

UNITED NATIONS



REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



Ministry of Rehabilitation and  
Social Integration  
(MINIREISO)

**REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON  
NGO/GOVERNMENT COLLABORATION  
IN RWANDA**

Kigali, Wednesday 22 May 1996



UNDP assisted project N• RWA/96/002

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	1
<b>II. PROGRAMME OF THE WORKSHOP</b>	1
<b>III. SUMMARY OF PLENARY DISCUSSIONS</b>	2
<b>IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION</b>	13
Health	15
Unaccompanied Children	16
Agriculture	17
Food distribution	17
Support to Small Enterprise Development	18
Water and Sanitation	18
Education	18
Shelter	19
Roads	20
Repatriation	20
General Recommendations	20
a. to NGOs	20
b. to Donors	21
c. to Government at the central level	22
d. to Government at the local level	22
<b>V. ANNEXES</b>	
1. Executive Summary	23
2. Opening Statement by representative of the Presidency	25
3. Final Communiqué	30
4. Guidelines for work group discussions	32
5. List of participants	34

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The present Report presents the objectives, programme, content of addresses made and discussions, and overall results and of the Workshop on Government NGO Collaboration held on 22 May 1996 in Kigali, Rwanda. The Workshop, which received assistance from Government, UNDP and the NGO community, may be seen as a stage in a process aimed at better informing Government, NGOs and other interested parties on NGO work in Rwanda and building the foundations for improved collaboration between Government and the NGO community, in the interest in improving the effectiveness of aid resources for Rwanda's people. Its specific objectives were: (a) to review, enhance and finalise the conclusions and recommendations of the Draft Report of the joint Government/UN/NGO evaluation study of the effectiveness of NGO operations in Rwanda during 1994-5; (b) identify mechanisms for implementing the recommendations; (c) prepare discussions to be held during the Rwanda Round Table Conference to be held in Geneva at the end of June on the transition from humanitarian assistance to sustainable development.

The Draft Report presented information gathered on sectors covered, achievements, institutional arrangements and bottlenecks, and formulated recommendations on how to improve Government - NGO collaboration in the interest of ensuring that the limited international aid resources reach and are of maximum benefit to Rwanda's people.

## **H. PROGRAMME OF THE WORKSHOP**

### **MORNING SESSIONS**

8:30                      Arrival and registration of participants and formation of Work Groups

8:50-9:00              Seating of participants

### **Opening Ceremony**

9:00-9:20              Opening statement of the Minister, MINIREISO by a Senior Advisor to the President of the Republic

9:20-10:45            **Presentation of the Study on NGO Activities:**

- (a) Introduction by Director of Cabinet, MINIREISO
- (b) Purpose and working modalities of the workshop by UN Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator
- (c) Presentation of the draft Report by Director of HACU
- (d) Comments by Chairperson, NGO Executive Committee

10:50-11:10 Coffee break  
11:10-12:45 **Work Groups deliberations**  
12:45-14:00 Lunch break

#### AFTERNOON SESSIONS

14:00-15:15 **Work Groups formulate a list of recommendations**  
15:15-15:35 Coffee break  
15:35-16:15 **Plenary session: presentations by Work Group  
Rapporteurs**  
16:15-17:00 **Discussion and Formulation of overall conclusions and  
recommendations of the Workshop**  
17:00-17:40 **Closing Ceremony**

- Closing remarks by Chairperson of NGO Executive Committee
- Closing remarks by a donor representative
- Closing statement/remarks by Government representative
- Closing remarks by an International Organisation representative

17:50 Press Conference - Interviews with National and International Press

18:00-19:00 Cocktail

### **III. SUMMARY OF PLENARY DISCUSSIONS**

#### **(a) Morning Plenary**

The workshop was **officially opened by Dr Emmanuel Bajyana, Senior Advisor at the Presidency of the Republic**. The full text of his address is included as annex 2 to the present report.

## **Opening address of Mrs Christine Umutoni, Director of Cabinet, MINIREISO**

Government, NGOs and donors are all represented here today, only the beneficiaries are not sufficiently represented at this workshop. Serving the beneficiaries is the heart of all our work. We are intermediaries who together need to work out mechanisms for serving them. There are both scientific and objective reasons for why we must work all work together; conflict and mistrust are futile. This evaluation is a great opportunity for us to take proactive measures to solve problems. The past is the past, we need to look to the future and move forward together.

## **Introduction of the Draft Report by Mr Antoine Sendama, Director of HACU/MINIREISO**

Mr Antoine Sendama, Director of HACU, started by giving a general overview of the context of the report. He then reminded participants that the Draft Consolidated Report which was to be examined on that day emerged from a generally recognised need to gather information, analyse it and propose modalities to ensure as efficient as possible working relationships, and use of limited international resources available for the benefit of Rwanda. With this in mind the Government, UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator's Office and NGO Executive Committee agreed to second staff and mobilise funds to conduct an Evaluation Study Mission.

The Draft Report which was distributed was a 47 page Consolidated Edition which presented the main trends noted from the much longer and more detailed Draft Report, compiled by the Evaluation Study team, which would have been difficult to discuss in a one day workshop. In addition, as an Annex to the Draft Report, and posted on the walls of the Workshop rooms for the Work Group discussions, were Prefecture Maps indicating data available to the Mission, or subsequently received, on the geographical distribution of NGO work in the country and Prefecture Tables showing sectors of intervention by Commune of the Prefecture. It was hoped that additional information would be received during the work group discussions such that if necessary any amendments /additions may be made for the final published report.

The Condensed Report was structured as follows:

- an Executive Summary of the report, except for the Chapter on Conclusions and Recommendations which was reproduced in full (see annex)

The following chapters:

## I. General Introduction:

This chapter presented the country context, objectives and scope of the Evaluation study. It also introduced NGO work in the country and the Government institutional framework for NGO work and some of the initial problems faced.

## II. Analysis of the Institutional Framework:

This chapter described the role of MINIREISO and its Humanitarian Assistance Coordination Unit (HACU), the steps and legislative framework for NGOs to register and operate in the country and the role of line Ministries in coordination with technical projects.

## III. Geographical Distribution:

This chapter attempted to analyse the situation of territorial distribution of NGOs in the country as compared to needs for a balanced coverage of all of Rwanda's Prefectures and Communes and the Government's own policies and priority sectors. It highlighted the changes in circumstances of the country (emergency to rehabilitation) and some of the problems encountered (e.g. several NGOs doing similar work at same site whereas other sites in need not covered). This chapter also examined the possible reasons /explanations for the situations.

## IV. Analysis of Sectoral coverage:

This chapter examined the concentration of NGOs by sector of activity and highlighted sectors which are covered more than others by NGOs and compared this situation with the countries needs and Government's own sectoral priorities. It pointed to the need to shift resources available more to certain sectors. It also reviewed trends in terms of successes and failures by sectors. It identified changes that have occurred over time in approach by NGOs and pointed to the need for more focus on capacity building and sustainable projects.

## V. NGO Management:

This chapter showed that though some NGOs had designed relevant programmes, a number of the conceived programmes which had only an emergency perspective and lacked sufficient integrated development component and had imprecise objectives. It showed also that even if NGOs are second largest employers in the country, a number of them have recruitment procedures which do not appear to conform to regulations, and expatriate staff are excessive and expensive. NGOs use many human, material and financial resources, from which the beneficiaries sometimes do not as yet receive the maximum potential benefits.

#### IV. Conclusions and Recommendations:

The conclusion explored quickly the NGOs' primary activities during the period 1994-1995 which include food distribution, emergency health care, distribution of seeds and tools, Rehabilitation of socio-economic infrastructure. To manage support from NGOs in a more efficient manner and to attain tangible results, recommendations were formulated for each sector that NGOs had intervened in, these included: Health, Unaccompanied Children, Agriculture, Micro-projects, Water and Sanitation, Education, Resettlement, Roads. In addition, General Recommendations were given for NGOs, for the Government at the Central level, for the Government at the local level and finally for donors.

Mr Sendama informed participants that copies of the draft Prefecture Maps with information showing which NGOs were working in which Communes, based on information received from NGOs that responded, were being posted on walls so as to be available for participants to review after the present session

#### **Opening remarks of Mr Sukehiro Hasegawa, UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator**

Recalling the sometimes heated discussions between the EU and the Government a few months ago, Mr Sukehiro Hasegawa welcomed Ms Marie Spaak, Regional ECHO Representative, and volunteered the following comments:

- UNDP tended to be considered as a provider of funds. However, it should be noted that it itself had its donors who have a say in the assistance it provides. He expressed his appreciation for the support donors had provided to UNDP and his initiatives;
- It had not been easy to obtain UNDP headquarters funding; there were risks and challenges involved; word had come that if the Japanese NGOs were asked to cease operations that would be the end of Japanese assistance to Rwanda; NGOs were a new area for the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator and he had almost no direct knowledge of their operations; when the project for the NGO study was submitted for funding to New York the idea of UNDP involvement in evaluating NGOs was rejected; However, it had been possible to convince the Head of the Emergency Response Division that the risks involved in such a study were worth taking;
- The NGO and international community had remained open regarding study;
- The 4 or 5 Rwandese consultants were to be congratulated for their hard and thorough work;

Mr Hasegawa indicated he saw the purpose of the Workshop as, firstly, to review the tentative Conclusions and Recommendations of the Draft Report which had been sent around and see how relevant they can be, and, secondly, to come up with ideas or strategies for change in collaborative partnerships between International NGOs and the Rwandese people. This was a major challenge because if it succeeded it would be a historical accomplishment and one could talk of a continuum from humanitarian assistance to sustainable development.

He encouraged participants to be truthful as to what one was doing which was never perfect. The study team had produced very voluminous detail on how NGO operations were doing. It was important to be honest and bring integrity into the relationship. It is hoped that the Workshop would come up with concrete recommendations which can go to the Round Table Conference in Geneva. Planning was underway for a Round Table working lunch or dinner at which the results of the study and present Workshop can be presented in Geneva.

Mr Hasegawa went on to introduce the three work groups and their modalities. A copy of the work group guidelines, which indicated the respective sectors, co-chairs, rapporteurs etc, is attached as Annex 5 to the present Report. He concluded that the Workshop was not the end but rather only a step in the process.

### **Opening remarks by Mr John Cosgrave, Acting Chairperson, NGO Executive Committee**

Mr Cosgrave made the following opening remarks:

NGOs welcome the report and the workshop though of course they may not agree with everything in it. Thank you for this process.

Firstly, it is very important to avoid generalisations when talking about NGOs. We are a very diverse group. In this room, for example, I can see a colleague from one of the oldest NGOs, which is around 80 years old, and a colleague from an NGO which is 2 years old. This diversity, including in terms of sectoral activities, policies and agendas, means that it is difficult to say NGOs are this, or NGOs are that, because we are not a uniform group.

NGOs are highly visible and vocal because otherwise we do not get funding. The flow of international assistance to Rwanda through NGOs has been however, only somewhere between 15-25 % of the total flow of funds. The proportion of funds flowing through NGOs is decreasing and will continue to do so as there is more bilateral and multilateral assistance. Because of their high visibility NGOs are however often seen as a manifestation of the international community, which affects us.

In terms of the Draft Report, I was surprised at the figure of 25 % of NGO expenditures going on expatriate costs. Expatriate costs could be up to 100% of an NGO's budget if they are bringing in trainers. Such a high percentage is not necessarily bad and needs to be taken in context.

From the evaluation process it is clear that there is a greater need for transparency and for NGOs to communicate better what they are doing, why they are doing it and how.

In 1994, when many of us started working, there were very few structures in place and functional, for example the Labour Law. Over time the structures of government have been put into place but, we are still left with the legacy of the past when structures did not exist.

Rwanda is still suffering from a grave shortage of skilled staff. There is a need for training. NGOs are caught in a conflict concerning staff: expatriates are expensive and we want as many Rwandan staff as possible, but we also do not want to rob other sectors particularly government of those skilled staff.

In terms of auditing, those familiar with the very stringent requirements of certain donors will laugh at the thought that NGOs do not have to carry out audits. NGOs are responsible to three groups: their beneficiaries, the Government of Rwanda and the donors. According to the internal regulations of NGOs we have to carry out annual internal audits with one of the seven recognised major accountancy firms. At present in Rwanda there are no auditors affiliated to one of the seven firms, who can carry out these audits.

The past is the past, we should not dwell on the events of December. Our resources need to be used for the benefit of the Rwandese people. We must constantly look at how we can improve communications and how we can do a better job.

NGOs also face a number of constraints. For instance in terms of the sectors for which they can attract funding from donors. Both education and roads are sectors in which up to now NGOs have had difficulty getting funding from donors. Geographically there are also constraints. Many NGOs have continued to work in the areas that they were initially asked to go to as a priority. There is also the problem that the Government of Rwanda faces threatened peace and security in the West of the country.

NGOs need stable conditions in which to work. We have these in Rwanda, although this is not fully understood by those outside the country. An important role for NGOs is the influence they can bring to bear on the international community. NGOs can tell people what the situation is like and give a more balanced view of Rwanda. Finally, we are grateful for the workshop and the chance that it gives us all to improve the services we offer.

*After the Opening addresses the participants were invited take a coffee break and then proceed to the rooms where the work groups sessions would be held.*

## **(b) Afternoon Plenary**

The recommendations which were drafted or modified by the three work groups were presented by their rapporteurs to the plenary session. For Work Group 1, dealing with the sectors health, unaccompanied children and water and sanitation, Abel Nizeye and Nima Patel presented some specific recommendations for each of these sectors, as well as some amendments to the general recommendations. The recommendations for Work Group 2 were presented by James Kimonyo and Rebecca Dale and were related to the NGO activities in the sectors of repatriation, roads and shelter and to the general recommendations. Finally, Stef Vandeginste presented the recommendations of Work Group 3 on agriculture, education, food distribution and micro-projects.

The UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator commented on these presentations saying the recommendations would certainly make an important input to a further improvement of collaboration between NGOs and the Government. He highlighted some of the salient features of the work group reports.

First of all, almost all work groups considered it of highest importance to strengthen the capacity of local NGO institutions and local government authorities. It was also recommended to make greater use of locally available human resources and materials with due regard to the sustainability of the activities that are embarked upon. The transition from humanitarian assistance to development was indeed endorsed by this workshop. Secondly, all mentioned the need to envisage the relationship with the Government as a collaborative or cooperative one rather than as an advisory relationship or a relationship in which one partner is controlling the other, or one is knowing more than the other. There is a realisation that through collaboration we can achieve more. Thirdly, it is recommended that the international community looks after the neglected sectors or areas. Two work groups mentioned that there are not enough NGOs or resources devoted for certain sectors, for example, education and agriculture.

Antoine Sendama recommended making a calendar, given the fact that most of the NGO activities are situated up country, to organise follow-up meetings in the Prefectures after e.g. three months to gather all NGOs active in the region in all of the sectors that were discussed, together with the line ministries, the bourgmesters, MINIREISO and the Prefets. At these meetings the recommendations of this seminar will be presented with the accomplishments and the implementation of the recommendations on the field.

Christine Umutoni proposed to set up a committee composed of a representative of the NGO Executive Committee, a UNDP representative, a Government representative and possibly some other members. This should design follow-up mechanisms, bearing in mind the recommendation by the Director of HACU to organise meetings in the Prefectures. It would also lay the basis for future evaluations.

Mr. Hasegawa welcomed these suggestions and proposed to add a chair or rapporteur of the work groups to the follow-up committee. Regarding the implementation of the recommendations, he noted that if half of the recommendations are implemented, this will be a major achievement and a tremendous progress. The revised recommendations of the study Report were adopted by the Workshop.

On the official report of the study, Mr. Sukehiro Hasegawa, clarified that UNDP, in financing this evaluation exercise, has from the beginning envisaged two products. First, the voluminous report of the national consultants who were hired by MINIREISO and took part in the mission which provides detailed and useful information. Secondly, a Condensed Edition. This Report would be produced with the main salient findings and recommendations of the consultants but also incorporating comments, amendments and additions made by the work groups and endorsed by the Workshop. This would be the product which would represent the joint work of all the concerned partners.

He then invited Mr. Anthony Wood, Co-Rapporteur of overall Workshop to read the Final Communiqué of the Workshop. The full text of the Communiqué, which was made available to the Press, is included as Annex 3 of the present Report. This was adopted after comments from the floor which resulted in adding a sentence to reflect the point made by Mr

Steve Rifkin of SCF/UK concerning lessons learned which could assist other countries. The revised recommendations were then adopted by the workshop.

### **Closing Remarks of Mr John Cosgrave, Chairperson, NGO Executive Committee**

The NGO community welcomed the evaluation because whenever you are doing anything if you do not stop to look at what you are doing you continue to make the same mistakes. Evaluating implies that we recognise that there are some things we are doing wrong or some things which we could do better. The relationship between the Government and the international NGO community has vastly improved since the low point last December. We now have regular meetings between the Director of Cabinet of MINIREISO and the NGO Executive Committee and in other ways as well relations are now better. That is essential because you can always do more when people are working together, when there is an effective partnership, and when there is co-operation rather than when people are pulling their own individual ways.

The evaluation highlights lacks in both the Government and in the NGOs. On the part of the NGOs its clear to me from the evaluation that we need to be more transparent, to communicate that transparency better, so that its clearer to everyone what we are doing and why. We also need to work more closely with local NGOs, that process has already begun with yesterday s meeting with CCOAIB.

I would emphasise again that as NGOs although we are highly visible and highly vocal, we are only a small part of the international assistance to Rwanda. Back in 1994, because NGOs are much more flexible that other international funding mechanisms, there was a much greater flow of resources through NGOs. As time goes on this flow will continue to decrease and we will see much more of the funds from multilateral and bilateral donors going directly through the government rather than through NGOs. I should explain that for instance, in the case of LWF (Lutheran World Federation), which is the organisation I work for, we have renovated 6 schools and built one and we are building another four now with funds from UNHCR, but that is a drop in the ocean compared to the number of schools which for example the World Bank can build in Rwanda. So it is important to remember all the time that NGOs are only a small component of the total international assistance to Rwanda.

As Pitt, a British Prime Minister said 200 or 300 years ago: "There are lies, dam lies and statistics". As I said this morning, you have to be careful with global statistics like NGOs spend on average 25% of their budgets on expatriate costs. It could, as I said be 100% if all they are doing is training, it depends on the circumstances. One has to be very careful using global statistics indiscriminately with such a diffuse community as NGOs.

Finally to sum up, NGOs welcome the positive nature of the Workshop and the conclusions which came out of today, which are all very positive. I would also like to thank UNDP for funding the evaluation and Workshop because it does give us a better chance to explain what we are doing, to be more transparent and to communicate better about what NGOs are doing in Rwanda. I hope that we will be able to continue working together to better serve the people of Rwanda.

## **Closing Remarks of the Delegate of UNHCR, Mr Roman Urasa, on behalf of International Organisations**

Mr Urasa began by commenting that those of us who attended the Gisenyi Workshop last October will remember what happened and some of the recommendations. If you compare what we have heard and read now, with those recommendations then it is clear that we have come a long way. Congratulations to every participant for the progress that has been made.

He went on to talk firstly about global statistics and how they mislead. In 94-95 for example, UNHCR spent \$7m acquiring transport equipment for UNHCR, including some of the NGOs we work with. This was one-off expenditure. Then if we come to the figure, that only 30% of programme budgets went directly to the beneficiaries, this may be true for 1994, it may be true for 1995, but you cannot work without investing in certain things to be able to function. NGOs had to incur expenditures which are not recurring. Now an NGO may be able to have 70-80% going to beneficiaries as opposed to the 30% that went in 1994. Statistics must be taken with a bit of analysis as to whether expenditures are recurring or not.

Yes, we should look to the future but, we have no special faculties to see it. Therefore we must look at our past mistakes to learn how to approach the future. We, NGOs and UN agencies, started working at a time when the Government of Rwanda was not really functioning. Many NGOs wanted to do something, to come and help. A good many of these have now left. Those who came did not necessarily have experience, to some of them the absence of government at that time seemed to be the modus operandi. Though experienced NGOs knew differently. When the government wanted to see/monitor what NGOs were doing there was some resistance. We should not conclude that this resistance was intended to obstruct, sometimes it was due to a lack of experience or to ignorance.

There have been quite a few misunderstandings and miscommunications, and at the same time we have not been told what is the level of transparency that is required. I hope that the aspects of the levels of transparency that someone mentioned from the floor can be incorporated into the report, and I hope that this is the level of transparency that is acceptable. We should not talk about transparency without really defining how far we go.

We have all gone through the land that NGOs are engaging in activities other than their declared activities. But also we have to question ourselves whether it is the NGO or the individual employee working for the NGO. So why not target the individual employee of an NGO rather than the NGO as a whole. Maybe by targeting the individual employee of an NGO we would actually be able to expose that employee and the management of the NGO would congratulate us, rather than blame the government.

While we correct the mistakes of the past, we should also be proud of the achievements. The report more or less shows these. When I arrived on the 13/7/94 there was no water or electricity, Kigali was in a bad state. I recall the efforts we had working out who would contribute, who would do what. The Government, NGOs and all participants should be proud of what has been achieved. Now, for example much of Rwanda has water and education

has restarted. We do not need to be ashamed of what has been achieved. Yes, more can be done, and more could have been done, and there were mistakes, and everything can be improved; but to do so you need more resources, you need to collaborate more and you need to communicate better. We need to develop the partnership with NGOs in order to increase the resource base.

We need to learn from the past, we also do not need to reinvent the wheel if practices have been accepted elsewhere. NGOs have worked all over the world in both developed countries and in Africa, Asia and Latin America. We can draw on these many years of experience by learning from the experiences developed in other countries.

We have to define how much transparency is adequate transparency. Is transparency co-management? I believe it is not. So long as we define minimum transparency the bulk of NGOs are willing to live within it.

We definitely need the NGOs. We need the expertise of NGOs. We need the advocacy role of NGOs. We can only get the confidence of foreign donors, of foreign taxpayers, of foreign mothers and children, who contribute to humanitarian activities overseas, through the advocacy of NGOs; and I believe we can get that if we live within the recommendations we have heard today.

To conclude, let us not bury or inter the good things which NGOs have done, but learn from the mistakes and endeavour to develop a genuine partnership through transparency. Let us endeavour to develop a partnership of interdependence and collaboration. We are going to the roundtable and I believe that this partnership will be put to some test at that stage.

### **Closing Remarks of Mr Guerrit Noordam, of the Netherlands Embassy, on behalf of donors**

Mr Noordam began by expressing thanks on behalf of the donor countries for the chance to participate in this unique workshop. He commented that today has been a great achievement since discussions of the work of NGOs have not always been easy. He agreed with Mr Hasegawa that getting the evaluation done was an achievement in itself. He commented that he was happy that the evaluation has been done and a report presented. In his experience of evaluations generally a report is produced and it is put away in a drawer. The challenge is how to work with it and improve. It is unique that together Government, international organisations, NGOs and other participants are already working with the evaluation document. We need to get the points out of the evaluation and see how to improve communication and co-ordination.

He went on to talk about the need for synergy in management. Synergy is where the whole is more than the sum of the parts, when those parts are not put together the outcome is less or nothing. For example when the parts of a bicycle are not joined together they are useless. Within our relationships we need to work towards synergy. It is not something that maybe we can have reached today with these recommendations, but it is something that we have to fight for every time. With a bicycle sometimes a nut becomes loose and it has to be

tightened. He pointed out that synergy is not only a matter of theory, it is not enough to say we now have a nice model of how Government, NGOs and donors can work together and it is just a matter of implementation. There is something extra within co-ordination and communication. Sometimes within such cases the phone is not working, or there is no fuel or there is a lack of resources; then co-ordination decreases, communication decreases and there is general deterioration. When we try to have this synergy, but are also aware that we need each other, and that we are also investing in relationship building, trust building and confidence building; in this case, he commented, I do not always mind if I do not receive that call or if a report is late. When we all know that we are part of the same system, fighting for the same objectives we automatically trust each other and still the machine continues working.

He concluded by saying that within the framework of the Government of Rwanda there are very clearly defined objectives, we all know where we are heading, and it is also set in the resolutions of today. We are all here for the people of the Rwanda and if we keep to these objectives this synergy will be maintained and sustained. Sometimes when a small nut comes loose we tighten it and say "Dukomeze Gukorana Umurava" (let us strive forward towards better results).

### **Closing remarks of Mrs Christine Umutoni, Director of Cabinet, MINIREISO**

Thanks to all those who have contributed to making this meeting the success it has been. The meeting has taken place in a very good atmosphere, much has been discussed and I think the conclusions are satisfactory to everybody and we have reached consensus recommendations. In particular we would like to thank the consultants who worked on the draft report, UNDP, Government representatives who participated in many meetings, international bodies and of course the NGOs themselves, for their efforts during the process of building this evaluation and at its conclusion. In particular thanks are due to HACU for their special efforts. Special thanks are also due to the donors for their participation, resources are a major factor in all our efforts to make things happen.

A number of achievements and a number of problems are highlighted in the report. When looking at these achievements we should not forget that what we do adds to what the Rwandese people themselves have achieved. Through these tough times the Rwandese People have had their own internal coping mechanisms which have made things work and improve, and which have allowed us to give what contribution we can to improve their lives. Many times we say thank you to NGOs, to government and to donors but we should all give a very large thanks to the people themselves for what they have done. This contribution cannot be evaluated, it cannot be counted. Without their internal stamina and internal coping mechanisms much of our efforts would find nothing to support.

This evaluation study and workshop are a manifestation that we are moving forward and a sign that we are working together. We have today talked about the past, and must put it behind us, as we all work to avoid being bad girls and bad boys.

The main idea of this report is not to dwell on statistics but rather to draw everyone's attention, to please if it ever happens that expenditures on overheads are not necessary they

should be reduced. But, where such expenditures are necessary, there is nothing you can do about it, they are justifiable and a big issue should not be made of them. This is not an attempt to pinpoint particular instances, it is just a question of raising our own consciousness to use our resources better.

From the recommendations adopted today we all have things we are supposed to do, on the side of the government, and on the side of the international community. We have to ask ourselves to be committed to today's conclusions and to ensure that we do a very good follow up. We must only be satisfied if we can fulfil these objectives and thereby satisfy the people we are supposed to be working for.

The UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator, Mr Hasegawa, spoke of the positive interdependency of our relations, as those involved in working together in assistance to Rwanda. Interdependency does not mean that each of us loses our sovereignty, in fact it is strengthened. When I come to your country to work, I respect you and work under your laws and the same is true for those of you working in my country. Interdependency means working together to help overcome problems, recognising each others sovereignty and independence, then we have mutual respect. With this we can build an international community of mutual understanding and co-operation.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The workshop reviewed the Conclusions and Recommendations section of the Draft Report. No modifications were made to the Conclusions part. The Workshop adopted the revised Recommendations text which follows the Conclusions part reproduced below:

#### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The conclusions and recommendations presented are the final analysis of information gathered during the field visits during NGO evaluation, conducted January-March, 1995.

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

1. After the protracted series of civil conflicts resulting in the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, a massive influx of NGOs and international agencies arrived in the country to assist the Rwandese people. As coordination was not the priority in the beginning and NGOs distribution in the country was random, their activities did not necessarily meet the priorities of the Prefectures and Communes in which they were working.

2. During that period, the NGOs' primary activities included the following:

- Food distribution
- Emergency health care
- Distribution of seeds and tools
- Rehabilitation of socio-economic infrastructure; most of which has been minor

3. The NGOs expatriate personnel was excessive during 1994 and currently remains so for certain NGOs even though the costs of maintaining them remains quite high.

Recruitment of expatriate personnel is often conducted without advising national partners and expatriate personnel are often not specifically qualified for the positions they hold.

4. NGOs have created considerable employment opportunities in the country for national staff and, after the Government, are the second largest employers in the country. There are, however, cases where NGOs do not strictly adhere to the labor laws in place in the country which has resulted in many declared and undeclared cases of labor disputes. Despite these difficulties, employment opportunities created by NGOs, though strictly at low levels, have had an overall positive effect on the country.

5. The evaluation team notes that there is a lack of transparency in NGOs' management of funds. Certain NGOs have stated that their financial reports are finalized in their respective head offices.

6. Collaboration between NGOs and local officials, though improving, still remains at a low level; certain local officials are passive in their approach and do not initiate contact of collaboration with NGOs in the field. Efforts should be made, therefore, on both sides to improve the working relationships between them.

7. Following the emergency situation in Rwanda, NGOs programs are conceived according to the philosophies and priorities of donors without always considering the importance of the views of beneficiaries. During this phase of development, beneficiary participation will have to be improved if the NGOs and local officials improve their collaboration and consult at all phases of projects.

8. The emergency period in Rwanda was characterized by a considerable dispersion of efforts; certain NGOs were permitted to operate in several sectors without the sufficient means to work in them. This was observed in the following sectors; Agriculture, health and water and sanitation.

NGOs have encountered the following constraints in their work in Rwanda:

- Lack of clarity in inter-Ministerial NGO coordination.
- Administrative blockages that freeze NGO activities are sometimes the result of central and local structures
- Weaknesses of local partners at the level of the commune, makes difficult to find capable personnel to develop projects to respond to priorities. This is an area in which NGOs could support and build the capacity of local structures.

9. As a result of donor demands that rush to quickly attain results of their funded projects these demands, sufficient time is not allowed for beneficiaries to be integrated into the management of the projects.

10. NGOs' work in reinforcing national capacity has been inadequate and Government remains reliant on NGOs to take charge and control of the manner in which development work is undertaken in Rwanda.

11. The global overview of NGO activities in Rwanda is that their humanitarian intervention had innumerable positive outcomes for the country. The passage, however, from emergency to development has been slow and the approach taken towards development remains similar to that of emergency.

12. Finally, though one could recognize that aid granted to Rwanda during the first 18 months after the war was of fundamental use to the country, it is nevertheless necessary to point out the inadequacies between the real costs of, and the NGO expenditures related to, emergency programmes.

## **WORKSHOP ON GOR/NGO COLLABORATION**

### **FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

**During the Workshop participants split into three groups to finalise the draft sectoral and general recommendations of the report. These recommendations were then adopted by the Workshop as final for the report:**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

In order for the Government of Rwanda to receive appropriate support from NGOs and manage in a more efficient manner and to attain tangible and sustainable results, the following recommendations have been adopted:

#### **HEALTH**

- 1 All those involved in health projects should establish a broad policy and conceive of medium and long term projects that support the national health policy and are in accordance to the framework of activity and plans established by MINISANTE.
2. NGOs should work in close collaboration with the directors of the Region and District Sanitaire to develop projects and budgets.
3. NGOs should emphasize training by organizing on the job sessions and training courses regularly and by supporting MINISANTE the material and logistical support for training and refresher courses at the National Scale.
4. NGOs are encouraged to provide medical and paramedical personnel with a view towards building capacity, due to the lack of qualified personnel.

5. The Government and relevant NGOs should ensure that the capacity to undertake emergency medical interventions is declared necessary by the Government.
6. The Government should be assisted to put in place a system of references of the ill (radio-telephone-ambulances)

## **UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN**

1. All Unaccompanied Children, s programs should be developed within the policy framework developed. NGO s should conceive of medium and long term projects that are developed within the policy framework as established by MINITRASO
2. The Government and NGOs should review and change strategies and policies where appropriate to expedite processes for family reunification, adoption, fostering and alternatives to institutionalized care.
3. Programs encouraging host families to form associations and engage in income generating programmes with the assistance of the NGOs should be an integrated part of interventions in this sector. This type of intervention would provide a source of income and improve the livelihood of the family.
4. All unaccompanied children s programs must be implemented in close collaboration between Government and NGOs in adherence to National Policies.
5. The trauma programs have not been well conceived because of the lack of understanding of Rwandese culture. It is recommended that the trauma programmes be coordinated by the National Trauma Center and that the intervening NGOs strive towards reinforcing the Center s human, financial and technical capacity.
6. Moral, psycho-social, cultural, and educational needs of unaccompanied children should be incorporated into all programs for children in especially difficult circumstances
7. Unaccompanied children s programmes should follow the national regulations and policy guidelines for the care of children in centers.
8. All of the managers of centers should ensure that children maintain cultural links with families and communities.
9. The State should define the levels of kinship permitted for reunification
10. At the level of each Commune, there should be Communal committees to follow-up on vulnerable children. These committees should report to the local authorities and the prefectural NGO coordination committees on the state of vulnerable children in order to better aid them.
11. The State should have clear guidelines concerning the adoption and fostering of children.

12. The State should have a fund to aid unaccompanied children that should be managed in close collaboration with the Communal follow-up committees for unaccompanied and reunified children.
13. The Government should urgently finalize guidelines for Centers for Unaccompanied Children.
14. In addition to the specific problems of Unaccompanied Children in centers, the Government and NGOs should address problems of street children, HIV positive orphans and child soldiers and other categories of children in difficult circumstances.
15. All partners - Government, NGOs, UN agencies and Donors, must be committed to close collaboration of all programs in favor of Children in Difficult Circumstances and work to avoid duplication and overlapping of programs.

## **AGRICULTURE**

1. Given that less than 20 % of NGOs are active in agricultural sector, we recommend to the NGOs and to the Government of Rwanda, and also to the donor community, to invest more in the agricultural sector.
2. It is recommended that NGOs pay more attention to training, by supporting the reopening of agriculture and/or animal husbandry schools, and especially, by training at the grassroots level.
3. It is recommended that NGOs consult with the Prefectoral agricultural services in order to integrate their activities, the sectoral policies of MINAGRI, and, hence, the real needs of the local population.
4. It is recommended that NGOs support the Prefectoral agricultural services in terms of human and material resources, rather than to substitute them, in order to harmonise the activities of NGOs and local institutions.
5. It is recommended that NGOs and the Government of Rwanda address the problems of availability of inputs and marketing of agricultural products.

## **FOOD DISTRIBUTION**

It is recommended that NGOs and Donors ensure that food distribution does not have a negative impact on food production and or market prices. Within this they should:

1. encourage local procurement of food when available;
2. not engage in food distribution as a long term programme but as a short term emergency response.

## **SUPPORT TO SMALL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT**

It is recommended that NGOs support the creation of more associations and the reinforcing of their capacity by providing technical assistance in training As well as substantial financial and material assistance, putting emphasis on women s, minors heads of families and disabled persons groups.

## **WATER AND SANITATION**

1. The Government should set a broad policy framework with which medium and long term projects can be conceived.
2. All projects should be integrated with sanitation, hygiene, community empowerment and education.
3. NGOs should assess the norms of construction or rehabilitation of a borehole or a water collection structure.
4. NGOs should make budget charges as specific items rehabilitated or constructed rather than group these charges into a larger budget.
5. NGOs working in any aspect of water and sanitation should use materials that are locally available for the construction of water tanks, pipes and other equipment found within Rwanda, when they meet recognized standards.
6. Water and sanitation projects must include an aspect of training national staff.
7. Community management of water systems should be given high priority to ensure sustainability.
8. Local officials and NGO field offices should actively work with MINITRAPE, local authorities and beneficiaries to define needs for water and sanitation programs

## **EDUCATION**

1. Given that less than 10% of NGOs are active in education, it is recommended that NGOs and the Government of Rwanda, as well as the donor community, pay more attention to this sector by:

- addressing formal, informal, specialized education and training of teachers at all levels.
- investing in the rehabilitation and construction of infrastructure with sustainable, materials, respecting the construction norms.

- financing the procurement of schooling material and equipment.

2. In order to promote financial and material autonomy of schools, it is recommended that NGOs promote the creation of income generating activities.

Schools should be built in a lasting, cost efficient manner that will also be readily maintainable and repairable using locally available materials. (see the norms/m2 of buildings)

NGOs should develop and supervise school cooperatives or initiate income generating activities to provide funds to train students and to subsidize the operations of schools.

## **SHELTER**

1. The Government should clarify and disseminate widely the Government policy on shelter. It should be disseminated to all partners: Local authorities, beneficiaries and NGOs.

Mechanism: As soon as possible a short document summarising the policy should be widely disseminated throughout the country to all concerned partners.

2. The Government should continue to plan for resettling returnees and survivors including in the plans the following elements:

- social infrastructure
- arable lands
- pasture lands
- water and sanitation
- electrical systems
- access roads

These plans should be developed with due regard to the sustainability of the sites in terms of the above elements.

The donors should ensure that the Government has adequate resources for the identification, evaluation and planning of sites.

3. Local Government in partnership with NGOs should require the active participation of beneficiaries to assist in building their own houses and social infrastructure with NGO or other agency support, giving special consideration to vulnerable groups.

4. The prefecture shelter committees should be reinforced so that they can act a mechanism for implementing the above recommendations.

## **ROADS**

1. Given the central importance of access for enabling development, NGOs should attempt to assist local government and communities to improve access within communes within the limit of resources available to NGOs.
2. NGOs should support Government attempts to obtain donor resources to improve access to rural communities
3. When planning projects NGOs should consider the access needs of those projects.
4. To repair rural tracks NGOs should request technical support from MINITRAPE

## **REPATRIATION**

1. All Partners should strive for the acceleration of the shelter programme to continue to encourage repatriation.
2. All Partners should press for the implementation of the recommendations of the Cairo and Tunis Declarations.

## **GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

### RECOMMENDATIONS TO NGOs:

1. NGOs should work closely with national and local partners and encourage their participation in identifying needs, determining priorities of the area and the choice and development of projects responding to the aspirations of the local population. The international NGOs should work with Rwandese partners to adopt a system of joint execution of projects. International NGOs should remember that local NGOs may have special advantages in implementation due to their local knowledge and should consider sub contracting project components to them where feasible.
2. NGOs should acquire efficient management tools; their work should be based on a detailed program that has a cohesive implementation timetable and project plan including activities and objectives. NGOs should have their budgetary expenditures written in a more specific and descriptive manner. NGOs should have a monitoring and evaluation system in place to assess the status of their projects and the efficiency of their execution.
3. NGOs should recruit and manage national staff in adherence to the labor regulations in the country. Personnel administration should be a nationalized position in all NGOs and it is recommended that Rwandese also be involved in project and financial management. It is recommended that, where feasible, financial reports be finalized in Rwanda and given both to donors and Government partners of each NGO. A situation of joint responsibility,

management, transparency and partnership will serve to remove the climate of mistrust that persists between NGOs and national partners.

4. NGOs are recommended to collaborate very closely with national NGOs and to initiate efforts to reinforce their human capacity.
5. All of the modalities of collaboration between northern and national NGOs are to be defined in a consultation forum yet to be determined.
6. International NGOs should include capacity building as a component in all projects, this should ideally be at a level of not less than 5 % of project costs.
7. NGOs should limit their interventions to contiguous territories, preferably to avoid scattering their efforts and concentrate their means, taking into account their human and financial resources, on sustainable projects.
8. To improve their work, each NGO should have an external evaluation conducted to assess their strategies, competency and overall approach.
9. NGOs should actively avoid substituting themselves in the place of local structures and, instead, support and reinforce the local structure's existing capacity and means, including salaries and furnishing appropriate infrastructure and equipment.
10. International and National NGOs are encouraged to reinforce their respective Organizational collectives and exchange experiences, define objectives and work towards mutual cooperation and collaboration.
11. NGOs that operate programs in Rwanda from neighboring countries should establish an in-country office from which to operate.
12. NGOs should support the work of the prefecture coordination committees.
13. NGOs should provide effective development to reinforce national capacity and to contribute to the reinforcing of qualified human resources.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS TO DONORS:**

1. Projects executed by NGOs on behalf on UN Agencies should be executed under a tripartite agreement signed with the Government authorities
2. A study should be undertaken to determine the current status and level of national and governmental human resource capacity.
3. To facilitate the transition from emergency to development, donors should begin to provide longer term funding for programs.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS TO GOVERNMENT AT THE CENTRAL LEVEL:**

1. The Government should review and improve the inter-ministerial coordination of all humanitarian assistance, particularly that of NGOs in Rwanda.
2. The Government is requested to study methods of simplifying administrative procedures at the central and local levels that often hinder and discourage NGOs' initiatives.
3. The Government, through the National Assembly, should resolve with legal instrument the problem of exoneration for goods imported by NGOs and find a solution which is not prejudicial to the beneficiaries.
4. The Government should harmonize all policies and procedures regulating NGOs' activities and actions in Rwanda into one document.
5. The Government should reinforce and organize Prefectural NGO coordination committees whose mission will be defined in the document Working Procedures for local and international NGOs operating in Rwanda.
6. It is suggested that projects developed at the prefecture level be based on needs defined at the Commune level.
7. The Government should ensure a distribution of NGOs on the national territory based on the needs expressed by both the prefectures and communes and the areas of competence of each NGO.
8. To ensure transparency in the management of NGOs, it is recommended that the Government enforces a financial audit of NGOs conforming to Article 5 of the Basic Agreement.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS TO GOVERNMENT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL:**

1. It is recommended that local authorities and local communities should be directly involved in NGO activities by organizing field visits to assess the status and progress of and problems with the NGOs' work. This should be conducted with a view towards creating better cooperation and relations.
2. Local authorities should consult and devise a clear set of priorities for their Prefectures. They should also submit project proposals to the Prefectural NGO Coordination Committee.

## **ANNEXES**

### **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE DRAFT REPORT**

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

##### **Foreword**

1. A joint Government/ UN/NGO mission has studied the effectiveness of NGO operations in Rwanda during 1994-5 and produced this Draft Condensed Report, which is to be discussed at a workshop and finalised subsequently. Its principle objective was to gather information on sectors covered and achievements, institutional arrangements and bottlenecks and formulate recommendations on how to improve Government - NGO collaboration in the interest of ensuring that the limited international aid resources reach and are of maximum benefit to Rwanda's people.

##### **General**

2. A large number of NGOs arrived in Rwanda to respond to the immense needs of the unprecedented humanitarian crisis resulting from the Genocide. Priorities at the time were: between 200 and 400 thousand unaccompanied children; widows, internally displaced persons and refugees in need of assistance; social and economic infrastructure in need of immediate reconstruction and a destroyed State apparatus. The work of most NGOs in this complex environment was remarkable and highly appreciated by beneficiaries and Government. Key accomplishments included: food and medicine distribution; rehabilitation of hospitals, roads, schools etc.; relaunching agricultural production through provision of inputs and support to Government structures. However, others overstretched themselves lacking necessary experience and human or material resources or compromised themselves with the Government. At the same time the coordination structure set up by Government (HACU) was at an early stage of development and lacked the necessary resources to fulfill all aspects of its mandate and a number of NGOs did not abide by the Policies and Procedures issued by the Government for NGOs operating in Rwanda.

##### **Institutional framework**

3. The Humanitarian Assistance Coordinating Unit (HACU) of MINIREISO is the first port of call for NGOs wishing to assist Rwanda. MINIREISO puts the NGO in contact with the appropriate line Ministry and provides the overall facilitator role for NGOs working in the country. Its coordinating role has become largely recognised by the NGO community and technical ministries. However, in order to overcome difficulties in treating matters brought before it promptly it will be necessary to significantly increase its limited human and material resources. The field level structures envisaged by the Government (Prefectoral coordination Committees and MINIREISO offices) are not yet in place or do not have qualified or regularly paid staff. There is also a need to clarify the role of MINIREISO Prefecture level offices.

## **Geographical Distribution**

4. Present territorial coverage by NGOs on the ground does not sufficiently reflect the real needs of the population in the country's regions and populations. The needs in Rwanda have changed since the emergency phase and need to be re-analysed by NGOs with Government in light of today's needs and priorities. Several NGOs are doing similar work at the same site whereas other localities in need are inadequately or not covered, particularly those farthest from Kigali-Ville. Security and road/communications problems partly explain this situation but lack of coordination between the NGOs themselves and initial tendency to resist the Government and local authorities coordination topped by lack of beneficiaries involvement were major factors.

## **Analysis of sectoral coverage**

5. NGOs were found to be working in all of the following sectors: health, unaccompanied children, agriculture, water and sanitation, education, support to micro-projects, shelter, repatriation, roads and food distribution. There is a transition underway in NGOs towards working more through community participation, capacity building and supporting local structures. Health and unaccompanied children are both top Government priorities and have also received the largest shares of NGO assistance and are consequently the sectors where the largest positive impact has been felt.

6. Food distribution involved NGOs to a large extent during the emergency phase and has shifted to focus on vulnerable groups, feeding centres and distribution at transit centres run with NGO assistance. Agriculture and water and micro-projects received considerable emergency assistance from NGOs (e.g. hoes, inputs etc.), however, insufficient attention has been given to date to developing capacities of beneficiaries and national structures for sustainability. The transition towards longer term sustainable projects has started in the water and sanitation sector. Efforts in the micro-projects sector to build sustainability by encouraging the creation of associations and providing them with loans have had mixed results. As with agriculture dependency has often been created and considerable efforts at training and follow-up will be necessary to sustain what has begun.

7. With regard to education, NGOs helped with emergency rehabilitation of classrooms and provided desks and other basic materials. However, given this sector's importance for rebuilding human capacities for the future, the focus should be reoriented to medium and long term development needs. Donors need to be sensitised to support this. Overall, insufficient priority has been given to the shelter sector and difficulties have been encountered due to insufficient consultation with beneficiaries, the time needed to devise and transmit national policy, and lack of or inappropriate use of materials. Broadly speaking the roads sector has been given limited attention by NGOs due to a lack of NGO capacity in this area.

## **NGO management**

8. The evaluation study examined NGO management in four areas: programme design; planning, management and evaluation.

9. In the areas of programme design, the fact that the NGOs generally arrived in response to an emergency situation led to a focus on short term humanitarian programmes. There has been some adaptation to include development components, but greater emphasis on design of medium and long term projects is needed. Most NGOs have comprehensively planned their work, although some, specialised in emergency work, are not accustomed to detailed planning and/or are dependent on mobilising funds along the way.

10. In the area of management of human resources, the trend has been for expatriate staff numbers to fall since the emergency phase. However, the mission felt that their numbers are still excessive in view of the Rwandan human resources now available. Given the severe depletion of human resources that Rwanda has faced, finding qualified national staff was understandably difficult. This has been compounded by the often low priority given to training nationals. There is a need to bring NGO practices in line with Labour legislation and increase the number of nationals in positions of high responsibility. Concerning financial resources, NGO costs are composed of a number of elements including expatriate costs which averaged 25 %. A downward trend has occurred since the shift to a rehabilitation/development phase. In the interest of improving NGO - Government collaboration steps should be taken to comply with the Basic Agreement audit provision. It was also noted that evaluation should be an integral part of NGO operations.

## **2. TEXT OF THE OPENING STATEMENT READ BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE**

### **SPEECH DELIVERED BY PROFESSOR Dr. Emmanuel BAJYANA, COUNSELOR IN THE "PRESIDENCE DE LA REPUBLIQUE" DURING THE WORKSHOP ON THE REINFORCEMENT OF THE COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND NGOs OPERATING IN RWANDA.**

**Hotel Mille Collines - Kigafi, May 22nd, 1996.**

Permit me in the name of the Government of Rwanda to first thank for having been so kind as to accept our invitation to come to the workshop on enhancing NGO-Government Cooperation.

As you are aware, numerous humanitarian, organisations offered assistance in rebuilding the country from the ruins brought about by war and genocide.

The Rwandese Government and indeed the entire population of Rwanda appreciate these tireless efforts. Since many things have been said about the tragedy which befell Rwanda during the April-July 1994 and which reached its paroxysm with the genocide and mass massacre, there is no need to relate those events in details again, because I am certain that everybody in this room is aware of what took place during that period. I must however point out in short that the country was wrecked and populations were in total confusion. What happened in this country was beyond the magnitude of any war you can ever imagine.

Nevertheless, the genocide and the war were stopped, you cannot imagine enough what energy and how many efforts it cost to Rwandese people to do this. On the other side the country was completely destroyed and it became obvious that Rwanda was to be rebuilt from the scratch.

Since then a lot of achievements, have already taken place: peace, order and stability have been established in the country after the establishment of a broad based Government of National Unity and other institutions as well.

The new leadership has also made notable achievements in restoring some social services such as the provision of water, electricity, communications, hospitals, schools, etc.

It is important to note that these achievements, could not happen without the assistance of the international community, particularly, the non-governmental organisations for which I must reiterate the appreciation of the population of Rwanda to the tireless efforts they deployed to give support to our country at the time of need.

The performance of some of these NGOs, in this complex environment was effective in saving lives and the Government recognises the importance of this response.

However, it is important to note that a big number of Humanitarian organisations in such a short time required better-coordination in order to maximize the use of the assistance rendered. It is in response to the need of coordination that my Ministry whose mandate amongst other tasks is the coordination of Humanitarian Assistance, decided to set up a structure of the coordination of Humanitarian Assistance and NGOs operations. The commonly known as HACU. It was established in such a way that, amongst other things, it renders all services required by NGOs and to be able at the same time to be fully informed about their activities in the country on one hand, and on the other to follow up the evolution of the Humanitarian Assistance operations. To date, the task is still big, although it is clear that NGO coordination is now established. The Government policy is clear, it facilitates better working relationships and continuous reviews, so that maximum results can be attained from the NGO interventions.

In the bid to make sure that the little funds channelled to Rwanda are used effectively, the Government of Rwanda introduced a working guideline to help coordinate and orient humanitarian agencies towards projects that the Government felt were a priority and to ensure that activities carried out in Rwanda were in accordance with the law of the land.

Given the sheer numbers of NGOs operating in Rwanda at the time, the NGO working guideline introduced by the Government was appreciated by a recognised number of NGOs which registered immediately, yet some chose to resist the registration process and sometimes refused to sign the agreement. It became increasingly clear as time went on, that even among some NGOs who officially registered and signed an agreement with the Government, their mandates conflicted with the declaration that an NGO should be governed by aims which are non Governmental, non political, non sectarian and non profit making.

To date MINIREISO has 118 registered NGOs. The Government of Rwanda appreciates the reputable NGOs inside Rwanda who have tirelessly dedicated much efforts to complementing the Government's limited capacity to provide for its citizens. We in the Government recognise the role NGOs have played in the social-economic development of this country. While we have been extremely busy playing different roles in an effort to rebuild Rwanda, the concept of close cooperation, trust and understanding must continue to be improved. Sometimes we develop a mis-communication between us. We need to improve our communication channels and avoid any cause for inconveniences on both sides.

Some NGOs, however, undertook to cover large needs without experience and qualified staff. Some NGOs activities were characterised by duplication of efforts and thus waisting of resources. Sometimes some NGOs or NGO personnel because involved in activities contrary to their mission, sometimes directly affecting the security and politics of the country. That is why, on 6 December 1996, 38 NGOs were told to cease operations (in effect 19 of them had already left). So, only 19 NGOs left the country leaving behind 114 NGOs still operating.

Many rumours went on all over the world turning into propaganda as to why the NGOs had to be expelled.

The Government regrets the misinterpretation of the above event as general hostility to all NGOs. The Government of Rwanda would like to reassure all NGOs operating in Rwanda, that we in the Government are committed to maintaining a favourable environment within which NGOs can operate.

We regret the inconveniences this may have caused to anybody. The Government would like to clear the misunderstanding and continue building a working relationship with the 118 NGOs presently operating in Rwanda. In fact, the number might increase since, according to my technical departments, NGOs are still applying for registration.

When NGO evaluation study sponsored by UNDP was undertaken during the period January -March 1996, again rumours went on that this evaluation was geared towards expelling NGOs.

This was proven to be completely unfounded and we made sure that this does not become a basis to destabilise our efforts to better serve the Rwandans. Meanwhile HACU embarked on ways of carrying out a smooth re-registration and quickly communicated with NGOs regarding the re-registration procedures. To date most of the NGOs have been re-registered.

On the NGO evaluation, you will allow me very quickly to give you some of the reasons which brought us to put this exercise in place.

Through rapid evaluations done in the past by HACU in some areas of the country, reports showed that the effectiveness of many NGOs was greatly lacking. This proved to be true for many reasons: In some cases, they embrace many fields at a time without particularly having at their disposal qualified human resources. For some of them, the expatriate personnel is so numerous that salaries, means of transport, accommodation and running costs cover a very big

percentage of the budget. It is also known that many NGOs hardly accept budgetary controls even though the money they use comes from bilateral or multilateral aid granted to Rwanda.

On the other side, some NGOs taking advantage of a situation of disorder resulting from the fact that central and local administration structures were not yet working at the beginning, have sometimes acted in a manner which was contrary to any humanitarian ethic.

To date, almost two years after the war everyone recognises the great benefits of the emergency relief to Rwanda. However many people wonder whether the results achieved are proportional to the sums of money spent or whether they meet the expectations of the Rwandese populations.

Moreover, from reports at our disposal, United Nations Agencies have primarily been donors and have financed many humanitarian assistance operations, executed by NGOs, for the amount of about 200 million US dollars for the period here above mentioned. Unfortunately, the Government does not have (or will never have) details on the uses of all those funds.

Likewise, for most of the programme financed either by NGOs' own resources, or from funds granted by bilateral donors but managed by UN executing agencies or by NGOs, the Government is no more informed neither on their use nor on the modalities and the financing conditions of such or such project executed by the NGO, despite some elements of little importance supplied to HACU in the framework of the registration. It results from this that very often donors were obliged to finance certain NGOs for projects that had no real interest for the population or did not necessarily correspond to the Government's priorities. In this respect, it is worth recalling that during the Round Table on Rwanda held in Geneva in January 1995, the donors had considered that Rwanda had neither the capabilities to absorb directly the promised aid, nor the human resources capable of managing it. The best solution had been to have it managed by UN specialized agencies and by NGOs.

As Rwanda is little by little coming out of an emergency environment and as our administration is acquiring more and more human resources and strengthens itself, it is normal to initiate development programs as some donors had wished in January 1995 in Geneva. And one of the ways out is to improve support to local structures and local NGOs so that their capacities can be strengthened for sustainability.

In order to start off on good bases towards durable development, it is necessary to put together all the instruments capable of ensuring better efficiency for NGOs' action. An evaluation of NGOs during the period 1994-1995 was therefore indispensable in order to:

- assess NGOs' activities in Rwanda
- pinpoint any constraints to their action
- highlight factors that might contribute to improve NGOs' efficiency.

The evaluation did not aim at detecting NGOs' errors in order to expel them like some thought. Far from being an instrument of control or an audit, it aimed at allowing, after diagnosing NGOs and their environment:

- to clearly define the framework and institutional mechanisms which do not hinder NGOs' actions but rather which facilitate their operations on the field.
- to elaborate NGOs' programming, budgeting, follow-up and self-evaluation instruments
- generally, to improve work methods of the various partners concerned by NGOs' actions.

Now as the Report is out, and I am certain most of you have already read most of it, I must say that the picture on the humanitarian assistance, without being gloomy, is still needing quite some improvements.

The Report shows that, amongst other things, the present territorial coverage by NGOs on the ground does not sufficiently reflect the real needs of the population. Several NGOs are still doing similar work at the same site whereas other localities particularly those farthest from urban areas are not covered sufficiently. There is lack of communication and collaboration between the NGOs themselves, and the initial tendency to resist the Government and local authorities' coordination still exist. This is topped by a lack of beneficiaries involvement as a major factor. Insufficient attention has been given to date to developing capacities of beneficiaries and national structures for sustainability. The roads sector has been given limited attention by NGOs due to lack of capacity. On the education sector, NGOs limited their efforts with emergency rehabilitation of classrooms and provided some desks and other basic materials. On NGO management, greater emphasis on design of medium and long term projects is needed, because, NGOs generally arrived in the country in response to an emergency situation and this led to a focus on short term humanitarian programmes.

In the area of management of human resources, though the trend has been for expatriate staff to fall in numbers since the emergency phase, the Report shows that their numbers are still excessive in light of Rwandese human resources. Overall expatriate salaries and related benefits (housing allowance, transport, insurances, tickets, several missions) have an excessive cost. For instance, in a number of NGOs the share of the total budget allocated to each expatriate's cost ranged between 5 and 10 % of the total. Recruitment of expatriates often appears to take insufficient account of experience and training. And locally available human resources are not given enough consideration.

The Report estimates that a total amount of US \$ 265,473,227 was channeled to 142 NGOs in Rwanda during the 1994-1995 period, but the Report states that beneficiaries did not receive the maximum potential benefits. These are just a few of the points I can point out of the Report, but I can assure you that it is rich in information.

It therefore remains a challenge to us all to devise practical ways and means to ensure efficient use of these limited resources and I hope that at the end of this Workshop we will be proud, all together to defy these challenges.

In conclusion, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for kindly agreeing to fund not only the Evaluation process but also the present workshop. I thank also its organisers and all the participants who have accepted to respond to the invitation and I wish you fruitful deliberations.

With these few remarks, it is my great pleasure to declare the workshop on "Enhancing NGO-Government Collaboration" officially opened.

### **3. FINAL COMMUNIQUE OF THE WORKSHOP**

#### **FINAL COMMUNIQUE OF THE WORKSHOP ON GOR/NGO COLLABORATION**

As part of an on-going process of improving the efficiency of assistance to Rwanda, an all day Workshop on Government - NGO collaboration was jointly convened by the Ministry of Rehabilitation and Social Integration (MINIREISO) and the UNDP on Wednesday, 22 May 1996 at the Mille Collines Hotel Conference facility. The Workshop had been prepared in consultation with the Government, representatives of the NGO community and concerned donors. The workshop has aimed to:

- (i) review and enhance the conclusions and recommendations of the Draft Report of a joint Government/UN/NGO Evaluation Study mission undertaken during January - March 1996;
- (ii) identify mechanisms for implementation of the adopted recommendations by each group of partners concerned;
- (iii) contribute to discussions and identification of mechanisms which will make the transition from humanitarian assistance to sustainable development as effective as possible.

After opening statements and a presentation of the Draft Report participants moved to three work groups structured around sectors of activity as follows: Group 1 Health, unaccompanied children, water and sanitation; Group 2 Shelter, roads and repatriation; Group 3 Agriculture, food distribution, education and micro-projects.

The Work groups reviewed and discussed and commented on the Draft Report. The resulting comments and recommendations will be compiled into a final version of the Report.

The Government clarified that the Evaluation mission was an assessment by the Government and its partners of what has been achieved during the period under review, identifying constraints, finding solutions and building on successes. The Government expressed its profound appreciation for the life saving assistance given at a time when it Government was without resources and the Government regretted any misunderstandings which may have occurred in the past. NGOs welcomed the evaluation and the opportunity it gives them to review and improve their performance in Rwanda.

All of us here today are united by the goal of better serving our beneficiaries namely the Rwandan people. This goal is at the heart of efforts to improve coordination between

Government, NGOs, donors and other partners and is the spirit in which this study and workshop have been held. The recommendations and implementing mechanisms are to be taken forward from this workshop.

The huge range of activities surveyed in this study demonstrate the progress that has occurred in a very short time frame considering the magnitude of the devastation that Rwanda has faced

Now all partners are agreed that we must concentrate on the transition from humanitarian assistance to sustainable development which is one of the major challenges currently facing Rwanda.

This meeting is part of a continuous process to improve working relationships and will be followed up by much closer coordination and collaboration at all levels, national and local. All partners present here today will continue to assess how they may better serve Rwanda.

This process will take us all forward in a spirit of cooperation and mutual understanding to the Round Table Conference in Geneva. All participants appreciate the present mutual good relations in our joint task of rebuilding Rwanda and wish to emphasise their continued commitment to these relations.

It was recognised that the lessons learned in Rwanda, and borne out in both the Government/UN/NGO evaluation study as well as the recent multi-donor evaluation, could serve to enhance the effectiveness of humanitarian assistance in future emergencies in other parts of the world.

We would like to express thanks and appreciation to all participants, the Workshop organisers and sponsors for the organisation and opportunity offered by the present workshop.

Mrs Christine Umutoni  
Director of Cabinet  
MINIREISO

John Cosgrave  
NGO Executive  
Committee

Sukehiro Hasegawa  
UN Resident and Humanitarian  
Coordinator

#### **4. GUIDELINES FOR WORK GROUP DISCUSSIONS**

##### **Annex 4**

### **WORKSHOP ON GOR/NGO COLLABORATION GUIDELINES FOR WORK GROUP DISCUSSIONS**

The Workshop was divided into three work groups with the following Co-chairs:

<b>Group 1</b>	<b>Group 2</b>	<b>Group 3</b>
Health Unaccompanied Children Water and Sanitation	Shelter Roads Repatriation	Agriculture Education Food Distribution Micro-Projects
Co-chairs: MINITRASO Save the Children UK	Co-chairs: PRIMATURE Luthern World Federation	Co-chairs: MINIPLAN USAID
Rapporteurs: Abel Nizeye Nima Patel	Rapporteurs: James Kimonyo Rebecca Dale	Rapporteurs: Vincent Ngarambe Stef Vandeginste

Overall Workshop Rapporteurs:

Antoine Sendama  
Antony Wood  
Rebecca Dale, advisor

The purpose of the work groups was to discuss ideas and to finalize the condensed evaluation draft, particularly, the conclusions and recommendations:

The time frame for these work groups was between 11:00-12:30 and 14:00-15:00. Given the limited time allotted for these discussions, groups were requested to ensure they complete their scope of work within this time frame.

Each group was to focus their discussions on the recommendations and conclusions specific to their sectors and the general recommendations to NGOs, Government and Donors in the draft condensed report. Group members were asked to complete this task within the following framework:

- Review and enhance the conclusions and recommendation of the draft condensed report with a view towards its finalization.
- Identify mechanisms for implementation of the adopted recommendations by each group of partners.
- Contribute to discussion and identification of appropriate modalities for the Transition from Humanitarian Assistance to Sustainable Development.

### **Translation Arrangements:**

In the absence of simultaneous translation facilities, the following arrangements were foreseen: During the Plenary sessions, a short summary was to be made in the other international language after each presentation. During the work group sessions, a participant was designated to translate discussions points when required.

### **At the end of the Work groups:**

- Each group was expected to finalize a list of recommendations specific to their respective sectors.
- Each group was also expected to formulate enhancement of and implementation mechanisms for the general recommendations made in the report.
- Based on the discussions in the groups the rapporteur of each work group will prepare a list of recommendations to present to the plenary.

### **Overall Workshop Rapporteurs**

- The work group rapporteurs worked with the overall workshop rapporteurs and prepared a summary of the overall recommendations of the workshop in a final communiqué.

### **Follow-up to the Workshop**

- After the workshop, the draft condensed report was finalized taking into account the discussions and conclusions and recommendations drawn from the workshop.
- Comments and suggestions made by organizations and persons unable to attend were welcomed and taken into account in the finalization process.

## **5. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

### **(a) PARTICIPANTS - MAINLY PLENARY SESSIONS**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>TITLE/ORGANIZATION</b>
-------------	---------------------------

#### **GOVERNMENT**

1. Dr. Emmanuel Bajyana	Senior Advisor/Presidency of the Republic
2. Christine Umutoni	Director of Cabinet/MINIREISO
3. Justin Murara	Director General, MINIPLAN
4. Antoine Sendama	Director HACU/MINIREISO
5. Callixte Muzungu	MINIREISO
6. Dr. Sostène Bucyana	MINISANTE

#### **NGOs**

1. Miguel Mahfoud	CRS
-------------------	-----

#### **OECD AND OTHER DONOR MISSIONS**

1. Dr. Reine Peri Frey	Swiss Embassy, Kigali
2. Kaye Oliver	British Ambassador, Kigali
3. Marie Spaak	Regional Representative, ECHO

#### **UN AGENCIES**

1. Sukehiro Hasegawa	UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator
2. Roman Urasa	Delegate/UNHCR
3. Collins Asare	Deputy Representative/ U N W R
4. Rebeca Marteusen	UNHCR
5. Gary Stahl	Officer in Charge/UNICEF
6. Carlos Zaccagnini	Deputy Humanitarian Coordinator
7. Deidre Boyd	Information Officer, DHA
8. Randall Harbour	Policy and Strategy Officer, UNDP
9. Martin Mbanda	Africa 2000 Network, UNOPS

## **ORGANISING COMMITTEE AND SUPPORT STAFF**

1. Antoine Sendama	Director, HAMMINIREISO
2. Anthony Wood	Deputy Resident Representative (Emergency Humanitarian Response/Governance), UNDP
3. Nima Patel	LWF
4. Rebecca Dale	NGO Liaison Officer
5. Abel Nizeye	MINIREISO
6. Jean Marie Gaga	MINIREISO
7. Josiane Gatamba	MINIREISO
8. James Kimonyo	MINIREISO
9. John Gardner	UNV Technical Specialist, Business Center, UNDP
10. Jane Uwicyeza	Business Center, UNDP
11. Ldon Bwanadiru	Business Center, UNDP
12. Fabiola Kanobayire	Temporary Secretary, UNDP

### **(b) WORK GROUP PARTICIPANTS**

#### **WORK GROUP 1**

##### **HEALTH UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN WATER AND SANITATION**

<b>Co-chairs:</b>	Rose Marie Museminali, MINITRASO Save the Children/ UK
<b>Co-Rapporteurs:</b>	Abel Nizeye, MINIREISO Nima Patel, LWF

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>
-------------	---------------------

#### **GOVERNMENT**

1. Chantal Habarimana	Prefecture of the City of Kigali
2. Pierre Karemera	Director General, MIJEUMA
3. Rose Mary Museminari	DG/Social Affairs, MINITRASO
4. Dr. Gasana Karake	Office of the Prime Minister
5. Leon Fidèle Ndizihwe	MINIJUST
6. Pastor Abel Nizeye	HACU/MINIREISO

## **NGOs**

1. Gem Nguyen	Solidarités
2. Steven Riffin	Save The Children/UK
3. Noah Garaway	Food for the Hungry
4. Muriel Cornelis	Médecins sans Frontières/Belgique
5. Jeannette de Putter	MEMISA
6. Sylvia Schaller	ICRC
7. Emmanuel T.	AEF International
8. Gilles Foucho	Action Nord Sud
9. Julie Dargis	Save The Children/USA
10. Jane Mathison	Oxfam/ UK
11. Huguette Rutera	UNICEF/MINITRASO
12. Lars Noess	Red Cross Federation
13. David Lilie	ARC

## **OECD AND OTHER DONOR MISSIONS**

1. Luc Verbeeck	Belgian Cooperation
2. Dr. Bucyana	USAID

## **EXPERTS**

1. Dieudonné Vuningoma	Consultant MINIREISO
2. Dr. Emmanuel Kagambirwa	Consultant MINIREISO

## **UN AGENCIES**

1. Brigitte Delay	UNICEF
2. Catherine Mazy	UNHCR
3. Bibiane Uwera	World Bank

## WORK GROUP 2

### SHELTER, ROADS AND REPATRIATION

**Co-chairs:** Dr. Gasana Karake, Office of the Prime Minister  
John Cosgrave, Luthern World Federation

**Rapporteurs:** James Kimonyo, MINIREISO  
Rebecca Dale, NGOs Liaison Officer

**NAME** **ORGANIZATION**

#### GOVERNMENT

1. Charles Gahima	MWAPROFE
2. Augustin Bigirimana	MINIREISO/HACU
3. Dominique Muyango	MINIREISO
4. Jean Baptiste Mugaga	S/Préfet Gitarama
4. Callixte Gasana	S/Préfet Affaires Sociales/Gikongoro
5. Charles Furere	MINIREISO/Gikongoro
6. Edouald Sebushumba	S/Préfet A.S.C/Byumba
7. Gérard Ntashamaje	MINIJUST
8. Jean Pierre Kabugali	MININFOR
9. Senglo Louis Nsengumuremyi	MINIPLAN
10. Dorcella Kagwesage	MINIREISO
11. Isidore Munyakazi	Director General, MINITRANSCO

#### NGOs

1. Jurgen Feldmann	German Agro Action
2. Michael Dayle	Goal
3. John Keys	IRC
4. Dominic Mac SORLEY	Concern
5. Agnès Mukarwema	AVEGA
6. Norbert Clément	World Vision
7. Rwabuhihi Ezéchias	ARDEC
8. Mesfin Halefom	AHA
9. Kanyangira Stanislas	CCOAIB
10. Angelina Muganza	RDO
11. Jean Paul Biranvu	CLADHO

#### UN AGENICES

1. Papa Kysma Sylla	UNHCR
2. Richard Danziger	IOM

## **WORK GROUP 3**

### **AGRICULTURE, EDUCATION, FOOD DISTRIBUTION AND MICRO PROJECTS**

**Co-chairs:** Senglo Louis Nsengumuremyi, MINIPLAN  
Monty Crisp, USAID  
**Rapporteurs:** Vincent Ngarambe, Consultant  
Stef Vandeginste, UNDP

**NAME ORGANIZATION**

#### **GOVERNMENT**

1. Emmanuel Werabe	MINETO
2. Justin Gashugi	MICOMART
3. Narcisse Musabeyezu	MINEPRISEC
4. Alain Mugabe	MINIREISO
5. Jean Marie GAGA	MINIREISO
6. Jean Marie Byakweri	MINIREISO/HACU
7. Fidèle Uwizeye	MININTER

#### **NGOs**

1. John B. Bideli	RWARRI
2. Vivens Havugabaremyi	FORWA
3. Charles Danzel	Care International
4. Geoffrey Kayigi	Compassion International
5. Michael O'Brien	Trocaire
6. Bob Hesteman	ACIST
7. Soline N.Twahirwa	PRO-FEMME
8. Mary Barikungeri	Church World Service (USA)
9. Vénuste Sinalinzi	CRS/RWANDA

#### **OECD AND OTHER DONOR MISSION**

1. Monty Crisp	USAID
2. Buddy Shanks	USAID
3. Gerrit Noordam	Netherlands Embassy

## **UN AGENCIES**

- |                         |       |
|-------------------------|-------|
| 1. Joseph Nyilimana     | W.F.P |
| 2. James A.             | UNHCR |
| 3. Stef Vandeginste     | UNDP  |
| 4. Agnès Mukarugwiza    | WHO   |
| 5. Perpetue Mpinganzima | WHO   |