

SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND/UNICEF

MULTI-YEAR, MULTI-COUNTRY RESEARCH PROGRAMME
ON THE IMPACTS OF CASH TRANSFERS ON CHILDREN
IN EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA

Joint SCUUK/UNICEF STUDY Rwanda Country Report

Final Draft

Christina Nyhus and Jennifer Gibson

March 27, 2009

This is the final draft of the country report for Rwanda¹ prepared as part of the research design phase for the joint Save the Children/UNICEF multi-country, multi-year study of the impact of cash transfers on children in Africa.

Joint SCU/UNICEF Study

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	II
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	IV
I. CONTEXT.....	1
A. WHO ARE THE MOST VULNERABLE?	1
B. GOVERNANCE AND POLICY PROCESSES RE: SOCIAL PROTECTION.....	3
II. PURPOSE OF VISIT/STUDY	4
III. METHODOLOGY FOR DESIGN PHASE	4
IV. SOCIAL TRANSFER PROGRAMME DESIGN	5
A. BACKGROUND	5
B. COVERAGE	5
C. ELIGIBILITY/BENEFICIARIES	6
D. SIZE OF TRANSFER	7
E. CONDITIONALITY	8
F. FUNDING	8
G. IMPLEMENTATION	9
H. MONITORING AND EVALUATION.....	11
V. POLICY CONTEXT: SWOT ANALYSIS	12
VI. KEY STAKEHOLDERS FOR SOCIAL PROTECTION.....	12
A. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.....	12
B. DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS.....	13
C. NGOS.....	13
VII. CURRENT AND POTENTIAL RESEARCH PARTNERS.....	13
VIII. PROPOSED RESEARCH FRAMEWORK FOR THE COUNTRY.....	14
A. POTENTIAL KEY QUESTIONS	14
B. INFORMATION ALREADY COLLECTED AND USEABLE	15
C. INFORMATION THAT WILL NEED TO BE COLLECTED	15
D. POTENTIAL OPTIONS FOR COLLECTING INFORMATION	15
E. FREQUENCY.....	15
F. COMPARABILITY ISSUES.....	15
G. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT:.....	16
IX. PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR IMPLEMENTATION.....	16
A. PARTNERSHIPS	16
B. HUMAN RESOURCES.....	16
C. TECHNICAL GAPS AND NEEDS.....	17
D. QUALITY INSURANCE MEASURES (I.E. TRAINING).....	17
E. COSTS.....	17
VII. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	17
VIII. EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY TRANSLATION: GETTING BUY-IN.....	18
IX. OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS/FOLLOW UP	18
X. ANNEXES.....	20
ANNEX A: DECENTRALIZED ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PUBLIC WORKS COMPONENT OF VUP.....	20
ANNEX B: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED	22
ANNEX C: NOTES FROM SITE VISITS & BENEFICIARY FOCUS GROUPS.....	24

Rwanda Country Report

ANNEX D: NOTES FROM STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP.....	28
ANNEX E: REFERENCE CITED.....	30

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CCT	Conditional Cash Transfer
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
ECD	Early Childhood Development
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
EICV	Household Living Conditions Survey
FARG	Fund for the Support of Genocide Survivors
HIV / AIDS	Human Immuno-Deficiency Virus / Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
IPAR	Institute for Policy Analysis Research
JAF	Joint Action Forum
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MIFOTRA	Ministry of Public Service and Labour
MIGPROF	Ministry of Gender and Women in Development
MINALOC	Ministry of Local Government, Good Governance, Community Development and Social Affairs
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MINEDUC	Ministry of Education
MINICOM	Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Investment Promotion, Tourism and Cooperatives
MININFRA	Ministry of Infrastructure
MINIRENA	Ministry of Natural Resources Ministry of Health
MINISANTE	Ministry of Health
NSPP	National Social Protection Policy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NISR	National Institute of Statistics Rwanda
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PDL-HIMO	Labour intensive local development (Public works) programmes
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Programme (Ethiopia)
SCUK	Save the Children UK
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
VUP	Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme
VSL	Village Savings and Loan
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme

Rwanda Country Report

I. Context

A. Who are the Most Vulnerable?

Poverty levels in Rwanda are high. Over 5 million Rwandans live in poverty, 90% of whom are in rural areas¹. According to the latest Household Living Conditions Survey², half of all Rwandans live in poverty and one third are considered extremely poor (defined as unable to meet caloric requirements of 2100 calories/adult/day).

Children continue to be among the most vulnerable population in Rwanda. Population growth is considered high, with roughly one third of all Rwandans being children. Among these, 83.3% are OVCs (orphans and vulnerable children), or roughly 2.8 million children³. The high number of orphans in the country (roughly 825,000) are due to both the HIV and AIDS epidemic as well as the 1994 genocide. Infant mortality rates are high and are due to common preventable diseases like diarrhea, acute respiratory infections and malaria. Just under half of all Rwandan children under 5 are stunted, an indication of chronic malnutrition⁴.

Genocide survivors are currently recipients of various government programmes including a social transfer programme within the Fund for Genocide Survivors (FARG), which collects its revenue as an income tax from all Rwandan citizens. Many of the FARG transfer beneficiaries are genocide orphans, and are given comprehensive support in education, health, housing and basic needs. HIV prevalence rates in Rwanda have declined over the past ten years. According to the Rwandan Demographic Health Survey, HIV prevalence in Rwanda is 3% among adults and the highest rates are seen among women, especially among educated, urban women⁵. The World Food Programme, CRS and World Vision (from USAID) support households affected by HIV and AIDS through food programs. Maternal mortality is a large problem in Rwanda, where 710 deaths/100,000 live births occur (DHS 2005).

What is the State of Social Protection/Transfers in the Country?

Safety net programs for various subpopulations in Rwanda cover roughly 10-12% of the population and include programmes for genocide survivors, households affected by HIV/AIDS, refugees and returnees and demobilized former military personnel⁶. Social protection programmes up until 2008 missed poor households that fell outside of these specific categories.

In 1999, the Rwandan government launched a long-term development strategy, 'Rwanda Vision 2020', to build social capital, establish a modernized agriculture system, ensure good governance, build infrastructure and incite private sector development, laying out goals and priorities for Rwandan growth. Poverty reduction strategies in Rwanda have been developed with this long-term Vision 2020 in mind.

¹ Government of Rwanda (2007). Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2008-2012), source National Institute of Statistics Rwanda 2006. Household Living Conditions Survey.

² National Institute of Statistics Rwanda 2006. Household Living Conditions Survey

³ Republic of Rwanda (2008) A Situation Analysis of Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children in Rwanda. Revised Draft Report. MIGEPROF. May 2008, Kigali, Rwanda.

⁴ ORC Macro 2005. Rwanda Demographic and Health Survey

⁵ ORC Macro 2005. Rwanda Demographic and Health Survey

⁶ Republic of Rwanda 2006. Public Expenditure Review: Government and Donor Expenditure on Social Protection. MINALOC, MINECOFIN

Joint SCUUK/UNICEF Study

The first five-year poverty reduction strategy 2002-2007 (SPRS) was established in 2002, but it was the second five-year strategy, renamed the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy 2008-2012 (EDPRS), that recognized social protection as a means to alleviate poverty. The EDPRS aims to meet Rwanda Vision 2020 goals as well as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for 2015 to which the Government of Rwanda committed in 2000. The three pillars of the EDPRS are (1) Sustainable growth for jobs and export, (2) Vision 2020 *Umurenge* and (3) Governance (building a low corruption reputation). The social protection pillar of the EDPRS is the Vision 2020 *Umurenge* Programme (VUP), led by the Ministry of Local Government, Good Governance, Community Development and Social Affairs (MINALOC). The stated goal of the VUP is to eradicate extreme poverty by 2020, with a mid-term target to reduce the share of people living in extreme poverty from 37% in 2005 to 24% in 2012⁷. Decentralization is a central reform policy of the government and the VUP is very much placed within this larger plan, delegating pivotal project implementation to the *umurenge* (sector) level of government. See Box 1. For more information on the roles and responsibilities at each level of government, as it relates to the VUP, see Annex A.

Box 1: Rwandan Decentralization Structure



Source: Government of Rwanda 2007. Vision 2020 Umurenge An Integrated Local Development Program to Accelerate Poverty Eradication, Rural Growth, and Social Protection: EDPRS Flagship Program Document

The VUP is run by MINALOC and has three components: public works, credit packages and direct support. These components are offered to poor households based on land ownership and labour availability. Public works projects are primarily aimed poverty reduction for the recipients of the public works but also have the objective of improving community assets and infrastructure (via land

⁷ The target was originally intended to be a reduction to 20% as per Rwanda, Government of. 2007. "Vision 2020 Umurenge An Integrated Local Development Program to Accelerate Poverty Eradication, Rural Growth, and Social Protection: EDPRS Flagship Program Document." MINALOC. August 2007. Kigali, Rwanda

Rwanda Country Report

terracing and road building) while supporting community-based participatory approaches and decentralization to put project identification in the hands of the districts and sectors.

The VUP began to pilot their cash transfer programme for public works in August 2008 in the poorest sector in each of the 30 districts in the country. Although there have been other social transfer and support programmes in the country (some aimed to genocide survivors), the VUP intends to replace the patchwork of current programmes with a national systematic social transfer programme across the country aimed at supporting the most vulnerable households. As of mid-December 2008, neither the credit packages nor the direct support arms of the VUP had begun.

B. Governance and Policy Processes re: Social Protection

The Ministry of Local Government, Good Governance, Community Development and Social Policy (MINALOC) is responsible for social protection policy and implementation under two different units: The Social Policy Unit and the Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme. The Social Policy Unit is responsible for setting policy and producing the National Social Protection Policy (NSPP). The NSPP is currently in final draft form and was scheduled for presentation to cabinet for approval by the end of 2008. MINALOC Minister Protais Musoni was involved with the initial drafts of the VUP Manual and has been a strong proponent of social protection, pushing much of the internal progress made so far in Rwanda. In Rwanda, the implementation of social protection is, in fact, proceeding faster than the policy formation behind it.

Although MINALOC is charged with social protection for the country, the Ministry of Gender and Women in Development (MIGEPROF) is responsible for safeguarding the protection of children. MIGEPROF is not directly involved with the VUP, but sits on the VUP steering committee, chaired by MINALOC, along with the following ministries: the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAGRI) who vice chairs the committee, the Ministry of Natural Resources (MINIRENA), the Ministry of Health (MINISANTE), the Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA), the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN), Ministry of Public Service and Labour (MIFOTRA), and the Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Investment Promotion, Tourism and Cooperative (MINICOM)⁸.

Historically, the government partner for UNICEF and SCUK has been MIGEPROF, given their mandate to cover children. However, there are two working groups for the two arms of MINALOC where international agencies can engage with government. UNICEF and SCUK are both part of the working group for the Social Policy Unit but not with the VUP unit's working group, however a formal working group for the VUP focused on technical issues has been mentioned as a priority need. SCUK's involvement with the VUP is increasing as they begin to engage more directly with the VUP through Joint Action Forums (JAF). MINALOC has asked NGOs to work at sector level with VUP officials to sit in on periodic meetings as part of a Joint Action Forum (JAF) composed of sector VUP staff, cell secretaries, CBOs, CSOs and NGOs working in the sector. The JAFs are still being organized but the proposed role of an NGO like Save the Children would be to take meeting minutes and encourage dialogue on VUP's implementation, including such items as targeting and logistics, so any issues arising can be addressed.

⁸ The source of this information comes personal communication with the VUP Unit, however, it differs slightly with a draft version of the VUP manual which does not include MIGEPROF in the steering committee.

Joint SCUUK/UNICEF Study

II. Purpose of Visit/Study

The two-week country visit to Rwanda (November 30 to December 13, 2008) was conducted as part of the design phase for the development of a five-year, six-country study being planned by Save the Children and UNICEF to assess the impact of social transfer programmes on child development outcomes in Eastern and Southern Africa. The overall goal of the study is to contribute high-quality evidence to influence policy formulation and to improve the design of social transfer programmes that will achieve positive impacts on child well being in particular and poverty reduction for children and their families more broadly. Rwanda has been identified for inclusion in this research, along with Kenya, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Mozambique and Malawi.

During the design phase of the study (October 2008-March 2009), country visits undertaken by a two-member team consisting of lead researcher and research advisor aim to:

- Develop a clear understanding of the country's transfer programme(s), their management and operational structure;
- Consult with key stakeholders in country on the design of the framework, the development of indicators and methods for collecting and disseminating relevant data;
- Document details of the country's transfer programme (including data collection systems); identify information gaps; and recommend potential options for filling those information gaps

III. Methodology for Design Phase

During the two-week visit, the Research Team undertook the following:

- 1) Semi-structured interviews were carried out with representatives of key government ministries, NGOs engaged in social protection work, and international organisations to better understand how the VUP programme works, what key questions stakeholders have regarding impacts upon children and what the key debates regarding social protection in country are. See Annex B for a complete listing of stakeholders interviewed.
- 2) Site visits were carried out to see the relevant programmes in action. During the site visits, the research team held focus group discussions with beneficiaries and interviews with local officials and staff involved in implementation of the transfer. In Rwanda, two of the 30 VUP Public works pilot sectors were visited: Gitobu sector in the northern district of Burera, and Mwendo sector in the Ruhango District to the southwest of Kigali. See Annex C for further information on these site visits.
- 3) A stakeholder workshop was held near the end of the second week. The workshop provided a forum through which the Research Team could report back preliminary findings and also served to discuss further some of the outstanding questions that need to be resolved around the implementation of the VUP, as the programme is only in pilot phase and still ironing out its kinks. See Annex D for the notes from this meeting.
- 4) The Research Team also met with potential local research partners to garner interest in the project and assess capacity to carry out different aspects of the proposed framework. In Rwanda, the team met with NISR and IPAR both of whom have strengths and weaknesses that are detailed later in this document.

In addition to the various meetings, site visits and workshop, the Research Team also consulted key background documentation, project plans and assessments and M&E plans, in order to better understand gaps in the existing monitoring systems and how the proposed research could complement what already exists.

This report of the Rwanda country visit, compiled using the information obtained during the visit, will be shared in January 2009 with the study's external advisors for technical comments and with all

Rwanda Country Report

stakeholders at country level for further discussion and feedback. Based on this feedback, the research outline will be revised and finalized, in line with emerging issues and work on the research designs from the other countries involved in the study, with an overall research framework developed to guide and integrate the effort.

Representatives from all 6 countries involved in the study as well as the research team, Save the Children/UNICEF steering committee and external advisory board will meet in March 2009 to finalize the research outlines and discuss plans for implementation. During this design phase, it is expected that Save the Children and UNICEF at country level will bring together and continue to engage with a multi-stakeholder reference group for the study, based on current work underway as well as discussions and stakeholder meetings conducted in the course of the country visit.

In each country, either UNICEF or Save the Children, has been designated as the lead agency for the design phase of the study. In Rwanda, Save the Children country office is currently assuming the lead role for the coordination of stakeholders around this research project.

IV. Social Transfer Programme Design

A. Background

As described earlier, the Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme (VUP) is one of the three pillars of the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2008-2012). The VUP is integrated into decentralization reform which has been rolling out since 2000. The VUP is run by MINALOC but crucial roles are played at the level of *umurenge* (sector), as well as *akerere* (district), and *umudugudu* (village). Annex A outlines the roles of the various levels of government in the implementation of the VUP's Public Works scheme.

The VUP has three arms of service provision depending on land and labour criteria found within qualifying poor households: the public works scheme, a credit scheme and direct support. The VUP began piloting its public works scheme in August 2008. The two other arms of the VUP have not yet begun piloting, although identification of direct support households has already been done and training of staff for direct support was underway by mid-December 2008. Scale up of the public works scheme is planned for 2009, although the details of scale-up are not clearly defined.

B. Coverage

According to the VUP Unit, by mid December 2008 17,500 households were enrolled in the VUP's public works scheme. One sector per district was identified for inclusion in the pilot; therefore 30 sectors are included in the pilot. However, personal communication with VUP officials indicates that only 28 sectors have been included so far. The poorest sector in each district was identified by community development committees at the district level based on various criteria including sector infrastructure, level of poverty, dispersion of households (ruralness being an indicator of poverty in the sector), education levels, numbers of cars, bikes, health centres, etc.

During the first roll out of the public works programme in Autumn 2008, funding was distributed equally among participating sectors, irrespective of population size or need. As a result, roughly

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

600⁹ households were covered in each sector. In Gitovu this meant that roughly 75% of all households were on public works support, because the sector population is small. In contrast, in Mwendo only 25% of all households were on public works support. This poses a number of challenges both programmatically and in terms of the study. Programmatically, it is possible that far wealthier households are being included in sectors with small populations, while poorer households in larger sectors may be excluded. From a research perspective, this poses methodological challenges for any cross sector comparisons we may want to make.

Although direct support has not yet begun, beneficiaries have been identified and current estimates are that 6,860 households will be covered by direct support in the 30 pilot sectors, once the programme begins in early 2009.

C. Eligibility/beneficiaries

Eligibility is determined through a community-based participatory approach that ranks poor households by labour and land criteria. The *ubedehe* is a community-led process which allows communities to create social maps at the village level. See Box 2 for details on the *ubedehe* process as it relates to VUP targeting.

According to some district officials, even though only certain community designates develop the *ubedehe* ranking lists, they are made public to the community for review. These ranking lists of poor households are then used to offer social programmes to households according to the following classification: poor household without any available labour qualify for social assistance schemes including direct support, and poor households without land but with available labour can engage in public works programmes. The targeting criteria for the financial services package has not yet been approved, however beneficiaries from both public works and direct support should be able to access this third component, as well as other qualifying households.

The programme does not specifically target children, despite reports that a conditional cash transfer scheme prioritised to children has been suggested in the Rwanda Integrated Child Poverty, Policy and Budget Study¹⁰. Although there is no specific policy on distribution of transfers to females versus males, the VUP Manual does specifically state that 50% of all VUP beneficiaries are supposed to be women.

⁹ During consultant field visits this number was estimated to be roughly 1500 households per sector, but VUP reports 600 households per sector

¹⁰ OPM 2008. Rwanda Integrated Child Poverty, Policy and Budget Study. Oxford Policy Management

Rwanda Country Report

Box 2: The *ubedehe* social mapping process for eligibility into the VUP Public Works

Source: Government of Rwanda 2008. Vision 2020-Umurenge Programme Operational Frameworks and

The selection of clients for participation in public works will build on the participatory approaches based on the ubedehe model of village selection processes. This is based on the existing, periodically updated, systematic “social map” of each Umudugudu community, in combination with discussions at a meeting of village members or of representatives they have designated. Rwanda has used this approach successfully for a variety of other purposes. It involves three steps:

- 1. Identifying the poor from the non-poor;*
- 2. From among the poor, identifying households with and without adult labor to work; and*
- 3. Ranking identified poor households with adult labor according to their welfare level to pick the poorest for participation in the available public works. If a new project arises, then the list can be consulted and reviewed for another group of clients.*

It is recommended that the above approach be supplemented by a few specific, well-known, measurable, non-income household characteristics that reliably distinguish the very poor in the community. For example, households with an adult suffering from long term sickness, or a disabled person in the household, households who hold no land or livestock assets, or households who are so poor they are unable to eat two square meals a day, etc. These characteristics are best identified by communities while doing a “social map” for the community. The ultra poor households may be accorded priority in the selection.

Procedures Manual. MINALOC

D. Size of transfer

The current size of the transfer for the public works component of VUP is dependent on local wage rates and therefore varies from sector to sector. *On average* a beneficiary collects 833 RwF per day worked up to a maximum of 20 days per month (according to October 2008 data). Participation in the programme is limited to one person per household, irrespective of household size. As a result, the value of the transfer in real terms can vary greatly from household to household depending on the number of dependents for whom one might be caring. During focus group discussions with a group of beneficiaries, this became a key complaint. Older participants were much more likely to say the transfer value was not enough; when probed further this was because they were often caring for in excess of five children, many of whom were not actually their own. In contrast, younger workers who only had one or two children found the transfer to be not only sufficient, but some were actually able to use the transfer to start a business or hire others to work in their gardens while they were doing Public Works.

There was some discussion about the current voluntary savings program promoted by the VUP during these discussions as well. According to the policy, it is suggested that 300 RwF, or roughly one third of a person’s wages, be set aside as savings and not withdrawn until the end of the project. This would then give them an asset base when they finish and might enable them to participate in programmes such as the credit component of the VUP, the ultimate aim being self-sufficiency. During both site visits, though, there seemed to be confusion as to whether beneficiaries could access their savings and if so, when. Some clearly believed they were not allowed to access the money until the end of the programme, while others stipulated varying time frames and some didn’t know at all. Several cited their wage rate as 500 RwF per day, as the were

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

sceptical that they would ever see the “saved” money, while a few younger participants who lived near the bank stipulated they could access their money at any time.

For direct support beneficiaries, there is a calculation of benefits based on number of children in the household. Through direct support a household can earn between 250 RwF to 700 RwF per day. This is calculated as: 250 RwF for household head, 150 RwF for spouse plus 100 RwF per dependent, up to three, at which point a household no longer gets additional money for additional dependents.

The Financial services component is not yet developed and there are no estimates on what the size of the loans offered to qualifying households will be. Because of the financial shortfalls of the VUP programme (to be discussed in more detail later), it is possible that the ‘credit package’ component of the VUP will be passed to willing NGOs. For example, CARE is in discussions with MINALOC to implement their Village Savings and Loan (VSL) programme in some of the sectors. Current plans estimate that the financial services packages will be available by late February 2009.

E. Conditionality

There are no conditions, i.e. participation or enrolment in services, in return for receiving cash transfers in the VUP in Rwanda. Beneficiaries are only expected to attend sensitisation and training sessions in return for being in the programme, but it is not clear if lack of attendance would result in dismissal from the programme.

It should be noted, however, that in 1999 the Ministry of Health moved to a public health insurance scheme called the *mutuelle de sante*. Before 1996, health services used to be provided for free, followed by three years of fee for service. Enrolment in the *mutuelle* is required to access health services, and costs 1200 RwF per family member, as a one-time enrolment fee. According to the policy, no family member can receive service until all members are enrolled, however this policy seems to be someone relaxed in practice. In addition to the enrolment fee, individuals are expected to pay a co-pay of 10% of all costs associated with their health visit. The only services which do not require a co-pay are HIV and TB screening and treatment. Hospital coverage is not included in the *mutuelle* costs. It is estimated that roughly 75% of the population should be enrolled in the *mutuelle* (the rural poor not otherwise covered by private health schemes), and of those roughly 85% are current paid participants. Although payment into the *mutuelle* is not a condition of the transfer, households in the VUP often list it as one of the first outlays of transfers.

F. Funding

The two major international funders for the VUP programme are DFID and the World Bank, however, the World Food Programme, UNICEF, and UNDP also support the programme. Starting in 2009, the VUP has had its own budget line in MINALOC and therefore government funding will be channelled directly to a dedicated VUP bank account. The World Bank will provide funds through general budget support, not as funds specifically earmarked for the VUP implementation. The World Bank also provides funds through their community development fund (CDF) to staff the supervising team for the VUP (the central VUP officers and two sector-level VUP personnel in each of the 30 sectors). DFID intends to support the VUP programme directly and also contributes funds to support 2-3 technical advisors (international consultants) who sit in the VUP Unit.

For the mini budget period from January to June 2009, the VUP has a Government funded budget of 2.74 billion RwF (approximately \$5 million) to cover the costs of continuing the programme in the same 30 pilot sectors. Scale-up will be greatly determined by the amount of funds that become available in 2009. The World Bank has committed to \$15 million over three years. DFID is hoping

Rwanda Country Report

to support the VUP with an grant of £19.0 million from 2009 - 2013, but has not given anything to dates, aside from the technical assistants.

As of the end of October 2008 the total amount of transfers dispersed through the public works component was 950,165,240 RwF. Although the VUP Flagship Programme document estimated that \$44 million (24 billion RwF) would be needed to cover all three programmes for a total of one year in 30 sectors, experience to data suggests that actual costs for 30 sectors will be approximately \$10 million. For future scaling up beyond the 30 pilot sectors, however, shortfalls in funding have been discussed, and there is pressure for international donors to help cover the costs so that direct assistance programmes can be covered. The medium term budget was being costed out, but will need further revision as donor funding commitments become clearer and Government scaling up decisions are made.

The baseline survey of 2400 households in 10 pilot sectors had an estimated cost of 116,000,000 RwF, or roughly \$200,000, which was covered by the World Bank and others.

G. Implementation

The VUP Unit, comprised of national staff as well as sector level staff, conducts the implementation of the VUP. National staff includes a team of five: the Coordinator, Finance Officer, Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist, an Outreach Specialist and a Program and Resource Mobilization Specialist. The national VUP team is supported by 3 international consultants who are technical consultants in the areas of programme management, M&E and finance. At the sector level, there are two VUP staff: a programme manager and a finance officer. And finally at the district level is a statistician (from the National Institute of Statistics Rwanda).

The piloting of the public works component which began in August of 2008 is due to finish in June 2009, followed by a scale-up to other 120 additional sectors, or 4 more sectors per district, depending on funding. Direct support beneficiaries have already been identified and the programme was supposed to begin by January 2009.

Public works projects are ongoing in sectors and beneficiaries are intended to be on cash transfer support for 6 months, after which they exit the programme, although site visits also showed variations in this as well. There is a clear indication in the manual of operations that the 'exit strategy' does not mean graduation or self-sufficiency, but rather that after 6 months of support they may be able to use credit package schemes to then slowly build themselves to a level of self-sufficiency or to the 'livelihood protection threshold' at which they can ensure basic needs as well as have enough of a buffer to overcome periodic shocks. Currently with the slow roll out of credit packages in this pilot phase, it is not clear what gains the current pilot beneficiaries will make after exiting from the programme. This is especially true for direct beneficiaries who are selected based on poverty as well as lack of a labour supply (elderly or child headed households, pregnant women, or HIV/AIDS affected households or those with a critically ill family members). The definition of 'graduation' is currently being discussed among stakeholders and the VUP is planning on working towards a paper outlining the current thinking around 'graduation' from the two support schemes.

Implementation manuals were finalized late in 2008 but had not yet been distributed to sectors. Therefore there are a fair amount of inconsistencies in programme implementation across the various sectors. Most personnel are brought into Kigali for trainings as new developments arise, like the initiation of the direct support programme. Since Rwanda is a small country, travel to Kigali and communication with central staff is consistent and frequent, however, undoubtedly on the spot

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

decisions are made by sector staff as issues arise and consistency across sectors may be compromised.

During the visits to two different sites within the country, the research team noticed several differences in implementation which could impact the design of the research and result in impact differences across sectors. Some of these differences in implementation include:

- **Targeting** Because all sectors received funding to cover the same amount of households regardless of population size or need, there are various coverage rates in the sectors. Sector visits to Mwendo and Gitovu indicated that in Gitovu roughly 75% of all households were covered by public works, whereas in Mwendo only 25% of all households were covered. It is likely that the exceptionally high coverage in Gitovu resulted in inclusion errors, perhaps on a significant scale. After discussions with beneficiaries and district officials, the research team learned that some of the individuals included in the public works projects were actually the owners of the land being terraced. District officials explained this was the result of a need to compensate them for taking their land away from them for a period of several weeks. After the terracing is complete, the owners are given seeds and removed from the public works project.
- **Scale-up** Even though scale-up plans will be limited by funding in 2009, there was much confusion among sector staff on when scale up would occur and how it would happen. One sector understood that scale-up would include one new sector per year while another thought it was three new sectors. Until scale-up plans are finalized it will be hard to determine potential beneficiary numbers and sectors from which to draw sample sizes and control groups.
- **Payment management** In all sectors, transfers are deposited into bank accounts of beneficiaries through the Popular Bank (Banque Populaire). Because some sectors did not have a bank branch, mobile tellers were being used to help beneficiaries deposit and access their funds. However, these mobile tellers were only available on certain days when disbursements were expected (once a month). Therefore access to funds in some communities was much more limited than in others where bank branches could be found within walking distance. Although this may be unavoidable it may affect the way in which individuals use and save money that needs to be controlled for in any research undertaken.
- **Programme duration** In some sectors, beneficiaries were only continued through the life of a public works project, whereas in others they were held on for 6 months and then released regardless of completion of the project. In other words, there seems to be significant variation in the 'exposure' time of beneficiaries to transfers, ranging from 2 to 9 months.
- **Timeliness of transfers** In some sectors, payments were being made routinely and on time where in other sectors there were complaints of late and unpredictable transfers. Differences may be due to a variety of factors which could also impact the programme success, including sector inaccessibility, or personnel with poor logistical capacity, but more importantly the differences in the predictability of transfers may alter beneficiary behaviours on spending, saving and asset accumulation.
- **Length of time in each sector** It was not clear in the manuals or among sector officials how long each sector would remain in the VUP programme. Some were under the impression that each sector would be covered for a period of one year, whereas others understood the scale-up to continue to include ongoing sectors as well as new ones. Although follow-up of households over the course of five years would still be possible without sector involvement, it would certainly be much easier if VUP sector officials were present throughout the life of the research, to aid with follow-up.
- **Trainings to beneficiaries** In both sectors observed, regular educational talks were being given to beneficiaries as part of the VUP programme. However, there were no guidelines on topics to be covered or frequency of trainings across sectors. In some sectors, therefore, some beneficiaries were being given trainings on savings whereas in others there were none. Differences in messages may have an impact on how households invest, and would

Rwanda Country Report

be important to track in the research. It did not appear that training dates or topics were not recorded in either sector visited.

Given how new the programme is, and that it is still in pilot status, inconsistencies are to be expected. Many of those listed above are known to VUP staff and are currently in the process of being worked out. Since this field visit in early December 2008, in fact, adjustments might have been made already or are planned to be made with scale-up sectors in 2009. This includes policy around graduation, scale up and identification of public works projects for 2009. Difficulty filling key vacant posts quickly has also slowed things down. As the VUP team move towards making decisions on many of these issues, it will be important for SCUK/UNICEF to stay heavily engaged with the process and identify potential barriers to implementing strong and sound research on VUP impacts.

H. Monitoring and evaluation

The EDPRS has a monitoring and evaluation framework for the broad development strategy of the country, within which the VUP sits. The system it is focused on performance indicators more than impact indicators, but may help inform general progress of the VUP. Of the current performance assessment framework proposed for the EDPRS, only three indicators exist for the VUP and they are: (1) the percent of vulnerable men, women and children assisted through safety net schemes, (2) the percent of food insecure households who graduate from livelihoods enhancement schemes to self-sustainable livelihoods, and (3) the number of food insecure households benefiting from public works employment scheme¹¹.

The Manual of Operations for the VUP M&E is heavily focused on programme evaluation (ensuring processes are meeting targets, graduation rates, satisfaction with services, etc.). Although some impact measures are slated to be included in the M&E framework, they are mostly focused on economic indicators, as their intended goal is to eradicate extreme poverty.

The World Bank has devised a baseline survey based on the Household Living Conditions Survey (EICV), which has been used nationally for estimates on poverty levels and general economic development. Training of enumerators for administering the baseline survey was going on in the middle of December 2008 and data collection planned for late 2008/early 2009. The baseline survey is a household survey focusing on expenditures, assets and income estimations. There is likely not enough data to be collected that is of specific interest to this research on children, aside from estimations for poverty and basic immunization rates or school enrolment. Therefore it will be necessary to add to the existing baseline survey a variety of outcome and process indicators that are of interest to the stakeholders in this research, both in country and at the regional level.

A new M&E technical advisor for the VUP has been hired to assist with the system for the VUP and has expressed interest in the value-addition this research may bring to the VUP M&E. It is crucial that communication with the VUP M&E personnel continue periodically as they develop their list of indicators and plans for monitoring. The ability for this research to add to their structure will be essential for obtaining buy-in and for a unique opportunity to join forces to collect of a wide variety of indicators on child development early on in the country's transfer programme.

¹¹ Government of Rwanda 2008. "EDPRS Common Performance Assessment Framework."

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

V. Policy Context: SWOT Analysis

Based on analysis of key policy documents and plans, discussions during the country visit, and inputs from stakeholders at the national stakeholders' workshop, the following analysis might be made concerning the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of conducting this research around social protection in Rwanda:

- **Strengths:** The newness of the transfer programme in Rwanda affords SCUK and UNICEF the unique opportunity to contribute to the development of a useful monitoring and evaluation system for looking at the impact of social transfers in child development in the African context. The openness of the government to foreign involvement, the manageable size of the VUP Unit and the timing of the research with the VUP scale-up make for an almost ideal setting in which to conduct this work.
- **Weaknesses:** Positioned between SCUK and UNICEF, the link to MINALOC requires some work. Currently both SCUK and UNICEF partner more commonly with MIGEPROF, as the mandate for overseeing children sits within this ministry. However, MIGEPROF is not involved with VUP aside from sitting on a governmental board for the VUP. Therefore partnerships with MINALOC need to be strengthened in order to garner the support necessary to contribute to the M&E system.
- **Opportunities:** There are various opportunities within the VUP in conducting this research. SCUK has recently commissioned a feasibility study on the establishment of early childhood development (ECD) centres in Rwanda. The idea is to engage ECD centres with local VUP programs by offering public work hours as participation in running the ECD centre (i.e. cooking for the children, helping staff to monitor the children, etc.). The impact of additional programmes in conjunction with social transfers is of interest to international stakeholders. The VUP plus ECD would offer the opportunity to examine the impact such additional programs may have on long term impacts of cash transfers, especially as it relates to children.
- **Threats:** Although the Rwandan government's ability to initiate or alter programmes overnight is beneficial in most cases, it could also prove to be a threat to the research. With many of the implementation plans in flux or under review, it may be difficult to plan for research in the long term.

VI. Key Stakeholders for Social Protection

In addition to the primary stakeholders and planners/implementers of the study (Save the Children and UNICEF), the following are some of the key national stakeholders in social protection in the country.

A. Government Departments

- The **Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme (VUP) Unit** of the Ministry of Local Government, Good Governance, Community Development and Social Policy. Although their main focus is in implementing the VUP they would certainly be interested in process evaluation indicators that may be included as value-added components in the research, not covered by their own M&E system.

Rwanda Country Report

- The **Social Policy Unit** of the Ministry of Local Government, Good Governance, Community Development and Social Policy. This unit is charged with the formulation of policy and the establishment of the National Social Protection Policy.
- The **Ministry of Gender and Women in Development (MIGEPROF)** currently is responsible for overseeing children, especially OVCs. Although they lack technical capacity, they may help garner support for more child-specific indicators in the ongoing M&E system.

B. Development Partners

- The **World Bank** currently supports the VUP through general budgetary support and is responsible for conducting the baseline survey at the end of 2008. Discussions with WB on recommendations for the success of this research include the need for government buy-in and a forewarning that SCUUK/UNICEF may encounter ethical difficulties in conducting research with a control group here in Rwanda.
- **DFID** is a key contributor to the formulation of social protection policy and VUP implementation in Rwanda. Their interest in this research appears to be high and they will be pivotal in ensuring the political buy-in of the research in country.
- The **World Food Programme** has been instrumental in providing social safety nets for a variety of vulnerable populations in Rwanda. However, food aid has become somewhat contentious in the country of late and current WFP programmes are scaling down, including their nutrition centres aimed at monitoring and child growth. Depending on the WFP's future in Rwanda, they may be helpful partners in the areas of nutrition and 'additional programmes' for the VUP. Unfortunately, the WFP was unable to meet with the consultants during their site visit, however, it may be worth pursuing further engagement with them. It was heard that the WFP is currently conducting a vulnerability study which includes a nutrition assessment.

C. NGOs

- **CARE:** The Village Savings and Loan programme run by CARE may indeed expand to include the VUP sectors as part of the credit package services offered in the third arm of the VUP.
- **VSO:** VSO is substantially engaged with the Rwandan network of disabled persons, called FENAPH (National Federation for Disabled Programme). The direct support arm of the VUP will be often targeted to disabled household members. Although it is not yet clear what role VSO would play as a partner in this research, they would be helpful in identifying the needs of the disabled in Rwanda and what if any outcome indicators would be of interest to them in their work with the disabled.

VII. Current and Potential Research Partners

- **NISR (National Institute of Statistic Rwanda):** The NISR is the main statistical and survey data structure for the country. They implement the Household Living Conditions Survey (EICV) as well as the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS). They have the capacity to undertake large research as well as manage and analyze data. However, they

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

are a government institution and may be prone to bureaucracies that would delay the research, including full schedules. If this work were to be undertaken by such a research partner, timing of upcoming EICVs and DHSs would be prioritized and therefore considered in the timeline for this research.

- **IPAR (Institute for Policy Analysis and Research):** Started as a think tank by the Tony Blair Project, the IPAR is relatively new in Rwanda. They currently have funding for two years and have six researchers on staff. The Government of Rwanda supports them through in-kind donation of their building, and the African Capacity Building Foundation provides the rest of the support. They openly admit that to date they have had difficulty in recruiting staff and have moved to a model of using junior researchers, usually PhD students at the university, under the guidance of a few established researchers. Their strengths are in qualitative data analysis, but as of yet there is no work published from which a better assessment of their abilities could be made.

VIII. Proposed Research Framework for the Country

The general aim of the study in Rwanda will be to contribute to the monitoring, evaluation and analysis of both processes and impact on children and their families of the Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme. The research in Rwanda seeks to make a unique contribution to the overall multi-country study, by providing potentially a very broad array of evidence on the impact of social transfers on children in the African context. The research will build on and seek to expand the M&E processes both planned and underway in the World Bank and within the VUP Unit.

A. Potential Key Questions

Some of the key questions for the overall research have been outlined by various stakeholders across the six-countries and at the regional level. They can be grouped into the following categories and, in Rwanda, have the potential to be covered most extensively.

- **Child impact indicators** including programme impacts on health, nutrition, education, child protection, and poverty. Potential questions will include impacts on child growth, incidence of illness, school attendance and enrolment, child time use, as well as child migration and fostering.
- **Dynamics at the community and household level** include programme effects on social capital, traditional support systems, and other community-wide impacts. Household impacts will include household dynamics and composition.
- **Programme processes**, including the effectiveness and efficiency of its operations, activities, use of resources, and so forth.
- **Additional programmes** include the added impact that additional programmes may have on beneficiaries. Such programmes include specific projects like ECD centres, food aid, or Care's Village Savings and Loan (VSL) can be used to assess the impact of VUP + versus VUP on its own. Alternative research questions could examine the impact of health and education services in the context of social transfers. Such questions would then likely measure such things as satisfaction with local services, distance to services as well as data collection at the service-delivery level on uptake of services among other things.

Rwanda Country Report

B. Information already collected and useable

- The **Household Living Conditions Survey (EICV)** is collected every 5 years, most recently in 2005. Data are focused mainly on economic indicators, with a few measures for health and school attendance. Although this survey will be helpful for obtaining information on background progress in poverty alleviation, it may not be helpful for this research given its limited scope and time frame. The World Bank Baseline survey, which is very similar to and modelled after the EICV, will be more useful as it is targeted only VUP beneficiaries as well as a control group (n=2400 households) and was implemented as a baseline in late 2008. Because the public works component had begun in August 2008, the baseline is not helpful for those beneficiaries but will be useful for direct support beneficiaries, and for upcoming public works sectors.
- The **Rwandan Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS)** by ORC Macro but implemented by NISR collects data at the national level on a range of health issues including child and infant mortality and morbidity, vaccination rates, rates of HIV, knowledge and attitudes about STIs and HIV/AIDS, contraceptive use, fertility rates, maternal mortality, domestic violence and child feeding practices. The third DHS in Rwanda was last conducted in 2005.

C. Information that will need to be collected

The information obtained from the EICV and DHS are not likely to be useful for specific programme impact and evaluation questions outlined earlier. They are datasets that may be useful in getting general development information about districts or sectors. Because the VUP M&E is not yet fully developed, it is not clear what additional data will need to be collected by this research. Once the VUP has a clearer idea of their indicator priorities, it will be easier to determine where the gaps exist and how this research intends to fill them.

D. Potential options for collecting information

Again, depending on the M&E plans within the VUP unit, there are various data collection options that might need to be employed to collect the necessary and remaining data. For most household level data, an attempt will be made to add questions to the VUP M&E survey instrument if at all possible. Depending on the frequency of their data collection this additional 'module' can be separated out as necessary. Data will also be collected at health centres, district offices, and schools on a periodic basis. Such data gathering can be done by hired staff as the volume of the expected data is fairly minimal. For qualitative data collection, perhaps those focused on community and household dynamics, a special team of trained qualitative enumerators will be employed to collect specific data in control and intervention sectors as necessary.

E. Frequency

The VUP M&E Unit for the data they are collecting will determine the frequency of data collection. If more frequent collection is necessary, separate funds will be necessary for data collection off schedule. Thoughts for the across-country studies indicate that perhaps three periods of data collection over the five years will be necessary, currently suggested to be: time 0 (baseline), year 2 and year 4, with time 0 likely to be 2010 in planned scale-up sectors for that year.

F. Comparability Issues

Given the potential broad range of questions that may be undertaken in the research in Rwanda, there may be a good deal of cross-country comparisons possible. The most obvious comparison

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

may be with the Ethiopian Productive Safety Net Programme, after which the VUP was modelled. Both transfer programmes have a public works element, which no other countries have, and may provide an interesting opportunity to examine the value-addition of public works for communities and infrastructure development.

G. Knowledge Management:

A rigorous management information system (MIS) will be essential for the success of the research project. It is likely that much of the data will be managed and housed by the NISR for the VUP-collected information, as they are likely to be the research partner internally. NISR data management is well tested given the fact that at least two large national surveys are managed through their staff. An agreement would have to be established ahead of time on access to the data for SCUK personnel hired for the research. Additional data collected solely from SCUK, including qualitative data, will have to be managed within SCUK structures and under specially hired personnel brought on for research.

IX. Proposed Framework for Implementation

A. Partnerships

A potential partnership for the Rwandan research could be made according to the following:

- SCUK hires coordinating staff for the research, manages qualitative data collection and coordinates with local and regional partners on the analysis of data.
- VUP houses the research and works closely with SCUK staff to coordinate research gaps and plans with their M&E system. Data is managed at VUP and coordination is heavily managed through their current channels (enumerators, etc..). Data analysis for some process indicators likely to be done in-house, depending on VUP capacity.
- UNICEF supports SCUK in designation of additive research questions and technical capacity if and where necessary (i.e. nutrition growth monitoring)
- DFID helps to ensure coordination between the VUP, World Bank and SCUK is smooth and buy-in of the government to the additional research is obtained
- NISR's role needs further discussion among the above stakeholders. Currently NISR manages all data and data collection in country related to the VUP, those being the baseline studies organized by the World Bank. The drawbacks to NISR data collection include their already busy schedule with country-wide surveys and whether or not this would fit into their time schedule. Certain research questions also may not play to their strengths, which are largely economic. Alternatively, a regional research partner, such as HSRC in South Africa, could potentially be brought in to help collect, managed and even analyse some of the data if VUP is overburdened by this responsibility.

B. Human Resources

In order to conduct and coordinate this research sufficiently in Rwanda within SCUK, staff would need to be hired. A study coordinator based within SCUK Rwanda would be essential. There should also be further discussion around whether a policy advisor would be needed, to engage partners and government with research outcomes periodically throughout the five-year study, or whether such capacity and availability exists among current SCUK staff.

Rwanda Country Report

C. Technical Gaps and Needs

There already exists a strong background among partners in data collection, survey design, data management and quantitative analysis. Therefore the technical gap outstanding would be around the collection, data management and analysis of qualitative data. Perhaps some of this work could be picked up by IPAR or a regional research partner, such as HSRC in South Africa. Otherwise, it would come from hired consultants to come in at specific periods as necessary.

D. Quality Insurance Measures (i.e. Training)

Training of VUP M&E enumerators will be undoubtedly be conducted, however, SCUK staff may be required to assist with the additional survey modules, specific to this research. Depending on the final list of indicators and key questions in this additional module, SCUK staff or hired consultants may be necessary to conduct the training. In some instances, like with anthropometric training, UNICEF technical assistance might be garnered given their vast experience with child growth monitoring.

E. Costs

A clearer idea of scale up and a viable time line is needed to estimate costs accurately for the Rwanda research. Costs will include hiring of 1-2 SCUK staff, as well as the costs of data collection, management and analysis for at least three survey rounds, as well as periodic qualitative data collection determined by the country research partners.

VII. Ethical Considerations

- **'Treatment' and 'Control' Groups:** The moral implications of the experimental random selection approach to designation of some households for treatment and others for comparison – simply for the purposes of the study – is an ethical dilemma part and parcel of doing research of this type. Control groups are not unethical in nature if benefits are extended to them once the research is concluded. It may not be possible in Rwanda, or across any of the countries, to withhold transfers for five years, but this will depend on the pace of scale-up. In any case, control groups will be maintained for the time possible after which analysis can be made, less rigorously but nonetheless with validity, on before and after comparisons within treatment groups.

- **Sustainability:** What will happen – after VUP ends – to direct support households that have become dependent on the cash transfers for their well-being? How can sustainability be built into the project, both through greater government 'ownership' and financing, as well as through stimulation of investment and income-generation through the use of cash transfers as a means of boosting households out of poverty into self-sustaining livelihood? These questions will have to be discussed as the research continues to develop in Rwanda.

- **Research with Children:** Certain ethical considerations come to the fore in research in general – in terms of informed consent, confidentiality, and use of research results – which have particular ramifications in terms of research on and for children. Study planners and implementers will need to take care to conform to existing guidelines on research involving children and all pertinent ethical issues are taken into consideration. All study clearances will be obtained from SCUK, UNICEF as well as Rwandan governmental bodies responsible for approving human subjects research in country.

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

VIII. Evidence-Based Policy Translation: Getting Buy-In

Linking with national policy and policy monitoring progresses at the outset will greatly improve chances of research results being taken into consideration in policy formulation. The research in Rwanda should therefore be designed in such a way as to contribute to the evolving thinking around social protection and the improvement in programme implementation (cost-effectiveness being a valuable measure used in government policy processes).

It is important that the findings from the study and its various components reach high level policy makers not just at the end point (after 5 years) but through periodic reviews of emerging findings along the way and the organization of policy discussion fora (both national and regional), which should be planned as an integral part of the study. A clear communications plan should be developed to guide all such efforts.

The monitoring and study of the cash transfer programmes themselves should also be accompanied by research and analytical work to support the government in its review of policy options through, for example, an analysis of fiscal space for social protection; a comparative cost-benefit assessment of universal benefits and targeted transfers; and other topics which might emerge as priorities through the course of the study and the implementation of national policy.

Key recommendations arising from the above:

- Enlist representatives from policy making wings of government as members of the national research team/steering body from the outset
- Make use of existing fora for policy discussion and debate, which will evolve as the national social protection framework is finalized and implementation begins;
- Develop a communications plan agreed upon by the VUP Unit, Save the Children, UNICEF, DFID and NISR such a plan should aim at periodic dissemination of interim results and emerging issues through a variety of channels (media; policy briefs; national seminars, etc) rather than production of a single report at project's end;
- Encourage experience and information exchange across the six countries involved in the study so that countries can learn from each other, including around issues of translating policy into action.

IX. Outstanding Questions/Follow Up

Due to the developing nature of the VUP implementation plan, there are outstanding questions that need to be answered in order to effectively design the research. These questions include:

- What of the programme implementation inconsistencies have been ironed out since the country visit, i.e. can we count on a consistent 6-month 'exposure' to the treatment. Can we count on similar transfers dosed across the sectors (the voluntary savings issues need to be squared away), have the targeting issues been clarified, etc.
- What will the VUP M&E system look like? What indicators have been chosen? How often will data collection take place? At what levels will data be collected (child, household, community)? What sample size will they obtain for their impact evaluation? Will it be possible to add a module of additional questions to the instrument? How will we manage and divide responsibilities, costs, etc.?
- When and how will direct assistance be rolled out? Is there a plan of when it will start in each sector?

Rwanda Country Report

SCUK and UNICEF's ECD proposal holds great promise as a comparative study for this research. More detailed plans around how it might be implemented and when implementation might begin will be important for the finalisation of a comparative research design.

In addition to the programmatic issues, it will be important that both SCUK and UNICEF continue to engage in the national dialogue as VUP develops to ensure that this research is owned nationally. The success of the research in informing policy will directly correlate to how well it is integrated into ongoing discussions around the development of the M&E system.

A decision will also need to be made regarding a steering committee for this research. Should the steering committee be housed by MINOLOC or MIGEPROF and who should be involved? Is there scope for one of the current steering committees, either the one directed towards the Social Protection Policy or the one directing VUP to take on the role of steering committee for this project as well?

Finally, a research partner will need to be identified, agreed upon and approached. Both the country teams and the research team may want to consider a regional/international partner if an appropriate local partner cannot be found. Once this is complete, it will be necessary to do more detailed costings of potential research frameworks and what is possible given the unlimited possibilities and the much more limited study budget.

Joint SCU/UNICEF Study

X. Annexes

Annex A: Decentralized Roles and Responsibilities for Public Works component of VUP

Umudugudu (Village)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Selection of projects ▪ Provide feedback to Akagari level on the progress of work ▪ Provide all data collected through Ubudehe Process to the respective stakeholders
Akagari (Cell)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work with Umurenge level functionaries to select participants from Umudugudu to the program ▪ Work with Umurenge level officials to select projects from Ubudehe data at Umudugudu level ▪ Monitor the timely payment of wages and give feed back to the sector ▪ Monitor work progress and provide feedback to the sector for onward submission to District
Umurenge (Sector)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Work with Akagari level functionaries to select participants from Umudugudu to the program ▪ Work with Akagari level functionaries to select projects from Ubudehe data at Umudugudu level ▪ Work closely with the district to hire contractors ▪ Channel funds for execution of selected projects ▪ Ensuring timely payment of wages ▪ Monitor progress and provide feedback to the district for onward submission to MINALOC ▪ Advocate for Public Works at the Sector Joint Action Forum level ▪ Run an Appeals Unit to address complaints on issues such as participant selection, wage payments, project selection, and contractor behaviour.
District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure coordination of social protection interventions by other stakeholders for harmonisation of procedures and to avoid duplication. ▪ Ensure that the direct support activities are incorporated into District Development Plans and that activities are properly integrated with other ongoing interventions. ▪ Support umurenge to provide adequate technical support for direct support activities. Identify constraints and help umurenge and Umudugudus to solve problems. ▪ Support the development of appropriate infrastructure required to implement the VUP activities through the decentralised technical structures. ▪ Ensure that monitoring and evaluation activities are undertaken on a regular basis, provide technical support to the process, and compile M&E information including action learning experiences from the umurenge into a district overview.
National	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MINALOC ▪ Overall responsibility of supervising and facilitating the programme by: ▪ Ensuring the VUP Public Works oversight, orientation, and guidance in line with the steering committee expectations to reflect all ministries whose sector activities form part of the VUP activities. ▪ Soliciting technical assistance from sectoral leveled stakeholders to harmonize the VUP Public Works with the sectoral guidelines, technical norms and standards

Rwanda Country Report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advocating for the VUP Public Works to the high-level representatives from the development partners' community, such as DFID, EU, GTZ, the Netherlands, ONE-UN, USAID, WB, WFP, CARE, SNV, and Action Aid who have already expressed interest in VUP and several others who have not been reached ▪ Ensuring Advocacy and Coordination of financial and technical resource mobilization for the CDF, the major channel of Government funds to local governments as well as an overseer of the Labour Intensive Public Works Approach, Ubudehe Process and the VUP ▪ Offering sectoral orientations to harmonize Public Works with Good Governance, Community Development, and Social Protection ▪ Ensuring daily monitoring and evaluation of the programme activities to offer corrective actions and recommendations ▪ Receiving and analyzing reports from the Programme Management Team for onward submission to the Steering Committee ▪ Calling and chairing Steering Committee meetings ▪ Observing the application of the procedures indicated in the operational manual and spearheading any changes or modifications as may be dictated by internal and external environments. Changes/modifications will be effected after consultative process with development partners, donors inclusive.
Project Management Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General management of the program ▪ Provide training and technical assistance to Umudugudu and committees ▪ Coordinate and supervise the transfer of resources to Umudugudu—fiscal allocation could depend on performance and rules established in the operational manual. ▪ Coordinate the processes of identification and selection of clients. ▪ Coordinate the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) work ▪ Ensure proper documentation and reporting for the program. ▪ Coordinate with external agencies and related stakeholders in project related activities. ▪ Ensure linkage of Public Works with social Protection ▪ Define the ToR for short-term technical consultants. ▪ Ensure application of recommendations of the steering committee through the MINALOC ▪ Ensure consultation with the CDF especially the HIMO and Ubudehe wings

Source: Government of Rwanda 2008. Vision 2020-Umurenge Programme Operational Frameworks and Procedures Manual. MINALOC

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

Annex B: List of People Interviewed

SCUK- Rwanda

Tamsin Ayliffe- Country Director
Dr. Binyam Woldetsadik Gebru- Health Program Officer
Boureima Ouedraogo- Child Protection Program Manager
Jacqueline Uwumukiza- Child Protection Officer

DFID

Isabelle Cardinal- Social Development Advisor (i-cardinal@dfid.gov.uk)

MINALOC

VUP Unit

Albert Ndemeye- Acting Director
Bizimana Yves – Resource Mobilization Officer (yvesbiz@yahoo.fr)
Louis-Marie Asselin - M&E Technical Advisor (lasselin@socialimpact.com)
Heather Kindness- Incoming Program Manager Technical Advisor
(heather.kindness@gmail.com)
Rupert – Outgoing Program Manager TA

Social Protection Unit

Eugene BARIKANA- Secretary General (barikanae@minaloc.gov.rw)
Crispus Ayabare – Social Protection (ayebarecris@yahoo.co.uk)

UNICEF

Francesca Morandini- Social Protection (fmorandini@unicef.org)
Giselle Rutayisire – SP (grutayisire@unicef.org)
Dr. Abuid Owenga – Nutrition Advisor
SOULEYMANE Aboubacar- Social Planning & Rights Advocacy Officer

World Bank

Abebe Shimeles
Alex Kamurase – Operations Officer (akamurase@worldbank.org)

CARE

Phil Christensen- Country Director
Josephine Ulimwengu- Social Protection Officer

National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (NISR)

Dr. Munyakazi - Director General

MIGEPROF

Minister Dr. Mijawamariya Jeanne d'Arc

MINISANTE (Ministry of Health)

Rwanda Country Report

Hertilan INYARUBUGA- Coordinator Mutuelle de sante (ihertilan2@yahoo.fr)

Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (IPAR)

Antonia Mutoro- Acting Director

Send a Cow Rwanda

Laurent Munyakusi (laurent.munyakusi@sendacowrwanda.org.rw)

VSO International

Amanda Crookes- Disability Programme Manager (amanda.crookes@vsoint.org)

Burera District Office

Clemente Uwiragiya- Health and Social Protection Officer

Gitovu Sector Office (Pilot sector)

Maniriho Kamanzi Philibert, Finance officer

Ruhango District Office

Mayor Celestine

Vice Mayor Chance Kabono

Vice Mayor for Social Affairs

Mwendo Sector Office (Pilot sector)

Executive Sec Valence Akizamo

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

Annex C: Notes from Site Visits & Beneficiary Focus Groups

8 December 2008

Field Visit to Burera District- Gitovu Sector

Participants:

Binyam Gebru (SCUK Health Programmer Officer), Vincent Kayiranga (SCUK Driver/Translator), Jennifer Gibson and Christina Nyhus (SCUK consultants)

District Office (Akerere of Burera) Personnel:

Clemente Uwiragiya- Health and Social Protection Officer

Peter (Piere) - Head of Planning

Mayor and Vice-Mayors unable to meet, as they are in a performance assessment meeting with Kigali VUP officers.

- Burera has 17 districts.
- Gitovu was selected as poorest district based on per capita income, food insecurity, inaccessibility and low soil fertility. It has no health centre and no market.
- Public works project chosen by listening to community and advising them based on indicators to reach. Radical and progressive terracing are the two main PW projects here, as well as roads and building schools. They say they are already seeing improvements.
- They haven't decided which 3 new sectors to include in the VUP next year, but know they will have to make the decision and are aware of scale up plans.
- The 5-year district plan has information on all sectors like health centres, schools, etc..
- They have not heard anything yet about the direct support program starting.
- Main child protection issue here is school fees for both primary and secondary. Primary supposed to be free but requires contributions (300 Fr), materials which can be prohibitively expensive for some households.
- District has 7000 orphans.
- Cash for VUP goes through district to get to sector. Joint Action Fora (JAF) supposed to help with distributing transfers. Now they use local NGOs to help distribute the money (to the bank from district it seems). HelpAge is engaged in this cash delivery project. Distribute at local level with security guards.

Beneficiary Focus Group

4 beneficiaries (2 women, 2 men) during work duties at terracing site

- get 700 Fr/day for 22 days a month
- work M-F only from 7am-1:30pm
- they've worked for three months and have been paid already for 2 months
- first month received all the money, 2nd money just got 70% (forced savings of rest)
- ¾ had land (part of what they were terracing).
- VUP giving seeds and fertilizer for their land once terraced
- Only one member of their household was working in PW

Rwanda Country Report

- Female 1: had 3 kids only 1 in school, 3 of 5 family members in *mutuelle*. Brings young children to public works project when the 10yr old is in school, otherwise he minds them at home when she works.
- Female 2: used money for *mutuelle* and for food
- Male 1: 5 kids, no land, paid for *mutuelle*
- Male 2: 3 kids, wants 2 more, uses money for food, has land
- All still only eating 1 X day, and not before work or school (not in the morning)
- See public works project as a good thing, says the project allows them to use the land without the rain washing away the plants.

Visit with Gitovu Sector Office Personnel:

Executive secretary

Registration officer

Finance officer- Maniriho Kamanzi Philibert

Almost all information came from Philibert, the finance officer.

- Began VUP work in June 2008 as public works (PW)
- Conducted study of the 2,111 households (hhds) in the sector:
 - 1,358 hhds had no land, but had able bodied labour
 - 354 hhds had no land and no labour
 - 295 hhds had land
 - 104 hhds 'were able to eat 2 X day' (i.e. not poor)
- Terracing project ran from Sept to October with 466 people
 - 1 Nov added more people to finally total 1,538 people (hhds) on PW
- Terracing will end in January and then they will begin road construction
 - They will switch workers to give everyone a chance to work, therefore some people on PW for 2 months, others 4 months (not 6 months as per protocol)
- Conducted a small evaluation of what people spent money on (though did not ask about things like mattresses, pots&pans, etc.):
 - 349 of original 466 bought 'productive assets' (livestock, *mutuelle*, businesses)
 - 104 bought sheep, 20 another animal, 16 goats, 25 seeds, 76 *mutuelle*, 62 food, 2 bought a business
- Only 1 worker per household allowed but can switch worker within hhd as needed
- Beneficiaries obliged to open bank account (they are helped to do it since bank is in district city and therefore far away). Bank comes to sector to pay beneficiares over course of two days. This is currently through Banque Populaire. They were told they can begin to withdraw 'savings' portion after 3 months of being on program.
- Trainings and sensitization:
 - Sector officers hold trainings for the PW beneficiaries every 3 days to one week, roughly a one hour talk split between two groups (as large group), after their work day. Umerenge groups help them give the talks, all volunteers. At each umudugudu there are 3 volunteers (X23 villages) + 3 coordinators at

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

each cell (X3) + 3 exec secretaries = 87 volunteers who help them with sensitization workshops.

- Trying to obtain seeds and fertilizer from VUP project via a direct request.
- The 700 RwF a day was set in May. Heard it will increase to 1000 RwF next year.
- HelpAge pays the same, as does any PW project.
- 700 X 22 days is roughly 22,000 RwF a month (or roughly \$110). A primary school (A2) teacher makes 45,000 RwF a month. Some nurses only make 24,000 RwF.
- The sector has 3 primary schools, 1 secondary school (but only 3 years of it).
- Health centre currently being built in sector next year, currently there isn't one.
- Private land owners within PW terracing project allowed to participate in PW because they are being neglected their land for those 4-6 months.
- Uncertain when direct support is beginning.
- Held JAF meeting with representatives from local cooperatives, no NGOS invited even though 5 working in the area.

9 December 2008

Field Visit to Ruhango District- Mwendo Sector

Jacqueline Uwumukiza (SCUK Social Protection Officer), Vincent Kayiranga (SCUK Driver/Translator), Beverly Roberts (SCUK consultant for Early Childhood Development Centres) (bevroberts@gmail.com), Jennifer Gibson and Christina Nyhus (SCUK consultants)

Ruhango District Office Personnel:

Mayor Celestine

Vice Mayor Chance Kabono

Executive Sec for Mwendo Sector VUP: Valence Akizamo

Vice Mayor for Social Affairs (including education)

- Mwendo is one of 9 sectors in Ruhango
- They have 1,200 hhds working in the PW (500 started in Aug, the remaining 700 in November) out of 4866 hhds in the sector (25% coverage).
- Mwendo sector chosen from a long list of criteria (infrastructure, education, food insecurity, etc.). Community development committees (CDCs) at district level assessed all sectors and chose Mwendo.
- 30% of wage forced to stay in the account (can only withdrawal 70%). Working towards schemes for cooperative banking. Bank Populaire has a fee each time a deposit is made (not a withdrawal). Plus people need to pay for the booklet (account balance booklet). Two banks in sector, one branch nearby. Everyone set up their own account personally. Mobile teller available to help fill the booklets out.
- Within household the one worker can alternate depending on availability of individuals.
- PW work hours are 5 days a week, 22 days a month from 7am-1pm.
- PW began Aug 10 2008

Rwanda Country Report

- 3 payments have been made so far. Paid every 15 days or three weeks, no per month.
- Currently working only on road rehabilitation because not enough money for other project.
- Can only work on project for 6 months, then dismissed and new people will be enrolled. However, they aren't forced to graduate...can continue if still needy. *Ubedehe* (community ranking process) is updated regularly. And assembly of people must then approve the wealth ranking list they come up with.
- Condition that 50% of beneficiaries must be women.
- Trainings currently done by VUP administrators, but looking into finding others to do specialized trainings for beneficiaries.
- Scale up: In 2009 will add another sector, 1-2 each year of so until all are covered by 2012. Will spend 5 years in each sector.
- Data collected across sectors at umudugudu level. Information about infrastructure, poverty in sector, etc. done every 3 months. NISR leads this questionnaire.
- *Umudugudu* committee elected by people (overseen by national election committee).
- From WFP food aid distribution they understand that giving money/food to women the children benefit more than if the transfer is given to men.

Beneficiaries Focus Group 1 (20-30 people)

- Generally a younger group with many heading households of siblings (child headed likely even though they are supposed to be 18 to be in PW, many looked much younger).
- When asked what the first thing they spent their new income on the following responses were given:
 - By young women: pig, goat, chickens, rabbits, clothes, food, seeds, school fees for secondary school, paid last money owed for school certificate, beans, paid into PLWH association for HIV+ orphan in hhd to get ARVs (5000 RwF), land, door, built two new rooms to house
 - By young men: tile roof, goat with kid, clothes for siblings, new house under construction, pig, mutuelle payment, paid day laborer to work his land and bought seeds (he made more than laborer).
- How many have land? Roughly 50%
- How many eat more than once a day: <25% (rest only once a day, no one ate 3X day)
- 7 of 25 people had hhds with kids <4 in it
- One young man quoted a Ugandan saying about you have to work through hunger to overcome it
- 80% were heads of their households
- None were aware of how long they would be given the option to be in the program
- Many said the program was good citing that before they had to borrow money from their neighbours but now they no longer have to. They said they are not asked for money in return now from the neighbours (after being asked this).

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

- They all liked having a bank account and felt comfortable using the bank, they knew how they could withdraw money, etc.. They go to the bank on Saturday when open before noon.

Annex D: Notes from Stakeholder Workshop

UNICEF Office, December 11, 2008 (10am-12pm)

Attendees:

Bizimana Yves – VUP Outreach Specialist (Resource Mobilization Officer)

(yvesbiz@yahoo.fr)

Laurent Munyakusi – Send a Cow Rwanda (laurent.munyakusi@sendacowrwanda.org.rw)

Tamsin Ayliffe – SCUK Country Director (cd@savethechildren.org.rw)

Isabelle Cardinal- DFID Social Development Advisor (i-cardinal@dfid.gov.uk)

Louis-Marie Asselin - VUP M&E Technical Advisor (lasselin@socialimpact.com)

Crispus Ayabare – Social Protection MINALOC (ayebarecris@yahoo.co.uk)

Heather Kindness- VUP Program Manager Technical Advisor

(heather.kindness@gmail.com)

Gisele Rutayisire- UNICEF (grutayisire@unicef.org)

Francesca Morandini – UNICEF (fmorandini@unicef.org)

Jennifer Gibson – Lead Researcher, SCUK (j.gibson@savethechildren.org.uk)

Christina Nyhus – Consultant (Research Advisor), SCUK (cmn32@cornell.edu)

Agenda:

- I. Overview of Research Project
- II. Evidence of Transfers in Africa
- III. Vision 20/20 Umerenge (VUP)
- IV. Potential Research Frameworks
- V. Discussion
- VI. Going Forward: Timeline and Engagement

Powerpoint Presentation- attached as a separate file

Discussion points and clarification from presentation:

Current status: The VUP is currently active in all 30 districts, not just the 28

Scale-up: Slated for 2009. VUP will continue in pilot sector, idea is to scale up to 3 new sectors per district but this is budget-dependent. Current budget may only allow for continuation in pilot sector (30 sectors). Perhaps 60 sectors by 2010.

\$9 million by 2011 by DFID (though still not assured)

\$10 for 3 years by World Bank but through direct budget support

Re-targeting: PW and DS supposed to be for 6 months at a time only. Someone can re-qualify for another 6 months but only 2 times (for 1 year max). (Later discussion with Albert indicates that there are no specific guidelines on this 2-time maximum, it is up to the

Rwanda Country Report

ubedehe). To receive benefits and hold up their agreement for PW, beneficiary has the responsibility to attend meetings and trainings.

Savings: WB policy to only have voluntary savings therefore the current systems may/will likely change (and people will be given 100% of their funds unless they request for some to be saved).

Baseline: WB wants 3-year panel study with strict control group (currently the second poorest sector of the district). This doesn't seem feasible given the governments current idea of scale-up (though it reality may work out that the next poorest sector is not covered until 2010 anyhow).

New reduced cost for baseline is 116,000,000 RwF (~\$200,000) much less than earlier figure of \$500,000. Future direct support beneficiaries (and credit access beneficiaries) will be covered in baseline.

Manuals: Not (widely) distributed at sector level, no formal approval process or input from stakeholders, perhaps not specific enough. The importance of having specific, short, performance manuals in Kinyarwanda at sector level was discussed and generally agreed upon as a recommendation for reducing some of the inconsistencies seen across sectors.

Cash value: Discussion on the value of the cash transfer being set on the one allowable labour participant regardless of the number in the household. Maybe the reason why some households find that forced savings to be too limiting for their current financial needs, and why others are able to cope (smaller family size).

District budgets in Gicumbi: At district level seems there is some resentment that the district is forced to use half of their discretionary budget on VUP for the one designated sector. These issues of operationalizing the VUP will need to be ironed out, but it is part of the decentralization process. In the meantime what are the opportunity costs for not using that money on something else?

Joint SCUK/UNICEF Study

Annex E: Reference Cited

Government of Rwanda 2007. Vision 2020 Umureghe, An Intergrate Local Development Program to Accelerate Poverty Eradication, Rural Growth and Social Protection: EDPRS Flagship Program Document, MINALOC. August 2007. Kigali, Rwanda.

Government of Rwanda 2007. Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2008-2012)

Government of Rwanda 2008. Vision 2020-Umurenghe Programme Operational Frameworks and Procedures Manual. MINALOC

Government of Rwanda 2008. EDPRS Common Performance Assessment Framework

National Institute of Statistics Rwanda 2006. Household Living Conditions Survey

ORC Macro 2005. Rwanda Demographic and Health Survey

Republic of Rwanda 2006. Public Expenditure Review: Government and Donor Expenditure on Social Protection. MINALOC, MINECOFIN

Republic of Rwanda 2008. A Situation Analysis of Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children in Rwanda. Revised Draft Report. MIGEPROF. May 2008, Kigali, Rwanda.