technical and economic feasibility of the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road rehabilitation. This study is anticipated to include a short section on environmental impacts. The study will also include a section on the feasibility of rehabilitating the Kigali and Gisenyi road: road rehabilitation that may be funded under a future EDF (Aubry, personal communication, 2004).

While improving market access can be an important means to alleviate poverty, opening up rural areas – especially in countries with weak environmental regulatory frameworks – can have negative environmental consequences. **Considering that** Rwanda's environmental regulatory framework is still evolving and that **the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road rehabilitation will improve access to an area with high agricultural and tourism potential, environmental impacts may be anticipated.**

As previously indicated (see Section 6.1.a. above) northwest Rwanda is known for its high agricultural potential: this in large part due to the region's highly fertile volcanic highland soils. Improved access to this area will, especially in one of the Africa's most densely populated countries, likely increase land clearing for agriculture, forest encroachment, and extraction of natural resources - especially of forest resources that continue to be used as the primary source of

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that coffee and tea account for respectively 49% and 44% of Rwanda's export earnings (MINITERE, 2003b).

energy in Rwanda (MINITERE, 2003). Furthermore, increased cultivation in this area of high relief and precipitation pose significant erosion risks: "...soil degradation affects a big part of [Rwanda], particularly fragile ecosystems of mountain regions in the North and in the West" (MINITERE, 2003b, p. 38). Erosion in Rwanda is already responsible for washing away annually an estimated 557 tons/ha (MINTERE, 2003b).

In addition to agricultural potential, northwest Rwanda also has high tourism potential. The Volcanoes national park - located in northwest Rwanda - is known for one of the world's few remaining mountain gorilla populations (see also Section 6.2.b). In addition Gisenyi, situated on the eastern shore of Lake Kivu, is a lakeside resort town that already attracts wealthier Rwandans, expatriates, and travellers. While tourism can generate much needed foreign income, rapid and poorly regulated growth has the potential to carry various negative environmental/livelihood consequences including soil compaction, water degradation and depletion, changes in species populations and composition, and introduction of invasive species.

In addition to environment/livelihood implications for Rwanda, the rehabilitation of the Ruhengeri-Gisenyi road - located close to the border of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) – is furthermore envisioned to improve market access for DRC exports (Aubry, personal communication, 2004). Such improved access may lead to further expansion of natural resources-based industries based out of the DRC and its contentious re-export in Rwanda (see Section 6.2.c. on past accusations of Rwanda's involvement in the illicit re-export of DRC natural resources).

## **6.2. Macro support, environment, and livelihoods**

The majority of EC funds for the macro support core area will go towards supporting Rwanda's macro economic reforms: as already noted 70% will be allocated to promote reforms articulated in Rwanda's Poverty Reduction Growth Facility, while the remaining 30% will be used for education and health initiatives. Privatisation, a principle economic reform in Rwanda, is envisioned to lead to growth in the agricultural, mining, tourism, and livestock sectors. Growth in other industries – such textile, sugar, and fruit juice industries – is also anticipated.

### *6.2.a. Agricultural growth*

Agricultural growth stands central to Rwanda's economic reforms. Growth of coffee and tea plantations as well as other agricultural markets (e.g., pyrethrum, rice, maize, sorghum, potatoes, beans, and bananas) is actively being promoted through privatisation. Already numerous coffee factories in Rwanda have been sold (i.e., Gikondo, Nkora, and Masaka) and tea factories are being privatised: Sorwathé has already been privatised while the Mata, Kitabi, Gisakura, and Shagasha tea factories will be privatised in 2004 (Privatisation Program, 2004). In addition various agribusinesses - such as tanneries, diaries, and pyrethrum, maize, sugar factories - have been sold (Privatisation Program, 2004).

Privatised plantations and companies, that typically have larger revenues, tend to spend greater amounts of money on increased input use. **Between 2000 and 2001 alone increased private sector activity in the coffee and tea industries prompted a threefold increase in fertilizer use** (Government of Rwanda, 2002). As previously mentioned, while fertilizer use is currently not problematic in Rwanda (Delaunay-Belleville, personal communication, 2004), continued intensive use of fertilizers over long periods of time may pose future threats to Rwanda's environment and in turn people's livelihoods (see previous Section 6.1.a). Leaching of agrochemicals in surface and ground water may be of particular concern, especially upon considering that wetlands and aquatic lands in Rwanda represent approximately 15% of national territory, 9% of which is lakes and rivers and 6% marshes (MINITERE, 2003).

**Competition from large plantations and commercial farms – who may become monopoly buyers - may furthermore jeopardize livelihoods of especially the rural poor** that depend on agriculture as their main source of income: 90% of the Rwandan population is currently employed in the agriculture sector (Government of Rwanda, 2002). To address this issue the Rwanda government is in the coffee and tea sectors developing a voluntary framework of cooperation between smallholder farmers and the tea and coffee factories to ensure that tea and coffee are not only grown on the large plantations but also bought from smallholder farmers. The extent to which such measures are protecting smallholder farmers needs to be further explored. Furthermore, there have been various fair trade initiatives to support smallholder Rwandan coffee farmers. A recent initiative funded by the USAID and other donors, for example, resulted in increasing smallholder coffee farmer revenue by almost threefold<sup>10</sup> (BBC, 2003).

#### *6.2.b. Growth in the tourism sector*

Prior to 1994, tourism was a major foreign currency earner in Rwanda. Since the 1994 civil war, however, tourism numbers have dwindled: 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). 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. The new tourism strategy emphasizes two types of tourism.

- 1) Nature-based tourism that will be centred around visiting Rwanda's primates: namely Rwanda's mountain gorillas in the Volcanoes National Park<sup>11</sup> and other unique primates such as the black and white colobus monkeys and eastern chimpanzees (e.g., in the Nyungwe forest<sup>12</sup>).
- 2) Historic tourism that will be focused on Rwanda's recent past and pre-colonial history (Environmental News Network, 2003).

While tourism can provide an important source of foreign income, its development must be coupled with effective regulatory framework that minimizes environmental damage (WWF news, 2004). **Rwanda fortunately has various success stories that it can point to regarding its tourism policies and initiatives. Current policies in Rwanda, for example, strictly restrict the number of visitors that may visit mountain gorilla's:** 11,000 visitors per year - 8 visitors a day - can get permits to see Rwanda's mountain gorillas (Kalpers, personal communication, 2004; New York Times, 2004). Visitors are in addition required to keep a minimum of 7 metres distance from the gorillas to minimize disease transmission (IGCP,). The International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) – an initiative set up by WWF, African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), and Fauna and Flora International (FFI)<sup>13</sup> – has been a front runner in effective protection of mountain gorilla populations in Rwanda and neighbouring Uganda and the DRC<sup>14</sup> (WWF Eastern Africa Programme, 2004). Despite the challenges of political turmoil, staff shortages, and refugee influxes, mountain gorilla populations have been maintained. **Mountain gorilla populations have even recently been shown to have increased during the past 15 years from 624 in 1989 to approximately 700 today** (WWF news, 2004).

---

<sup>10</sup> Significantly declining world prices for coffee has threatened the livelihoods of many of Rwanda's smallholder coffee farmers.

<sup>11</sup> The Volcanoes National Park is located in the Vigunga Mountains range of northwest Rwanda.

<sup>12</sup> The Nyungwe forest is located in southern Rwanda.

<sup>13</sup> The IGCP is currently focusing its efforts on the Virunga Volcanoes and the Bwindi Impenetrable forests (WWF Eastern Africa Program, 2004).

<sup>14</sup> Mountain gorilla populations in the DRC are found in the Virunga National Park, while in Uganda in the Bwindi Impenetrable and Mgahinga national parks.

**Efforts to manage other areas with tourism potential in Rwanda have, however, not always been as successful. In the Akagera National Park, for example, thousands of animals have been lost due to heavy poaching during Rwanda's war in 1994.** Buffalo numbers have decreased twenty-fold from 10,000 in 1990 to 491 in 2002 and impala populations have dwindled by fifteen-fold from 30,000 in 1990 to 1,890 in 2002. Two-thirds of the park, about 666 square miles, was furthermore gazetted to resettle land-seeking Tutsi refugees that returned in 1997 after living years in exile in the DRC, Tanzania, and Uganda. The settlers currently use the land to graze livestock near, and often inside, the unfenced park (Courier Journal, 2004). A lodge in the park was recently privatised in the hopes of reviving tourism in this area.

#### *6.2.c. Increased extraction of minerals*

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, including through tariff reductions and export tax removals. **Most mining in Rwanda is 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 already led to environmental concerns. **The search for gold and more recently for coltan – particularly in the Nyungwe forest – has led to the degradation of forests and protected areas. Mining industries in Rutongo and Gatumba have polluted the Nyabarongo and Nyabugogo rivers** with sediments and clay (MINITERE, 2003). In addition **quarries for brick making and the exploitation of lime, sand, and stones** - especially where pits have been left open - **has increased erosion** throughout Rwanda (MINITERE, 2003c).

In addition to growing concerns of an expanding mining industry – albeit currently small - in Rwanda, **Rwanda's alleged involvement in the extraction of natural resources in neighbouring DRC has been cause for concern.** While Rwandan soldiers formerly pulled out of the DRC in 2002, the Rwanda army was implicated in exploiting DRC's natural resources, in particular coltan and diamonds, in the late 1990s and early 2000s. In 1999, an estimated 60% of DRC's coltan - resulting in earnings of US\$250 million every 18 months - was according to a report by the United Nations (2002) mined under the surveillance of the Rwandan government. Furthermore, in 2000 it was alleged that the Rwandan forces were involved in monthly diamond sales - mined in eastern DRC - of an estimated value of US\$2million. **Rapid and unregulated mining of coltan has had devastating impacts on the environment in the DRC, particularly on two DRC World Heritage sites, the Kahuzi-Biega National Park and Okapi Wildlife Reserve** (IUCN, 2001). In the Kahuzi-Biega National Park alone, populations of eastern lowland gorillas have declined eight-fold from 8000 before the war to 1000 in 2003, while the poaching of elephants for ivory resulted in the dramatic decline of elephant families in which only 2 out of 250 elephant families remained in 2000 (IUCN, 2001; Knight Ridder Newspapers, 2003).

There is continued concern that regional incentive to re-export minerals from DRC via Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda, in addition to Rwanda's influence in DRC public utilities (e.g., various bosses of DRC public utilities are Rwandan) will continue to play a role in unregulated exploitation of DRC minerals (The Guardian, 2004). Further research needs to be conducted on the extent of re-exporting of DRC minerals in Rwanda and on opportunities to curtail (or make legitimate) such re-export.

#### *6.2.d. Expansion of the livestock sector*

Structural reforms in Rwanda are aiming to increase livestock levels through – among other things - privatisation and liberalization of the livestock industry (Government of Rwanda, 2002).

**There is noticeable rapid development of ranching in eastern Rwanda** - such as in Umutara province which has more than 30% of the country's livestock - **and in the former forest of Gishwati** in northern Rwanda (MINITERE, 2003; MINITERE, 2003b). Furthermore, considerable livestock potential is envisioned in Gisenyi and Ruhengeri (Government of Rwanda, 2002).

Pastoral areas are often victim to overgrazing, bush fires, treading, soil degradation, and erosion (MINITERE, 2003b). Such environmental threats in particular affect the rural poor whose health and livelihoods are directly affected by deteriorating quality of soils, water, and other natural resources.

#### *6.2.e. Growth in other sectors/industries*

Structural reforms in Rwanda are promoting growth in a large array of other industries, including in textiles and sugar. Although these industries are currently few and small/medium sized, environmental threats have already been documented. **Industrial dumping of effluents** with no prior treatment **has been observed at the Kabuye sugar factory and about various textile and iron factories in Rwanda** (MINITERE, 2003). **The dumping of these untreated effluents and by-products is jeopardizing in particular wetlands:** most small industries in Rwanda are found in or near wetlands.

### **6.3. Good governance/institutional support**

*6.3.a. Environmental management regulatory framework: Good environmental governance*  
**Rwanda's environmental management framework is**, as in many other developing countries, **evolving and poorly regulated**. While Rwanda has various new environmental policies - including a National Environmental Plan (adopted in 1991), National Forestry Plan (1986 –1997), and Agricultural Development Policy (1997) - **various existing laws are old, unknown, and/or poorly enforced**: “In Rwanda, the legal framework suffers from lack and/or non application of regulations governing environment” (MINITERE, 2003b, p. 48) and “In Rwanda, the current institutional framework for environmental protection and management shows a certain number of weaknesses [in] its effectiveness and efficiency” (MINETERE, 2003c).

#### *6.3.b. Land reform*

The Rwandan government is in the process of finalizing a new Land Policy and Land Law. The policy emphasizes decentralization, grouped settlement and urbanization, and improved land use planning and management. The new land policies highlights in particular the need for land registration, property rights, land use and planning, and land information systems (Lindoro, personal communication, 2004; Pillet, personal communication, 2004).

Upon considering that Rwanda is one of Africa's most densely populated countries in Africa - in which approximately 260 persons live per square kilometre - land reform is understandably a contentious issue. Land shortage has already necessitated the settlement of people on land unsuitable for cultivation, e.g, where crops are planted on marginal land with slopes of up to more than 80%. **The implications of Rwanda' current land reform coupled with privatisation trends** (of industries and land) on **especially the rural poor needs to be evaluated in more detail**.

## **7. Response strategies to address the environment-poverty concerns of the Rwanda CSP**

The following section describes response strategies that the WWF Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office (EARPO), the EC Rwanda country delegation, and other stakeholders (Rwandan government agencies, private institutions, and other NGOs) may consider in

addressing the above noted environment/livelihood concerns of the Rwanda CSP (see previous Section 6). It is recommended that collaborative approaches and synergies are sought wherever possible<sup>15</sup>. More specifically, it is recommended that WWF seek alignment with initiatives in Rwanda's focal ecoregions: namely the Albertine Rift Mountain Forests, East African Moolands, and Rift Valley Lakes ecoregions. More general recommendations directed to the Commission's headquarters – such as to EuropeAid and the Development DG - have not been mentioned below. These were previously described in detail by Snel (2004) and have been summarized in Annex 2.

### **7.1. WWF Regional Programme Office (EARPO), the EC, and other stakeholders**

- Agriculture
  - **Synergies need to be developed with current agricultural and/or related initiatives to address possible future extensive fertilizer use in Rwanda.** This includes strengthening continued agricultural research and the promotion of environmental friendly agricultural methods - particularly concerning (organic) input use and agro-forestry methods. Owing to high agricultural potential in northwest Rwanda, coupled with the anticipated improved market access in this region (see also below under “Transport”), **special attention needs to be given to developing/strengthening initiatives in northwest Rwanda.** More specifically, regions where tea and coffee are grown (for the most part scattered throughout the country); regions with high pyrethrum potential (currently geographically concentrated in Ruhengeri and Gisenyi); and areas where other agricultural crops are cultivated (primarily in Ruhengeri, Gisenyi, and Kigali-Ngali) need to be prioritized.
- Transport
  - WWF, the EC Rwanda country delegation, and other stakeholders will need to seek collaborative approaches and synergies with existing programs to address environmental/livelihood concerns due to improved road access in northwest Rwanda – anticipated as a result of the EC funded road rehabilitation between Ruhengeri and Gisenyi. **Particular attention needs to be given to spill-over effects of the road rehabilitation on the growth of the agricultural and tourism sectors.** While such growth can help alleviate poverty, given Rwanda's poor environmental regulatory framework negative environmental impacts are envisioned. Such environmental concerns may include forest encroachment (e.g., possibly in the Volcanoes national park and other protected areas), soil degradation (due to land clearance for agriculture), and possible rapid and unsustainable expansion of tourism (e.g., about Lake Kivu).
  - Improved road access in northwest Rwanda will in addition have regional implications by likely improving the flow of goods – including of natural resources – between the DRC and Rwanda. Considering allegations of the illegal exploitation of DRC natural resources and its re-export in among other countries Rwanda (see Section 6.2.c.), efforts needed to be developed/strengthened to monitor such (illicit) regional trade. **Synergies are needed to, among other things, strengthen institutional structures - especially at border controls and in eastern DRC where mineral extraction takes place** (see also recommendations under “Mining”)
- Tourism

---

<sup>15</sup> Such as with the existing WWF and Fauna and Flora International (WWF) International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP), WWF's EARPO Eastern Africa Corporate Club (WWF Eastern Africa Programme, 2004), and a recently proposed WWF project under DGIS consideration on “Integrated Watershed Management in the Kagera Basin and the Forests of the Congo-Nile Divide: Conflict reduction through integrated natural resource management” (Wamukoya, personal communication, 2004).

- **The success of tourism in Rwanda will largely depend on the continued development and enforcement of community-based ecotourism policies.** It is recommended that best practices used by the IGCP are drawn upon. Such best practices include incorporating local community concerns; supporting benefit sharing in the management of protected areas; strengthening institutions/park authorities; and emphasizing regional cooperation. Due to envisioned improvements in road access in northwest Rwanda, **efforts need to in particular be oriented towards monitoring tourism growth** in northwest Rwanda: more specifically **in and about the Volcanoes National Park and Lake Kivu**. Furthermore, initiatives need to be developed and/or strengthened in areas where political instability and poor management have already jeopardized Rwanda’s tourism potential, such as in the Akagera National Park in eastern Rwanda.
- Mining
  - While environment threats concerning the search for and extraction of mineral resources is currently small, **mining works and its expansion need to be monitored.** This includes monitoring mining industries **in Rutongo and Gatumba** (that have already polluted the Nyabarongo and Nyabugogo rivers), **gold and coltan mining explorations in the Nyungwe forest** (that has lead to forest degradation), **and** mining at **numerous quarries** found throughout Rwanda (that are increasing erosion). Regulatory frameworks need to be developed and strengthened to ensure that mining operations comply to environmental and labour standards.
  - In addition to addressing environmental concerns of Rwanda’s mining sector, additional **initiatives are needed to deal with regional allegations concerning the re-export of DRC minerals via Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda.** Synergies are needed to improve regional efforts to track certifiable mineral resources – including of coltan and diamonds from especially DRC’s World Heritage Sites (see Section 6.2.c. for more detail). Furthermore, support is needed to strengthen regional and national institutions to protect areas from illicit mineral exploitation, awareness needs to be raised to companies and consumers on the importance of buying certified minerals (synergies may be sought with WWF’s Eastern Africa Corporate Club), and alternative income generating activities need to be built for the thousands of poor people in eastern DRC who currently depend on mining for their livelihood (e.g., through the creation of community based conservation reserves and revenue sharing).
- Livestock
  - Initiatives need to be developed and/or strengthened to monitor environmental threats from growth in the livestock sector. **Monitoring of growth in the livestock sector is especially important in eastern Rwanda, in the former forest of Gishwati, and in the Gisenyi and Ruhengeri provinces** (see also Section 6.2.d.).
- Other industries (e.g., textiles and sugar)
  - A strong regulatory framework is needed to ensure that industries in the above and other sectors – e.g., textile and sugar - are held accountable to environmental damages. This in particular entails **monitoring factories**, many of which are currently **located in or near wetlands, that dump untreated effluents and by-products.**
- Macro support:
  - **WWF EARPO, the EC Rwanda country delegation, and other stakeholders need to keep careful track of growth sectors in Rwanda** – such as those described above – currently being promoted through privatisation and liberalization (see more detailed recommendations under “Good *environmental* governance” below). As previously emphasized, growth of these sectors can in countries with poor environmental regulation have significant negative consequences on the environment

and in turn on poor people's livelihood who significantly depend on natural resources.

- Good *environmental* governance
  - WWF EARPO, as well as the EC Rwanda country delegation, government agencies, private institutions, donors, and other NGOs **need to seek collaborative approaches to strengthen good environmental governance in Rwanda**. This will include:
    - **Strengthening monitoring** of environment/livelihood impacts **in the** above noted **growth sectors**: such as in agriculture, tourism, mining, and livestock. This in particular entails strengthening institutional capacity of Rwanda's environmental and related institutions and the development of an integrated monitoring program.
    - **Improving transparency – including fiscal transparency** – to help flag rapid, unsustainable, and illegal extraction of natural resources will be vital. Such improved transparency will not only help deal with environmental concerns in Rwanda, but will in addition help address regional concerns such as the re-export of DRC natural resources via Rwanda, Burundi, and Uganda. Synergies will need to be sought, including with existing anti-corruption initiatives.
    - A **detailed assessment on how land reforms are impacting the rural poor's access to and rights over natural resources and land is needed**. Based on results of such an evaluation, recommendations on land reform revisions could be made to help ensure that the rural poor concerns are adequately accounted for.
    - Population growth in Rwanda continues to exert enormous pressure on the environment. Synergies are needed to **strengthen population control initiatives** in this densely populated country.

## 8. Concluding remarks

Various lessons learned and best practices have been drawn concerning environment/livelihood impacts of initiatives supported by the EC in the Rwanda CSP.

### 8.1. Lessons learned

- A poor environmental management framework in Rwanda is threatening sustainable development in Rwanda. **Various case studies documented in this assessment indicate that expansion of mining and industrial activities – being promoted by various donors including the EC - has already led to soil and water degradation that is in turn negatively impacting the livelihoods of especially the rural poor**. Synergies are needed between WWF, other NGOs, and national agencies to strengthen good environmental governance in Rwanda.
- **Collaborative approaches and synergies are needed to address environment/livelihood concerns particularly in northwest Rwanda** where EC funded road rehabilitation will improve market access and likely jeopardize an already fragile environment. High relief and precipitation, coupled with this region's high agricultural and tourist potential, puts this area at high risk to forest encroachment and further erosion and soil degradation.

### 8.2. Best practices

- Various tourism initiatives in Rwanda have been successful. The IGCP has in particular been successful in promoting and maintaining mountain gorilla populations in not only Rwanda, but in addition in neighbouring Uganda and the DRC. Despite the challenges of political turmoil, staff shortages, and refugee influxes, mountain gorilla populations have been maintained and recently have even been shown to have increased. **Best practices**



**used by the IGCP include developing and strengthening ecotourism policies** (limiting tourist numbers that are allowed to view gorillas); **incorporating local community concerns; supporting benefit sharing in the management of protected areas; strengthening institutions/park authorities; and emphasizing regional cooperation.**

## Bibliography

Aubry, Jean Philippe, 2004. Personal communication. Kigali: EC Rwanda Country Delegation.

BBC, 2003. *Rwandan coffee farmers head upmarket*. By Stefan Armbruster, BBC News. February 10, 2003. Available on-line at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/2744415.stm>

Courier Journal, 2004. *Postwar Rwanda makes push for tourism*. By Tom Maliti, Associated Press. April 4, 2004. Available on-line at: <http://www.courier-journal.com/features/travel/2004/tra-front-rwanda0404-7128.html>

Delaunay-Belleville, Eddy, 2004. personal communication. Kigali: EC Rwanda country delegation.

Davalos, M.E., 2002. *Mainstreaming environment in the Country Strategy Papers: A review of 60 countries*. November 2002. EC DG-Development, Brussels.

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)

Government of Rwanda, 2002. *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning: National Poverty Reduction Programme.

IGCP, *Gorilla Rules: What does ecotourism mean*. Pamphlet of International Gorilla Conservation Programme.

IUCN, 2001. *Coltan mining in World Heritage Sites in the Democratic Republic of Congo: Updated summary*. April 23, 2001. The World Conservation Union (IUCN): Gland, Switzerland.

Kalpers, Jose, 2004. Personal communication. Kigali: Tourism and National Parks Authority (ORTPN).

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>

Knight Ridder Newspapers, 2003. *Mining of mineral used in cell phones threatening Congo's gorillas*. By Sudarsan Raghavan. December 3, 2003. Available on-line at: <http://www.realcities.com/mld/krwashington/7404686.htm>

Krissler, Dietmar, 2004. Personal communication. Brussels: EC DG Development.

Lindoro, Linda, 2004. Personal communication. Kigali: EC Rwandan Country Delegation.

- MINITERE, 2003 *National Environmental Policy*. Kigali: Ministry of Lands Resettlement and Environment (MINITERE).
- MINITERE, 2003b. *National strategy and action plan for the conservation of biodiversity in Rwanda*. April 2003. Kigali: Ministry of Lands Resettlement and Environment (MINITERE), Republic of Rwanda.
- MINITERE, 2003c. *Environmental bill*. October 2003. Kigali: Ministry of Lands Resettlement and Environment (MINITERE), Republic of Rwanda.
- 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>
- Pillet, Patrice, 2004. Personal communication. Brussels: EC EuropeAid.
- 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>
- Privatisation Secretariat, . *The mining sector*. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning: Republic of Rwanda.
- Reed, 2001. *Economic change, governance, and natural resource wealth: The political economy of change in southern Africa*. World Wide Fund for Nature. Earthscan Publications Limited, London and Sterling, Va.
- République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenné, 2003. *République Rwandaise et Communauté Européenné: Document de stratégie de coopération et programme indicatif pour la période 2002-2007*.
- Snel, M., 2004. *Environmental mainstreaming in EC Country Strategy Papers: An evaluation of the Tanzania (2000) and Madagascar (2001) Country Strategies and opportunities to address environment-poverty concerns*. Supervised by Hervé Lefevre, David Reed and Jenny Springer. World Wide Fund for Nature European Policy Office and Macroeconomic Policy Office, Brussels and Washington D.C.
- The Guardian, 2004. *Rwanda: Victim's license*. By George Monbiot. April 13, 2004. Available on-line at: [http://www.zmag.org/content/print\\_article.cfm?itemID=5316&sectionID=2](http://www.zmag.org/content/print_article.cfm?itemID=5316&sectionID=2)
- Thiollier, Francois, Personal communication, 2004. Brussels: EC EuropeAid.
- United Nations, 2002. *Final report on the panel of experts on the illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo*. October 16, 2002. Available on-line at: [http://www.afrol.com/Countries/DRC/documents/un\\_resources\\_2002\\_rwanda.htm](http://www.afrol.com/Countries/DRC/documents/un_resources_2002_rwanda.htm)
- Wamukoya, George, 2004. Personal communication. Nairobi: WWF EARPO.
- WWF Eastern Africa Programme, 2004. *International Gorilla Conservation Programme*. Available on-line at:

[http://www.panda.org/about\\_wwf/where\\_we\\_work/africa/where/eastern\\_africa/transborder/igcp.cfm](http://www.panda.org/about_wwf/where_we_work/africa/where/eastern_africa/transborder/igcp.cfm)

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)

## Annex 1: List of individuals contacted

“\*” : indicates individuals with which additional follow-up is recommended when the evaluation is conducted in more detail under EC-PREP funding

Aguirre, Rafael. Brussels: EC EuropeAid (Geographic coordinator for Rwanda). [Rafael.Aguirre-Unceta@cec.eu.int](mailto:Rafael.Aguirre-Unceta@cec.eu.int), Tel. 32 (0)2 2992595

Aubry, Jean Philippe. Kigali: EC Rwanda Country Delegation (Rural development, infrastructure). Tel: 250 585740 (no working email, send email via Delaunay-Belleville, Eddy)

\* Barbe, Jean. Kigali: EC Rwanda Country Delegation. [Jean.Barbe@cec.eu.int](mailto:Jean.Barbe@cec.eu.int) (referred to by Patrice Pillet)

\* Barthelmes, Ralf. GTZ (coordinator). [Dedrwa.dc@yahoo.fr](mailto:Dedrwa.dc@yahoo.fr) (referred by George Wamukoya)

Delaunay-Belleville, Eddy. Kigali: EC Rwanda country delegation (Rural development). [Eddy.DELAUNAY-BELLEVILLE@cec.eu.int](mailto:Eddy.DELAUNAY-BELLEVILLE@cec.eu.int), Tel: 250 585740

\* Hajabakiga, Patricia. Kigali: Ministry of Environment (Permanent secretary). [Miniterel@rwanda1.com](mailto:Miniterel@rwanda1.com) (referred by George Wamukoya)

Kabii, Tom. WWF Eastern Africa Programme. [TKabii@wwfearpo.org](mailto:TKabii@wwfearpo.org)

Kalpers, Jose. Kigali: Tourism and National Parks Authority (ORTPN) (Technical advisor). [jkalpers@compuserve.com](mailto:jkalpers@compuserve.com)

Kanyamibwa, Sam. WWF Eastern Africa Programme. [SKanyamibwa@wwfearpo.org](mailto:SKanyamibwa@wwfearpo.org)

Kojwang, Harrison. WWF. [hkojwang@wwf.org.zw](mailto:hkojwang@wwf.org.zw)

Krissler, Dietmar. Brussels: EC DG Development (Rwanda desk officer). [Dietmar.Krissler@cec.eu.int](mailto:Dietmar.Krissler@cec.eu.int), Tel: 32 (0)2 29 92511

\* Lester, Jeremy. Kigali: EC Rwanda Country Delegation. [Jeremy.LESTER@cec.eu.int](mailto:Jeremy.LESTER@cec.eu.int), Tel: 250 585740

Lindoro, Linda. Kigali: EC Rwanda Country Delegation (Rural development). [Linda.Lindoro@cec.eu.int](mailto:Linda.Lindoro@cec.eu.int), Tel: 250 585740

\* Mugorewera, Drocella. Kigali: Minister for Lands, Environment, Forestry, Water, and Natural Resources. [drocmugo@yahoo.fr](mailto:drocmugo@yahoo.fr). (referred by George Wamukoya)

Mwangeni, Hermann. WWF Tanzania. [HMwangeni@wwftz.org](mailto:HMwangeni@wwftz.org)

\* Mwine, Mark. International Gorilla Conservation Programme (Regional Enterprise Officer). [mmwine@igcp.co.rw](mailto:mmwine@igcp.co.rw) (referred to by Jose Kalpers)

- \* Ntaganda, Charles. National University of Rwanda. [ntagach@yahoo.fr](mailto:ntagach@yahoo.fr) (referred by George Wamukoya)
- Pillet, Patrice. Brussels: EC EuropeAid (Rural development, Rwanda). [Patrice-A.PILLET@cec.eu.int](mailto:Patrice-A.PILLET@cec.eu.int), Tel: 32 (0)2 2960880
- \* Rugamba, Rosette. Tourism and National Parks Authority (ORTPN) (Director General). [rosetterwandatourism@rwanda1.com](mailto:rosetterwandatourism@rwanda1.com) (referred by George Wamukoya)
- \* Ruzigandekwe, Fidele. Rwanda Wildlife Agency (Executive Director). [fruziga@hotmail.com](mailto:fruziga@hotmail.com); [ortpn@rwanda1.com](mailto:ortpn@rwanda1.com) (referred by George Wamukoya)
- \* Smith, Vince. Diane Fossey Gorilla Fund – Europe. [vince@rwanda1.com](mailto:vince@rwanda1.com) (referred to by Jose Kalpers)
- Thiollier, Francois. Brussels: EC EuropeAid (Macro support, Rwanda). [Francois.Thiollier@cec.eu.int](mailto:Francois.Thiollier@cec.eu.int), Tel: 32 (0)2 2957886
- \* Villa, Alexandra. Kigali: Rwanda country delegation (Rural development). Tel: 250 585740 (was on leave at the time of the evaluation, referred to by Jeremy Lester)
- Wamukoya, George. Nairobi: WWF EARPO. [GWamukoya@wwfearpo.org](mailto:GWamukoya@wwfearpo.org), Tel: 254 20 577355, 572630/1
- Westberg, Annette. Brussels: EC EuropeAid (Good governance, Rwanda). [Annette.Westberg@cec.eu.int](mailto:Annette.Westberg@cec.eu.int), Tel: 32 (0)2 2966981



## Annex 2: Response strategies directed to EC headquarters

[For further detail refer to Snel (2004).]

- While the EC requires the development of EIAs for all its projects that have an environmental impact, this may be dangerously bypassed in instances where the EC transfers its funds directly into national treasuries, as is commonly the case for EC funding under “macro support”. While the EC is not alone in supporting unregulated growth, **the EC (and other donors and agencies) must be held accountable for environmental and social impacts in all initiatives it funds**, irrespective of whether funds are transferred into a national treasury or to a specific project.
- The lack of an effective environmental management framework is seriously threatening sustainable development in many developing countries. **Good environmental governance is fundamental towards facilitating sustainable development**. The EC needs to emphasize supporting the development of strong environmental management regulatory frameworks in developing countries, particularly in its “good governance” core area. The use of the EC Rural Policy (2000) – that focuses on empowering rural communities, consolidating democracy, and promoting sustainable natural resource management – could be a useful policy framework to mainstream such sustainable development and good environmental governance.
- **EC funding in countries with a poorly developed environmental regulatory framework has entailed significant environmental degradation and consequently deteriorated livelihoods of especially the rural poor**. In Tanzania for example, EC (and other donor) financing to macro support and transport is, for example, prompting unregulated growth in the mining, tourism, and fishing sectors – documented to have resulted in significant increases in deforestation, biodiversity loss, water degradation, disease incidence, and displacement.
- While due credit is given to the EC for requiring EIAs for all its initiatives that have anticipated environmental impacts, as indicated by the evaluation of the EIA for the Mwanza road project<sup>16</sup> quality of the EIAs is lacking. **The development of high quality EIAs** includes comprehensive analysis of direct and indirect environmental and social impacts.
- Although developing high quality EIAs at the project level is crucial, **flagging initiatives with potential environmental consequences should ideally be done early on when the CSP is developed**. There are currently efforts underway to require CEP inclusion for all CSPs in the Mid Term Review. While CEP inclusion is important, guidelines need to furthermore be developed to ensure that CSPs integrate in their discussion of each of the core areas environmental concerns and environmental/poverty linkages.
- Gaining access to EIAs was cumbersome: no central archive exists of the EIAs. Since the EC country delegations are currently responsible to maintain EIAs under all EC funded initiatives (e.g., under the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF), it is recommended that EC country delegations **develop an EIA archive and provide open access to the EIAs**. Such public access would not only help inform the public on environmental considerations of EC funded projects, but may also facilitate accountability and provide incentive for the production of better quality EIAs. The World Bank, for example, includes EIAs for its projects on its website: similar transparency by EC funded initiatives is recommended.

---

<sup>16</sup> Note that this refers to the Tanzania CSP evaluation conducted in Snel (2004). Refer to Snel (2004) for further details.