



Version of 7 June 2006

Country: RWANDA  
SIGNATURE PAGE<sup>1</sup>



UNDAF Outcome(s)/Indicator(s):  
Productive capacity of the poor being enhanced by sustainable use of natural resources.

Expected Outcome(s)/Indicator (s):  
Strategies and programmes for sustainable environmental management integrated in national policies, national capacity raised to implement those strategies, and actual services delivered to the poor.  
MYFF Service Line 3.5: Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity

- Expected Output(s)/Indicator(s):
- Funding for Protected Area (PA) management increased through new business plans.
  - Increased level of income in communities through revenue sharing, Collaborative Development Fund plans and other income-generating activities.
  - District Development Plans include specific pro-biodiversity strategies, and are implemented.
  - Wildlife law produced, approved and applied to improved PA and wildlife management.

Total budget:	\$13,430,000
Allocated resources: GEF	\$5,450,000
▪ Government	\$880,000 (In kind )
• Regular	
Other Donors :co-financing:	
CARE	: US\$ 300,000
IGCP	: US\$ 1,500,000
WCS	: US\$ 500,000
MGVP	: US\$ 500,000
DFGF-I	: US\$ 1,200,000
DFGF-E	: US\$ 600,000 <i>The Cavilla Ong</i>


Implementing partner: MINITERE through REMA  
(Executing agency)  
Other Partners: ORTPN and NGO consortium


Programme Period: 2006 -2011  
Programme Component:  
Project Title: Rwanda Protected Areas  
Project ID: PIMS 1922  
Project Duration: 6 years  
Management Arrangement: NEX, with UNDP support


**Brief Description:** The Volcanoes Park and Nyungwe National Park are recognized sites of global importance for their biodiversity and endemism values. They are also seen as primary sources of tourism revenue and ecological services. This forest estate remains under threat from the land and resource needs of a still-growing human population that occupies the rural landscape at average densities of 345 per km<sup>2</sup>.

This GEF Proposal brings additional resources to assure the long-term maintenance of the P.A. for their biodiversity, ecological functions, environmental services, and economic benefits. This Proposed GEF investments target three key areas: 1) central government policies and laws, staff capacities, and collaborative frameworks; 2) local district capacity to plan, co-manage, and benefit from appropriate development activities on PA-adjacent lands; and 3) PA adaptive management capacity to assure long-term biodiversity values through applied research, monitoring, and evaluation.

This project responds to Strategic Priority BD1 of the GEF. The project is executed by NEX process, with support from UNDP. Field implementation is by institutions of local advantage. The prodoc builds on recommendations from the July 2005 Project Appraisal Committee.

Agreed by (Government: MINECOFIN): *JAMES*  *Director of Inv. Eco. Planning* 23/08/2006

Agreed by (Implementing partner: MINITERE): *M. Patricia Hajabakya*  23/08/2006

Agreed by (UNDP): *Johannes Kakanze*  23/08/2006

<sup>1</sup> This is Part 5 of Prodoc format

## Table of Contents

Section	Page
<i>SECTION I: Elaboration of the Narrative</i> -----	5
<b>PART I: Situation Analysis</b> -----	5
<b>PART II: Strategy</b> -----	9
<b>PART III: Management Arrangements: Execution and Implementation</b> -----	12
<b>PART IV: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget</b> -----	13
<b>PART V: Legal Context</b> -----	14
<i>SECTION II: Strategic Results Framework And GEF Increment</i> -----	15
<b>PART II: Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators</b> -----	16
<i>SECTION III : Total Budget and Work-Plan</i> -----	19
<b>PART II: Work-Plan by Output</b> -----	21
<i>SECTION IV: Additional Information</i> -----	26
<b>PART I: Other Agreements: Summary of LPAC</b> -----	24
<b>PART II: Terms of Reference For Key Project Staff</b> -----	34
<b>PART III: Stakeholder Involvement Plan</b> _____	<u>see Full Project Brief</u>
<b>PART IV: Rwanda Response to GEF Council Comment</b> -----	34
<b>PART V: Signature Page (Approved Project Brief).....</b>	<b>This is Front Page</b>

## SECTION II: Elaboration of the Narrative

### PART I: Situation Analysis

#### *National Environmental Context*

The conservation of environmental values in Rwanda must be understood in the context of on-going recovery from a decade of civil war, genocide, and subsequent instability. As conditions improve, renewed attention is given to chronic problems of poverty, landlessness, and HIV/AIDS. This context shapes government and donor priorities with regard to sectoral expenditures. Despite this situation, Rwanda's montane forests are increasingly viewed as a priority concern. The Volcanoes National Park and Nyungwe National Park are sites of global importance for their biodiversity values, which are among the highest within the Albertine Rift ecoregion. Within Rwanda, these parks – especially the VNP, where mountain gorilla ecotourism originated 25 years ago – are seen as primary sources of tourism revenue and ecological services. These include sustainable domestic water supplies, erosion control, and hydroelectric development potential. Yet Nyungwe (1,013 km<sup>2</sup>), Volcanoes (160 km<sup>2</sup>), and the relict forest reserves of Mukura (8 km<sup>2</sup>) and Gishwati (7 km<sup>2</sup>) now cover less than 5% of national territory. This forest estate remains under threat from the land and resource needs of a large and growing rural human population.

Rwanda has now emerged from the war. Infrastructure is rebuilt, security clearance is lifted, gorilla tourists are equal to highest levels ever, and there is a building boom. Donor support is on the rise, but into development not restoration. The Rwanda UNDP Common Cooperation Framework is explicit on this, stating in the 2001 CCF: *“As of mid 2001, however, the situation in Rwanda had evolved significantly beyond the emergency phase. However, it is important to maintain continuity between the two aspects of the programme {restoration and development} and flexibility in programming instruments”*. The CCF for 2002 – 6 goes on to say *“Within the context of this overall sustainable human development objective, the period of the second CCF will be marked by (a) a clear shift from emergency responses to developmentally-oriented initiatives, and (b) a shift to even greater emphasis on upstream policy support and advocacy/advisory initiatives”*. These shifts were emphasised at the recent Government of Rwanda Donor Development Forum (December 2005, in Kigali). Current development investment primarily targets poverty, land use, education, and the HIV/AIDS health sector. Government attention to the environment sector is also on the rise. This can be seen in significantly increased subventions to ORTPN, creation of the Rwanda Environment Management Authority, strengthening of the Ministry of Environment, new legislation in forestry and environment, and increasing decentralisation of environmental governance.

Rwanda's rural population densities average > 340 per km<sup>2</sup>: the highest in continental Africa. The pressures from high human population densities have resulted in habitat and species losses, as well as habitat degradation. To combat these problems the GOR, supported by international NGOs, has invested in rehabilitation of park infrastructures, restructuring of the national park service (ORTPN), and initial strategic planning for the sector. But capacity and resources are still limited. This GEF Proposal seeks additional resources to enhance this baseline capacity to effectively manage Rwanda's Protected Area Network with specific reference to montane forests, and to assure the long-term maintenance of the biodiversity, ecological functions, environmental services, and economic benefits accruing from the Protected Areas. The PA network and present pattern of support is shown in Figure 1 at the end of this summary. This GEF project focuses on the overall PA institutional system (see next paragraph), with on-ground interventions in and around the montane forest PAs. The project provides limited support to planning functions for the savanna PA (Akagera), which is a totally different ecosystem, with potential support from other GEF processes.

Investments target the sustainability of the entire PA system, with particular attention to three key themes: 1) central government policies and laws, financing mechanisms, staff capacities, and collaborative

### Socio-Economic and Sustainable Development Context

Rwanda's population density of nearly 350 per km<sup>2</sup> is the highest in continental Africa and it ranks among the world's ten poorest nations. Although the distribution of population is shifting to urban areas, the rural population continues to increase. There is virtually no unsettled land outside of existing parks and forest reserves and 90% of the population continues to live from subsistence agriculture. Sixty percent of Rwandans live below the officially established poverty level, with some of the highest poverty rates in districts bordering the Volcanoes and Nyungwe parks. Landlessness is also concentrated to a high degree in these areas. In Gikongoro province, along Nyungwe's eastern border, 59% of families own less than 0.2 ha of farmland; in Cyangugu province to the west of Nyungwe, 37% have less than 0.2 ha. In Ruhengeri, which includes most of the Volcanoes park, the figure is a comparable 36%. In all of Rwanda, only Butare province has a higher rate of landlessness. Gikongoro also has the highest percentage of renters (19%), who are generally less likely to use soil and other conservation practices (Bush 2004). Still, it is notable that roughly 25% of all families living around the VNP and NNP plant and maintain small woodlots on their private parcels: a significantly higher percentage than for those living around comparable PAs in southwestern Uganda (Plumptre et al, 2004).

Despite perceived needs and conflicts, large majorities of Rwandans living near the VNP and NNP think that the protected forest benefits their communities. Most (>60%) cite water catchment and climate in this regard. Even around the gorilla tourism center of the VNP, though, only a small minority (<10%) believes that tourism benefits local communities. Large majorities around both PAs (58% NNP; 90% VNP) recognize tourism revenues as a benefit for Rwanda as a nation (Plumptre et al 2004).

Gorilla tourism started in 1979 to combat the continued expropriation of parkland for development in the VNP; the Nyungwe ecotourism program was initiated in 1986 for comparable reasons (Weber 1979, 1981; Weber and Vedder 1983, 2001). The strategy has largely succeeded. Through the 1980s, tourism revenues permitted ORTPN to be self-supporting. In 1989, nearly 7000 people paid to see the gorillas and more than 2900 visited Nyungwe: both records. This memory – and significant international support – sustained government interest and limited investment through the difficult 1990s, when foreign tourism dropped to near zero for several years. As a direct result of that investment and an improved internal security situation, Rwanda is again experiencing a tourism boom. This is fuelled by both reality and heightened expectations. The reality is that tourism is growing faster than any other sector of the Rwandan economy, driven by the flagship gorilla market. After the long drought of the war-torn '90s, gorilla visitation has increased from barely 1200 tourists in 2000 to 7417 in 2004, shattering the previous record (Table 5). With visitors paying \$375 each for their gorilla visit, the VNP will likely earn almost \$3 million per year in direct entry fees in coming years. The "expectations" factor in the tourism equation is the government's promotion of this sector as a primary factor, second only to agricultural exports, in the nation's future economic growth. In this they are buoyed by an assessment that Rwanda can expect up to 70,000 foreign tourists per year by 2010, with most of these people visiting one or more national parks (MINICOM/OTF 2003; ORTPN 2004).

### Institutional Context and Policy Framework for Protected Areas

Rwanda is making progress on multiple fronts with respect to improved PA Management. However greater coherence and coordination among a growing number of *institutional actors* is essential. The Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forests, Water and Mines (MINITERE) is the GOR entity mandated to coordinate, monitor and supervise all activities in the field of environment including biodiversity. Within MINITERE, the National Focal Point for the Convention on Biological Diversity has coordinated the preparation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) and two subsequent National Reports on CBD implementation. These activities represent Rwanda's most comprehensive effort to document, understand, and address the totality of its biological resources, most of which are found in the three main PAs.

The private sector has not traditionally played an important role in resource management related to PAs. Even the major plantation forestry effort around Nyungwe was dominated by government and parastatal operations. This situation is rapidly changing. The Nyungwe buffer zone will not only be subject to new forms of co-management under revised forestry and decentralization policies, but private entrepreneurs and associations will be encouraged to bid for these management contracts. ASCOB&D, in Gatare District, has already made such a bid for a section of the buffer around northwestern Nyungwe. Tea plantations operate at several points around Nyungwe and their operations are likely to expand with new roads and popular support for tea cultivation (Masozera 2004). Recent studies of Nyungwe's ecotourism potential (Walpole/WCS 2004; Hitesh 2004) have also highlighted the potential for tea plantation tours and luxury eco-lodges on the tea-forest periphery. Discussions with private investors, such as the Rwanda Tea Trading Company, indicate strong interest in such partnerships. Another private investor has shown interest in the production and export of EU-certified organic honey from Rwanda's pesticide-free forests, in partnership with the USAID-supported ADAR project. At this time, the primary private involvement with PA conservation lies in the tourism sector. Numerous private agencies (Primate Safaris, Kiboko Tours, etc.) already operate in Rwanda; others (Volcanoes Safaris, Abercrombie & Kent, Ker and Downey) include Rwanda in their East African network. In anticipation of a rapid rise in foreign tourism, Rwanda has experienced a boom in hotel and lodge construction. This in turn has raised concerns about coordination of this commercial activity to avoid geographic imbalances and quality control. Real and expected demand has also stimulated increased production of tourist market curios and artwork, though the Rwandan offerings lag behind those of East Africa in quality and variety.

## **PART II: Strategy**

### *Project Rationale and Policy Conformity*

The project takes a systems approach to building capacity at all necessary levels, from central to local, working with a broad array of government and NGO partners. The project will strengthen *in situ* management of two montane forest PAs, increase local participation with and benefits from PA management, and strengthen the central government's institutional capacity to finance, monitor, and manage all PAs. Lessons learnt will inform policy processes, management practices, and sustainable use initiatives within Rwanda and across the montane forest realm of the five-nation Albertine Rift ecoregion.

### *Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs*

This GEF project is designed primarily to overcome those barriers cited above – barriers which in turn limit the GOR's and its partners' ability to address underlying root causes, reduce threats, and satisfy local needs. To achieve this end, a series of desired Outcomes and supporting Outputs is proposed (see also Log-frame, Annex B1 to the Executive Summary).

**Project Objectives.** The Project Goal, Objective, 4 Outcomes and 27 Outputs are outlined below:

<b>GOAL:</b> Sustainable management of renewable natural resources protects biodiversity while contributing to equitable economic and social development of all segments of society.
<b>PROJECT OBJECTIVE:</b> Increased capacity in Protected Area (PA) institutions leads to improved management effectiveness in the national PA network and improved partnerships between the different PA authorities and other stakeholders.
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Improved systemic capacity within institutions and key stakeholders at central, district and local levels provides the enabling framework for enhancing management effectiveness for natural resources in and around Protected Areas

Output 3.3. Adaptive park management plans implemented in Volcano National Park, through conservation partnership activity, with ORTPN and NGO consortium, (see Annex 11 in Brief).
Output 3.4 Effective methods of ecosystem restoration determined and piloted.
Output 3.5 Protected area management authorities implementing a monitoring system for biodiversity, key indicator species and environmental services.
<b>Outcome 4: Project effectively managed, monitored, evaluated and reported</b>
Output 4.1 Project management systems established and maintained, with adaptive management process.
Output 4.2 Project strategic and annual work planning completed.
Output 4.3 Project monitored and evaluated; lessons learnt integrated into adaptive management processes.
Output 4.4 Project reports produced, reviewed and disseminated.
Output 4.5 Project results and lessons disseminated widely; both in-country through more district involvement, and regionally into the Albertine Rift Programme and East African Community) seeking impact through replication.

### Project Indicators, Risks and Assumptions

Indicators here are treated at two levels: first indicators of sustainable Protected Area Systems, secondly – the gains in biodiversity impact ensuing from that improved institutional sustainability.

The main *system sustainability indicators* for this project are as follows:

- Funding for Protected Area management increased, & is less dependent on overseas investment.
- Alternative financing sources incorporated in business plans and serving to expand financial foundation for PA management
- Business plans for the PA system and key PAs, in place which directs overall management.
- District development plans include specific pro-biodiversity strategies, and are implemented.
- PA system staff with capacity to develop and implement broader business plan models.
- Wildlife law produced, approved and applied to improved PA and wildlife management.
- Protected Area Management Plans in place with adaptive management systems incorporating lessons from M and E process.

The main *impact indicators for biodiversity as a consequence of this project* are as follows (see expanded list and details in Log-Frame (Section II):

- Improved METT scores for the two montane Protected Areas.
- Zero habitat loss from forest conversion/encroachment in NNP and VNP
- Fire incidence and extent reduced in NNP, and regeneration effectively reclaiming burned areas.
- Population targets established and met for selected indicator species in Nyungwe and Volcanoes.

**Key Risks.** The following risks/assumptions and risk mitigation measures have been identified:

Risk	Rate	Risk Mitigation Measure
Competing priorities reduce government commitment to biodiversity conservation.	M/S	The project will build political will and support for the project but more importantly for improved management of Rwanda's Protected Area System (output 1.6). In addition, the project will facilitate a process of review and amendment of policies and laws to ensure that conservation of biodiversity is enshrined in the national law and reflected in the PRSP (outcome 2)
Ineffective decentralization of natural resources management leads to marginalized support for conservation	S	New approaches for co-management with districts / communities will be developed. The DEMP will provide a model for natural resources management at district level (output 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3). In addition, the project will assist the Direction of Forestry to develop and promote a national forest policy that complements decentralisation policy (output 1.4, 2.1 and 2.3). Collaborative forest management will complement the

to approved plans and budgets and delivers satisfactory results and impacts from a technical point of view; secondly to ensure good coordination and flow of information between the various ministries, institutions and donor projects, so as to optimize use of human and financial resources. The NPSC will review workplans and activities and budgets to be implemented. A Project Management Unit (PMU) will be established to assist REMA, as the Lead Implementing Agency. REMA will provide a National Project Coordinator, who will be the non-salaried entry point into Government.

The PMU will be housed in REMA, and will consist initially of three senior staff members. These are:

- A National Project Manager (NPM), envisaged as a senior Rwandan national, with responsibility for all aspects of project management.
- A Technical Advisor (TA), envisaged as an international post, bringing best practice in Protected Area management, including capacity building, community participation skills.
- An Administrative Officer / Accountant, envisaged as a national appointment.

They will be assisted by support staff: accounts assistant, driver, database clerk.

The PMU team will be contracted by UNDP, using open and transparent recruitment processes.

A Project Inception Report will finalize detailed implementation arrangements for the first year and beyond, to be prepared with full stakeholder participation and NPSC approval.

The PMU will prepare sub-contracts for organizations with comparative implementation advantage in both thematic and geographic areas of specialization. These sub-contracts are for delivering specific outputs. Details will be developed within the Inception Workshop.

#### **PART IV: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget**

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) will provide stakeholders and partners with information to measure progress, determine whether expected impacts have been achieved, and to provide timely feedback in order to ensure that problems are identified early in implementation and that appropriate actions are taken. Monitoring will be an integral activity of all objectives and will assess the project's effectiveness in improving Rwandan capacities to protect biodiversity; evaluate the benefits accruing to communities and other beneficiaries; appraise the underlying causes of project outcomes (positive or negative); and track the level and quality of public participation in conservation activities. A detailed M and E Framework is in Annex to the Brief attached to this Project Document.

Evaluation: This project will be subject to program evaluation and financial auditing in accordance with the policies and procedures established for this purpose by UNDP/GEF, including an independent Mid-Term Review and Terminal Review. Details are in the M and E Framework. The organization, TOR, and timing of the evaluations will be decided upon between UNDP and the Project Steering Committee.

Lessons Learned: A summary of Lessons Learned during the PDF-B process and from other regional projects, and how these are incorporated into project design is included in the annexes for the full Brief attached to this Project Document.

## **SECTION II: Strategic Results Framework and GEF Increment**

The Log-Frame, with Indicators and Targets follows. This is followed by the Atlas based fist year detailed budget in Atlas formats.



<p><b>Outcome 1</b> Institutions and key stakeholders at central, district and local levels have capacity to manage and conserve natural resources in and around Protected Areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Wildlife and National Parks Legislation is enacted, providing a legal framework for increasing management effectiveness and reducing resource conflict.</li> <li>At EOP, the budget amount appropriated and raised for PA management from national sources will have increased by 100%.</li> <li>Expanded range of training opportunities for agency staff, is used for skill enhancement.</li> <li>Intergovernmental linkage &amp; coordination in place via MoU / agreements, at central and to district levels.</li> </ul>	<p>Need for Legislation is urgent.</p> <p>The current available national budget for PA management is US\$ 4million.</p> <p>No training plans in place.</p> <p>No detailed agreements in place</p>	<p>Full Act with subsidiary legislation in place and under implementation</p> <p>EOP: 100% Increase recorded with % from national sources doubled.</p> <p>Training plan in place linked to institution M &amp; E. And &gt; 50% of relevant staff involved in at least 1 training.</p> <p>At least three central and three district agreements in place and functioning with M and E processes</p>	<p>Institutional mandates remain constant</p> <p>District decentralisation process remains on course.</p> <p>Tourism flows remain strong.</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2</b> Institutional capacities for PA management at local levels enhanced, with greater socio-economic benefit flows to local communities, with reduced illegal use of PA resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of income generating projects per participating district</li> <li>Household income in participating h-h increases, from enterprise</li> <li>Implementation of buffer zone co-management projects</li> <li>Incidents of illegal resource harvesting in target districts.</li> </ul>	<p>No projects</p> <p>No enterprise</p> <p>No Agreements in place</p> <p>District records are poor, without all cases recorded</p>	<p>At least 2 projects per district (7 districts) and 3 community tourism initiatives piloted</p> <p>30% more income from enterprise in 50h-h in 7 dists.</p> <p>One JFM agreement operational per targeted district (7) by PY6.</p> <p>Two buffer projects in place.</p> <p>Improved records show increase in first year, &amp; 50% decrease by EOP</p>	<p>Continued political will in districts to foster co-management and enterprise</p>

### SECTION III: 1: Total Budget and Work-Plan at Outcome Level – All Years

**Table 1: Total Budget and Work Plan**

**Award ID:** 43144  
**Award Title:** PIMS 1922 BD FSP: Rwanda Protected Areas  
**1. Project ID:** 50174  
**Project Title:** PIMS 1922 BD FSP  
**Implementing Partner/** "Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation Capacity in the Forest Protected Area System of Rwanda"  
**Executing Agency:** NEX: Ministry of Land, Environment, Forestry, Water and Mines (MINITERE)

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/impl Agent	Source of Funds	ERP/ATLAS Budget Description	Amount 2006 (USD)	Amount 2007 (USD)	Amount 2008 (USD)	Amount 2009 (USD)	Amount 2010 (USD)	Amount 2011 (USD)	Total (USD)
Outcome 1 : Improved systemic capacity within institutions and key stakeholders at central, district and local levels provides the enabling framework for enhancing management effectiveness for natural resources in and around Protected Areas	MINITERE	GEF	International							
			71200 Consultants	35,000						
			71600 Travel	10,000						
			71300 Local Consultants	10,000						
			71400 Contractual Services	105,000						
			72200 Equipment Furniture	35,000						
			74500 Miscellaneous Exp	10,000						
			<b>sub-total</b>	<b>205,000</b>	<b>178,069</b>	<b>178,069</b>	<b>178,069</b>	<b>178,069</b>	<b>178,069</b>	<b>1,095,345</b>
Outcome 2 : Institutional capacities for PA management at local levels increased; with greater socio-economic benefit flows local communities increased, with reduced illegal use of protected are resources.	MINITERE	GEF	International							
			71200 Consultants	45,000						
			71600 Travel	15,000						
			71300 Local Consultants	30,000						
			71400 Contract Service Ind	105,000						
			72200 Equipment Furniture	35,000						
			74500 Miscellaneous Exp	25,000						
										0

**PART 2: Output Level Budgets for Project Operational Management Responsibility**

Code	Outcomes/Outputs/Activities	Partners Responsible	Total Budget/ Outcome (USD)	Budget/ Outputs	Budget Year 1 (USD)	Budget (Year 2-6)
Outcome 1	Institutions and key stakeholders at central, district and local levels have capacity to manage and conserve natural resources in and around Protected Areas		1,300,000			
Output 1.1	A conservation financing plan developed and implemented to improve financial security and options for protected areas	REMA/ORTPN/PMU		100,000	40,000	
Output 1.2	Staff of MINITERE, ORTPN and other partner / support agencies trained in key aspects /technical skills of protected area management	REMA/ORTPN/MINITERE /PMU		400,000	80,000	
Output 1.3	ORTPN / REMA produce strategic plans for biodiversity conservation and community participation in forest resources/PAs area management	ORTPN/REMA		100,000	20,000	
Output 1.4	District Development Plans updated to reflect biodiversity and communities in forest resources management	REMA/DISTRICTS/NGOs/ORTPN		150,000	25,000	
Output 1.5	Effective coordination and information exchange structures developed that promote cross-sectoral information sharing and synergies among stakeholders	ALL partners		50,000	15,000	
Output 1.6	Political will and support for Rwanda's Protected Area System is increased and reflected in PRSP and other key documents	REMA/ORTPN/PMU		100,000	0	
Output 1.7	An information management system developed and used in the PA management System	ORTPN/REMA/PARTNERS		200,000	25,000	
Output 1.8	National and District level policies and legislation harmonized to support biodiversity conservation	MINALOC/MINITERE/ ORTPN		150,000	25,000	
Output 1.9	A comprehensive National Law on Wildlife and Protected Areas developed and adopted	ORTPN/MINICOM		50,000	25,000	
Outcome 2	Socio-economic value and financial benefits of the Montane Forest Protected Area System to local communities increased and negative impacts reduced		1,800,000			
Output 2.1	Collaborative Forest Management plans developed building on best practices from the region	DF/PAFOR/GTZ/AREDI/ASCOBEDI		150,000	50,000	
Output 2.2	CFM plans piloted in selected communities	DISTRICTS/ORTPN/NGOs		300,000	25,000	
Output 2.3	Sustainable income generating / value adding activities developed and piloted	ADAR/ORTPN/WCS/ICRAF		350,000	50,000	
Output 2.4	Water and Energy supply project in districts surrounding Volcanoes National Park initiated/developed (co-financing)	DISTRICTS/ARASSI/CARE/HELPAGE/NGOs		250,000	50,000	
Output 2.5	Micro-Hydro project in Districts by Nyungwe initiated (co-finance)	DISTRICTS/ELECTROGAZ/MINIFRA/KIST		250,000	25,000	
Output 2.6	Barriers to community tourism reduced in selected areas	Districts/ORTPN/WCS/HELPAGE/Canada COOP.		150,000	25,000	



Output	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				Year 4				Year 5				Year 6							
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4				
	4																											
4.1	x	x	X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	*	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
4.2	x	x	X				x				x																	
4.3				x				x			x	x				x								x				
4.4		x		x		x		x			x	x				x								x				
4.5				x				x				x												x				

X = Output under preparation, development and application

\* PMU future to be determined by mid-term review

l'équilibre écologique, climatique et hydrologique du pays. C'est ainsi que le Rwanda a ratifié la Convention sur la Diversité Biologique en 1995 le rendant éligible aux fonds du GEF et a depuis quelques années élaboré de nombreuses politiques et lois en faveur de la conservation des Aires Protégées et de l'Environnement en général.

En raison de l'évolution rapide du cadre institutionnel et légal lié à la gestion de ces Aires Protégées, la principale mission de ce PDF-B comme mentionné dans le document de projet, était de faire une analyse du cadre légal et institutionnel pour la conservation des Aires Protégées, une analyse des capacités institutionnelles ainsi que le partenariat existant entre les différentes institutions en charge de la gestion et de la conservation des Aires Protégées. Le projet se devait aussi de faire une évaluation des besoins en conservation in situ de toutes les Aires Protégées du Rwanda et des besoins en renforcement de capacités bien que le projet final se focalisera principalement sur les Aires Protégées de Montagne qui ont une importance globale reconnue car faisant partie de la région écologique du Rift Albertine.

### 1. ATELIER FINAL DES PRINCIPAUX INTERVENANTS

L'atelier avait pour objectif de faire connaître aux principaux intervenants l'état d'avancement du projet et ses réalisations dont la plus importante est la formulation d'un projet global GEF intitulé « Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation Capacity in the Montane Forest Protected Area System of Rwanda ».

L'atelier était présidé par le Secrétaire d'Etat chargé des Terres et de l'Environnement au MINITERE, Mme HAJABAKIGA Patricia. Son mot d'introduction a souligné la volonté du Gouvernement de mettre en place un cadre institutionnel et légal permettant la gestion durable des Aires Protégées du Rwanda et en particulier celle des forêts de Montagnes du Rwanda. Ces forêts fournissent en effet des services environnementaux et socio-économiques inestimables au pays et génèrent des revenus importants, la conservation de leur richesse se doit donc de devenir une priorité.

La session de la matinée avait consisté à la présentation du projet aux participants. Le Coordinateur National du Projet a d'abord fait une présentation des principales réalisations du projet PDF-B et ensuite l'Expert Technique du projet travaillant pour le Wildlife Conservation Society a présenté sommairement les objectifs et résultats attendus du projet global. Les participants ont exprimé leur satisfaction quant aux réalisations du projet et ont apprécié les nombreuses consultations qui ont été effectuées lors du déroulement du projet en vue d'assurer leur intégration dans la formulation du projet global. Des remarques ont été formulées sur le document final de projet remarque portant principalement sur le cadre institutionnel de mise en oeuvre du projet global.

Dans l'après-midi, les participants se sont scindés en groupes de travail et avaient pour objectifs l'identification des indicateurs objectivement vérifiables, faire des amendements et ajouts pour chacun des résultats à atteindre par le projet global. Trois groupes de travail ont été formés en fonction de trois domaines d'interventions du projet GEF qui sont : l'appui aux communautés locales, appui aux institutions impliquées dans la gestion des aires protégées (au niveau central), et appui à la gestion des parcs. Les amendements, commentaires et suggestions venus des différents groupes de travail ont été inclus dans le document final du projet. A la fin de la session les participants ont approuvé à l'unanimité le document du projet ainsi que le cadre institutionnel de la mise en oeuvre de ce projet. L'atelier s'est achevé par un mot de clôture formulé par la Directrice Générale du REMA saluant les efforts pour achever dans les délais la formulation du projet global qui pourra ainsi être soumis au PNUD et au Secrétariat du GEF à temps, elle a aussi salué la bonne coopération entre les institutions gouvernementales, les ONGs et le PNUD qui a caractérisé ce projet.

### 2. OBJECTIFS DU PROJET ET RESULTATS ATTEINTS

économiques des communautés, les conflits liés au manque d'accès aux ressources naturelles disponibles dans les Parcs et l'intégration des districts dans la conservation des Parcs.

- d) Un voyage d'Etude a été aussi organisé en Ouganda en vue de donner une opportunité aux gestionnaires des Aires Protégées du Rwanda de bénéficier de l'expérience des gestionnaires des Parcs de Mgahinga et Bwindi et ceux du Lake Mburo, dans le domaine de la conservation communautaire et de l'éducation environnementale en particulier. La visite du Uganda Wildlife Authority et du NEMA a permis de mieux comprendre le partenariat institutionnel nécessaire à la conservation durable des Aires Protégées.

### Evaluation de la gestion financière durable du réseau des Aires Protégées

- e) Des analyses de la gestion financière durable se sont penchées sur les projections des coûts et des bénéfices prévus dans le court et le moyen terme et recherchera les moyens innovateurs pour assurer la durabilité à long terme du système des Aires Protégées. Une évaluation réaliste du potentiel touristique, avec les scénarios des fluctuations potentiels, a permis d'identifier les barrières au développement du tourisme et d'étudier la problématique du partage des bénéfices entre le gouvernement, les communautés riveraines et le secteur privé.
- f) quelques projets générateurs de revenus en rapport avec les Aires Protégées et la conservation de la nature en général, l'identification des problèmes, des contraintes et des opportunités de ces projets pour la durabilité de la conservation des Aires protégées.
- g) les sources de bénéfices potentiels directs ou indirects qui appuient la conservation de la biodiversité dans le pays, en incluant tout en ne se limitant pas, aux bénéfices générés par le tourisme écologique. Ceci a inclus une analyse des partenariats stratégiques qui pourront être développés.
- h) La contribution potentielle que la conservation de la biodiversité à la reconstruction générale du Rwanda et à la réalisation des objectifs de développement nationaux a été analysée et les moyens d'inclure les programmes de conservation de la biodiversité dans les priorités de financement du gouvernement au niveau national ont été passés en revue.

### Formulation du projet global

Le projet PDF-B, à travers la collaboration entre les institutions gouvernementales appropriées (MINITERE et ORTPN) et les ONGs partenaires, se devait de développer le projet global (sous la forme d'un document de synthèse et un document de projet). Le processus de formulation devait se faire en concertation avec les principaux intervenants et groupes d'intérêts au niveau national (les ministères impliqués et le secteur privé inclus), et au niveau local (les représentants des communautés locales élus, les Comités de Développement Communautaire, les gouvernements locaux et les ONGs inclus). Ce processus se devait par ailleurs d'identifier les partenaires au co-financement et la préparation d'un cadre détaillé de suivi et évaluation.

La présente réunion des intervenants avait pour but de présenter le résultat d'une année de fonctionnement du PDF-B et du document de synthèse et de recueillir par la même occasion les dernières corrections et recommandations des intervenants dans le domaine.

#### 2.2.1 Récapitulatif des principales rencontres

Date:	Objet de la rencontre	Intervenants impliqués
Février – Mars 2004	Rencontres informelles avec les intervenants potentiels, les représentants du gouvernement et des bailleurs	Bailleurs (USAID, UNDP, ambassades...), représentants du gouvernement, ONGs, institutions de recherche...

2004	intervenants a Ruhengeri, Cyangugu et Kigali	ARASI, AREDI, ASCOBEDI, ARECO, ACNR, représentants du Secteur Prive, conservateurs des APs, représentants du gouvernement
2 Décembre 2004	4 <sup>th</sup> réunion du comité de pilotage. Présentation des objectifs et des résultats attendus dans le cadre du projet full GEF. Présentation des procédures de sélection des projets full GEF	Autorités locales, ONGs et représentants du MINITERE, MINALOC, Bureau du Premier Ministre et UNDP
17 Janvier 2005	Rencontre finale des intervenants. Présentation du document de projet final	Bailleurs (USAID, EU, UNDP, ambassades des Pays Bas et du Canada représentants du gouvernement, de l'ORTPN, conservateurs des APs, ONGs, institutions de recherche

### 3. PRESENTATION DU PROJET GLOBAL GEF

La phase du PIF-B du projet a identifié comme barrières principales à une gestion durable des Aires Protégées les éléments suivants :

- Insuffisance des financements pour la conservation des Aires Protégées.
- capacités institutionnelles et coordination insuffisantes pour la conservation
- Implication insuffisante des communautés locales

Les principaux éléments de ce projet sont :

<b>DEFI: Renforcement de l'état de la conservation, des services environnementaux et des valeurs socio-économiques des écosystèmes des forêts de montagne du Rwanda et amélioration des conditions de vie des communautés qui en dépendent</b>
<b>OBJECTIF DU PROJET: Gestion effective et durable par les institutions nationales et décentralisées du système des Aires Protégées de montagne du Rwanda conciliant les priorités de biodiversité et d'environnement avec les besoins sociaux et économiques</b>
<b>Résultat 1: Les capacités et les ressources des institutions et des principaux intervenants au niveau central, des districts et des structures locales sont renforcés pour gérer et assurer la conservation des ressources naturelles dans et autour des Aires Protégées</b>
<b>Résultat 2: La législation et les politiques qui appuient la conservation des ressources de la biodiversité dans les Aires Protégées et autour des zones tampons sont renforcés</b>
<b>Résultat 3: Les bénéfices socio-économiques et les revenus générés par le système des Aires Protégées des forêts de montagnes auprès des communautés locales sont augmentés et les impacts négatifs réduits</b>
<b>Résultat 4: La biodiversité du système des Aires Protégées de Nyungwe et des Volcans est conservée sur base de pratiques de gestion basés sur la connaissance approfondie</b>
<b>Résultat 5: Projet efficacement géré, évalué et rapports diffusés</b>

### 4. Liste des participants

	Nom	Organisation	Téléphone et mail
1	Mukas ne Hélène	District de Buhoma	08523131
2	Karara Apollinaire	Maire de district de Rusenyi	08540744



59	Munyenga Je Anselme	Maire Mushubi	08833643
60	Rurangirwa Justin	ORTPN /PNV	08303903
61	Nkunda G David	Cyangugu	08501269
62	Daniel Samiti	The New Times	584070
63	Rushimisha Romulus	ORINFOR /TVR	08684910
64	Albert Baudouin	Radio Flash	08612799
65	Habiyambere Valens	Ikinyamateka journal	08686918
66	Michel Misozera	WCS	08306663
67	Francoise Kayigamba	WCS	08350023
68	Sentama Vedaste	WCS	
69	Hakizimana Emmanuel	ORTPN/RWA	08306929
70	Mukankoneje Rose	REMA	
71	Patricia Hjabakiga	MINITERE	
72	Uwimana Suzanne	MINITERE	

### LPAC of 2 December 2005

This follow-up meeting to finalise implementation modalities was held in Kigali from 2.30-4 pm on 2 December at the Conference Centre of the Intercontinental Hotel.

The meeting was Chaired by the Minister for Environment in MinTerre, and was attended by:

Director-General REMA  
 Ag Director WCS, Kigali  
 Senior Programme Officer Environment UNDP  
 Programme Officer Environment UNDP  
 Head, Project Implementation Service Centre, UNDO  
 Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP-GEF

The meeting reviewed the documentation and concentrated on the implementation process. The outline given in the approved brief was agreed to, but more detail was clarified. In particular:

1. The project will be NEX with support from the UNDP Implementation Centre
2. The PMU would be housed in REMA
3. The PMU would be staffed by individuals recruited by open process, by UNDP, on behalf of Government.
4. The National Project Manager and Administrator / Accountant would be senior Rwandans.
5. The Technical Advisor would be a senior conservationist, recruited internationally.
6. The project would be implemented on the ground, by organizations of local advantage, contracted by a detailed MOU process/ The PMU would draw-up contracts and supervise implementation.
7. The Inception Workshop-Report Process would detail the contracts.
8. The Steering Committee would provide high-level oversight and coordination.
9. The Technical Advisory Committee, of conservation stakeholders at the main sites, would provide technical coordination and disseminate technical information.

- Execute required project functions for an initial three-year period within the agreed budgetary limits

The PMU will begin operations in Kigali no later than end May 2006, with the full team in place no later than July 2006.

*PMU Staff Requirements.* The PMU team will consist of a staff of three senior individuals. TOR for these positions are described below, followed by a list of functions to be filled by the remaining staff.

#### Technical Advisor

The Technical Advisor will be someone with considerable technical expertise, African management experience, language and diplomatic skills. Particular skills required are:

- Fundamental understanding of the science and implementation of biodiversity conservation in a context of rural poverty and development pressure
- Minimum 10 years conservation or conservation and development management experience
- Advanced degree in conservation or related resource management field
- French-English fluency
- Strong bio-diplomatic skills team building skills and a collaborative nature

#### National Project Manager

The National Project Manager will be a Rwandan supported by the project. He/She will work very closely with the National Coordinator assigned to the project by REMA and will be the primary contact with government and other partners. Required skills include:

- Minimum 3 years conservation or related management experience
- University degree, Masters in related field preferred
- French-English fluency
- Strong collaborative skills, team building skills and coordination skills.

#### Administrative / Accounting Officer

The Administrator will be a Rwandan national, supported by the project. He/she will be a senior person with at least five years increasingly responsible experience in project budgeting, financial control, and administration. Computerised accounting experience is essential and knowledge of GOR and UNDP systems will be an advantage.

### **PART III: Stakeholder Involvement Plan - Management Organs**

There are two management organs for the project. These are the high-level Project Steering Committee (PSC), and the lower-level Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

#### **Project Steering Committee**

The PSC will be chaired by the Minister of Environment in MiniTerre (or Representative) and the PMU in REMA will provide the Secretariat. The PSC will provide oversight and coordination for the project. The PSC will meet at least annually, and approve the Project Annual Report, and approve the overall annual work-plan and budget.

The PSC will comprise senior representatives from the following organizations:

MiniTerre (including Environment and Forestry)  
REMA (Director General, and National Project Coordinator)  
ORTPN

**PART IV**

**Response to GEF Council: Rwanda Protected Areas: PIMS 1922: July 2005**

Comments were received from Four Council Members: United States of America, Germany, France and Switzerland

The Council Member for France had no comment on this project.  
The Council Member for Switzerland gave very positive comments, wanting no clarification. The Council Members for USA and Germany, whilst generally positive, wanted clarification and assurance on some issues. Details are below.

Comment	Response
<p><u>USA</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Include more specific indicators, such as number of DFM plans etc.</li><li>2) Increase the level of analysis of incentives/dis-incentives, that affect the application of sustainable use strategies.</li></ol>	<p>These are useful comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) However the log-frame and indicators targets does in fact have some of these details (one agreement per district in 7 districts, two buffer zone projects in place, three community tourism initiatives and two income/revenue projects per district). A new indicator of forest area restored is included in the log-frame.</li><li>2) Further analysis will be undertaken in the Inception Report process, and results built into the work plans.</li></ol>
<p><u>Germany</u> asked for changes in the implementation process, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) The need to monitor local livelihoods was stressed, emphasizing linkages between poverty and resource use.</li><li>2) Indicators that are to be developed in the inception process should focus on results, not outputs.</li><li>3) The inception process should capture the issues of land use and incentives in the M&amp;E process as indicators.</li></ol>	<p>These are valuable comments, and these three issues will be flagged by the project management team during the inception process and be captured in the Inception Report and project work plans.</p>