



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

### UNDAF Outcome(s)/Indicator(s):

Productive capacity of the poor is being enhanced by the 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 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 with specific pro-biodiversity strategies implemented.
- Wildlife law produced, approved and applied to improve PA management.
- Forest cover maintained, with increased area under bamboo, natural regeneration.

Implementing partner: MINITERE through REMA  
(Executing agency)

Other Partners: ORTPN and NGO consortium

Total budget: \$13,430,000

Allocated resources: GEF

\$5,450,000

- Government  
\$880,000 (In kind)

Other Donors :co-financing:

CARE : US\$ 300,000

HELPAGE : US\$ 2,500,000

IGCP : US\$ 1,500,000

WCS : US\$ 1,100,000

MGVP : US\$ 500,000

DFGF-I : US\$ 1,200,000

**TOTAL :US\$ 7,100,000**

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): \_\_\_\_\_

Agreed by (Implementing partner: MINITERE): \_\_\_\_\_

Agreed by (UNDP): \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> This is Part 5 of Prodoc format, brought to the front.



## Global Environment Facility



# IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT DOCUMENT **GEF**

## **Government of Republic of Rwanda United Nations Development Programme**

### **“Strengthening Biodiversity Conservation Capacity in the Forest Protected Area System of Rwanda”**

PIMS 1922

**Brief Description:** Conservation in Rwanda must be understood in the context of that nation’s recovery from a decade of civil war and its chronic underlying problems of poverty, landlessness, and HIV/AIDS. Despite these preoccupations, Rwanda views conservation of its montane forests as a priority concern. The Volcanoes National Park and the newly created Nyungwe National Park are recognized sites of global importance for their biodiversity and endemism values. These parks are also seen as primary sources of tourism revenue and ecological services, such as water catchment, water supply, erosion control, and hydroelectric development potential. Yet altogether, 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>) & Gishwati (7 km<sup>2</sup>) cover <5% of the nation.

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>. To combat these problems the GOR, with support from international NGOs, has invested in rehabilitation of park infrastructures, restructuring of the national park service (ORTPN), and preliminary strategic planning. This GEF Proposal brings additional resources to enhance this baseline capacity to effectively manage Rwanda’s montane forests and thereby assure the long-term maintenance of their biodiversity, ecological functions, environmental services, and economic benefits. Proposed investments target the sustainability of the entire PA system, with particular attention to 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. Project activities include support for capacity-building at all levels, increased collaboration between central-central and central-local government bodies, and a complementary set of income and employment generating activities in targeted PA-neighbor communities. This project builds on national and regional experience and responds to Strategic Priority BD1 of the GEF.

This ProDoc is the implementation process for the approved project. The project is executed by NEX process, with support from UNDP. Field implementation is by institutions of local advantage. The Prodoc highlights the key operational processes, budget, workplan, TOR, reporting and M & E. The prodoc builds on recommendations from the July 2005 Project Appraisal Committee and requires detailed planning activities to be laid out at the Inception Workshop within three months of start-up.

## Table of Contents

Section	Page
<b>SECTION I: Elaboration of the Narrative -----</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>PART I: Situation Analysis -----</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>PART II: Strategy-----</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>PART III: Management Arrangements: Execution and Implementation-----</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>PART IV: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget -----</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>PART V: Legal Context -----</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>SECTION II: Strategic Results Framework And GEF Increment-----</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>PART II: Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators-----</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>SECTION III : Total Budget and Work-Plan -----</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>PART II: Work-Plan by Output -----</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>SECTION IV: Additional Information -----</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>PART I: Other Agreements: Summary of LPAC -----</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>PART II: Terms of Reference For Key Project Staff -----</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>PART III: Stakeholder Involvement Plan -----</b>	<b><a href="#">see Full Project Brief</a></b>
<b>PART IV: Rwanda Response to GEF Council Comment-----</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>PART V: Signature Page (Approved Project Brief).....</b>	<b>This is now Front Page</b>

### **List of Abbreviations and Acronyms**

ACNR	Association for the Conservation of the Nature of Rwanda
ADB	African Development Bank
ARASI	Rwandan Association for the Protection of Infrastructures
ARCOS	Albertine Rift Conservation Society
ARE	Albertine Rift Ecoregion
AREDI	Rwandan Association for Environment and Integrated Development
ASCOB&D	Association of commercial wood products
CBC	Community Based Conservation
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CDF	Community Development Fund
CFM	Collaborative Development Fund
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DED	German Development Service
DEMP	Decentralised Environmental Management Programme
DFGF-E	Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund – Europe
DFGF-I	Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund – International
EU	European Union
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOR	Government of Rwanda
KIE	Kigali Institute of Education
ICDP	Integrated Conservation and Development Project
KIST	Kigali Institute of Science and Technology
IGCP	International Gorilla Conservation Program
IUCN	World Conservation Union
JFM	Joint Forest Management
MGNP	Mgahinga Gorilla National Park (Uganda)
MGVP	Mountain Gorilla Veterinary Project
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
MINALOC	Ministry of Local Government, Community Development, and Social Affairs
MINECOFIN	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MINICOM	Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Investment Promotion, Tourism, and Cooperatives
MINITERE	Ministry of Land, Environment, Forestry, Water, and Mines
NBSAP	Nation focal point for the Convention on Biological Diversity
NEMA	National Environmental Management Authority
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
NUR	National University of Rwanda
NNP	Nyungwe National Park
NVL	National Veterinary Laboratory
ORTPN	Rwandan Office of Tourism and National Parks
OTF	On The Frontier Group
PAFOR	MINITERE/ADB Project to Support Forest Management
PAs	Protected Areas
PDF-A/ PDF-B	Project Development Framework, Phase A or B
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Plans
REMA	Rwanda Environment Management Authority
UNDP/DEMP	MINITERE/UNDP Decentralization and Environment Management Project
UNR	National University of Rwanda
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VNP	Volcanoes National Park
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

## SECTION I: 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 (including EIA), 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 infrastructure, 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 and training 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

frameworks; 2) local district capacity to plan, co-manage, and benefit from appropriate development activities on PA-adjacent lands; and 3) within-PA capacities to better assure long-term biodiversity values through adaptive management practices; this last outcome is in close cooperation with conservation and development partners on the ground. Project activities include support for capacity-building at all levels, increased collaboration between central-central and central-local government bodies, and a complementary set of income and employment generating activities in targeted PA-neighbor communities. This proposal builds on extensive national and regional experience and responds to Strategic Priority BD1 and Operational Programs OP3/4 of the GEF.

### Global Significance of Biodiversity

The Albertine Rift is the richest area of the African continent in terms of vertebrate species, with 52% of African birds, 39% of mammals, 19% of amphibians, and 14% of reptiles (Plumptre *et al* 2003a). The ecoregion also ranks first out of the 119 distinct terrestrial eco-regions of continental Africa in terms of endemic vertebrate species (1,100) and second in terms of globally threatened species (108), (Dinnerstein *et al* 2003). Most of these biodiversity values are in the natural forest ecosystems. Geographically the Albertine Rift ecoregion extends southwards from northwest Uganda through Rwanda, Burundi, western Tanzania and eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) (Map 1, Annex 2). In addition to its designation as a WWF “Global 200 Ecoregion,” the entire area has been recognized for its significance as an “Endemic Bird Area” by Birdlife International; and as a “Biodiversity Hotspot” by Conservation International.

### Rwanda’s National Protected Areas (PA) System

Rwanda’s three gazetted National Parks represent 8% of the national territory, with a diversity of habitats:

- Nyungwe National Park (1,013 km<sup>2</sup>): Africa’s largest remaining block of lower montane forest, species-rich and the nation’s primary water catchment;
- Volcanoes National Park (160 km<sup>2</sup>): Montane forest capped by afro-alpine systems which harbor highly-endangered biota, including mountain gorillas and golden monkeys; and
- Akagera National Park (900 km<sup>2</sup>): Extensive wetland/savanna complex that supports a diverse large mammal fauna, in addition to nearly 600 species of birds.

The social, economic, and political pressures on Rwanda’s natural areas remain strong and place the survival of the country’s protected areas, and the biological diversity that they contain, under considerable threat. Poaching of wildlife is a prime concern for both PAs, as is the illegal cutting and collection of wood, bamboo, and grass. Otherwise, there is considerable variability between the parks. Fire is the number one threat facing Nyungwe, where more than 13,000 ha have burned over the past decade – primarily due to human-set fires, complicated by drought conditions. This in turn is linked with problems of regeneration following such disturbance. Mining also ranks fairly high on the Nyungwe threats list, although this decades-old problem is increasingly under control in recent years. For obvious reasons, gorilla issues are among the priority concerns for the Volcanoes Park. Disease transmission from humans to gorillas (which are susceptible to almost all human diseases) is a direct threat from tourism and an even greater indirect threat from the wastes left by humans collecting water, wood, bamboo, etc. in the park. Uncontrolled tourists can also damage highly fragile alpine habitats around the park’s many attractive summits.

### *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 Rwanda 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<sup>2</sup>, 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 NP, 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 tenants (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 6). 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).

---

<sup>2</sup> Note the new decentralisation process replaces the past nine provinces with four larger Regions. Each Region has 6-8 Districts.

### *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 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. Within MINITERE, REMA (Rwanda Environmental Management Authority) is an increasingly capable implementation agency organisation (and implements this Project).

Direct responsibility for the management of Rwanda's PAs is vested in the Rwandan Office of Tourism and National Parks (ORTPN). ORTPN has had several institutional homes over its 30-year existence, but is currently housed within the Ministry of Commerce (MINICOM). Under its recent restructuring, ORTPN is composed of two principal agencies, with shared support services. The Rwanda Wildlife Authority (RWA) is responsible for ORTPN's mandate to protect the nation's wild flora and fauna. This includes most aspects of in situ park management, including monitoring and planning. The Rwanda Tourism Authority (RTA) is a parallel operation charged with the development and implementation of policies and practices to enhance Rwanda's tourism profile and potential to generate revenue. The two agencies report to a single Executive Director. Each of the three national parks has a comparable management structure consisting of a warden; deputy wardens for conservation, tourism, and communities; and subordinate ranks of chiefs, guards, and guides.

The District is the basic unit of government and the primary engine for development, under Rwanda's policy of decentralization. Each district is required to complete a District Development Plan to qualify for CDF assistance. Donor organizations also increasingly use the DDPs to identify district partners and guide their expenditures. DDPs are now required to include District Environmental Plans, toward which an estimated 10% of budgets are to be applied. The recently initiated Decentralization and Environmental Management Project (DEMP) is intended to help advance this process. However, as of early 2005, very few districts have even requested money for environmental activities through the CDF. Around the VNP and NNP, some districts have entered into partnering arrangements with international and national NGOs to promote appropriate local development activities.

Rwanda has a significant NGO community with direct PA, biodiversity, and sustainable development interests. These are summarised in Annex 4. The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) has been in Rwanda the longest, starting with its role in design and implementation of the gorilla ecotourism program in the VNP in 1978-79. While providing support for gorilla and other wildlife surveys in the VNP, WCS currently concentrates its efforts on Nyungwe and was the executing agency for this GEF PDF B design activity. The International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) concentrates on gorilla protection efforts in the mountain forests of Rwanda, Uganda, and eastern Congo. IGCP has also provided direct technical assistance for ORTPN's restructuring process. The former Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund now consists of two distinct NGOs: DFGF-International, responsible for monitoring the Karisoke Research Centre gorillas and training; and DFGF-Europe, which concentrates on local wildlife clubs and community-based development activities. The Mountain Gorilla Veterinary Center (MGVC) works on health matters affecting the gorillas, other wildlife, and local human populations around the VNP. There are currently no NGOs targeting the conservation needs of the Akagera Park, though a small-scale (DED) initiative is working with local districts. Two Rwandan NGOs are starting to play a role in the national conservation arena. The Association pour la Conservation de la Nature au Rwanda (ACNR) has recently linked with Birdlife International to secure a GEF regional small grant to conduct assessments in four critical areas for bird and habitat conservation, including the Rugezi and Kamiranzovu wetlands. The Rwanda Wildlife Clubs is seeking to expand its base among school groups.



CARE is the principal international NGO in Rwanda with a rural development focus. Though its activities are currently concentrated around the VNP, CARE until recently had operations on the Cyangugu side of Nyungwe. A national NGO, HELPAGE, is expanding its operations in Rwanda. It has activities in PA border districts in Cyangugu, Kibuye and Ruhengeri, with a pending entry into Gikongoro. A small but growing number of local and regional NGOs operate around the PAs and the forest reserves of Mukura and Gishwati. These include AREDI, ARASSI, ASCOB&D, PAFOR, ARECO, and others. Most of these international, national, and local NGOs have formed partnerships of different kinds with the major international conservation NGOs to promote certain development activities within target local communities.

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 Gatware 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. Capacity and training activities cover the entire PA network. Lessons learned 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: Sustainable management of renewable natural resources protects biodiversity while contributing to equitable economic and social development of all segments of society.</b>
<b>PROJECT OBJECTIVE: 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>
<b>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</b>
<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.</b>
<b>Outcome 3: Protected Area Management and conservation of biodiversity at forest parks is expanded and reinforced through knowledge-based adaptive management practices and field demonstration.</b>
<b>Outcome 4: Project effectively managed, monitored, evaluated and reported</b>

<b>Outcome 1: Institutions and key stakeholders at central, district and local levels have capacity and resources to manage and conserve natural resources in and around Protected Areas</b>
Output 1.1 A conservation financing plan developed and implemented with improved capacities for business planning at national and protected area levels (see detail of these issues in the Brief – Annex 1)
Output 1.2 Staff of MINITERE, ORTPN and other partner/support agencies with functional capacities in key aspects / technical skills of protected area management.
Output 1.3 Strategic plans developed and implemented that reflect biodiversity conservation and community participation in forest resources/protected area management.
Output 1.4 Districts with capacity to prepare and implement Development Plans that reflect biodiversity conservation and community participation in forest resources management.
Output 1.5 Effective coordination and information exchange structures developed that promote cross-sectoral information sharing and synergies among stakeholders
Output 1.6 Political will and support for Rwanda’s Protected Area System is increased, reflected in PRSP, other documents
Output 1.7 An information management system developed/used in the Protected Area Management System.
Output 1.8 Regional (TBNRM), National and District level policies and legislation harmonised to support biodiversity conservation in Protected Areas.
Output 1.9 Comprehensive Wildlife / Protected Area Legislation developed, adopted and functioning.
<b>Outcome 2: Institutional capacities for PA management at local levels enhanced; greater socio-economic benefit flows to local communities, leads to reduced illegal use of protected are resources.</b>
Output 2.1 Collaborative Forest Management plans developed building on best practices from the region
Output 2.2 CFM plans piloted in selected communities
Output 2.3 Sustainable income generating/value adding activities developed and piloted
Output 2.4 Water/Energy supply project surrounding Volcanoes NP initiated / developed (co-finance CARE / Helpage) **
Output 2.5 Micro-Hydro-electric project in Districts surrounding Nyungwe NP initiated (potential new co-finance) **

Output 2.6 Barriers to community tourism reduced in selected areas
Output 2.7 Communities provided with skills to enable them to participate in improved natural resources management; especially planning and implementation of co-management of forest resources
Output 2.8 Communities benefit from ORTPN PA revenue sharing programme.
<b>Outcome 3: Protected Area Management and conservation of biodiversity at forest parks is expanded and reinforced through knowledge-based adaptive management practices and field demonstration.</b>
Output 3.1 Adaptive park management plans for Protected Area System updated through regular incorporation of research and monitoring data this is not about capacity.
Output 3.2 Adaptive park management plans implemented in Nyungwe National Park, through conservation partnership activity, with ORTPN and NGO consortium, (see Annex 11 in Brief).
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.

*\*\* These two components are part of expected inputs (co-finance for water and new finance for hydel) to the community development Outcome. Project proponents (and their donor partners) and REMA have responsibility for ensuring EIA process (see comment 8 in response to STAP review). This project, which is executed by REMA, will ensure compatibility with EIA process*

### 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 natural regeneration effectively reclaiming burned areas, and bamboo areas increased.
- 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:

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Measure</b>
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 decentralisation policy. Strong lessons from other incentive based systems and local governance (eg Uganda's LC1 system) will be used.
External pressures on national parks and forest reserves do not significantly increase.	M/S	The project will work with communities around the park to implement alternative income generating activities and collaborative management of selected resources. This will build political support for the protected areas ensuring the political system does not yield to pressure to de-gazette the park. The project will improve the productivity of resources outside parks and improve household incomes, reducing immediate pressure from local communities (outcome 3 and outputs 1.6)
Reduction in current support and willingness to improve biodiversity conservation	N	The participatory nature of the project and improvement in revenue flows will ensure that interest is maintained (output 1.1 and outcome 3 and 4)
ORTPN's focus on tourism may weaken biodiversity conservation objectives.	N	Monitoring a broad set of biodiversity indicators will expand attention beyond gorillas (outcome 4). Better training for ORTPN and REMA staff will assure attention to non-tourism values of PAs
Failure to reach tourism projections impacts ability to fund PA management.	N	The development of a clear business plan for ORTPN will provide GOR a roadmap towards financial sustainability for many of ORTPN's functions, based on increased diversification of revenues (output 1.1, 4.1, 4.3).
Irreconcilable conflicts of interest over resource use inhibit collaboration to improve conservation	M/N	Participatory design process minimizes this risk and participatory, transparent execution will reduce conflicts. Draft forest policy submitted to cabinet will provide reconciliation mechanisms and framework for private/public/community partnership in Nyungwe buffer zone. (Output 1.3, 1.4, 2.3, outcome 3)
Lack of appreciation of economic value of PAs may lead to pressures to de-gazette part of them	M/N	The economic value of Rwanda's PAs to the nation will be shown to be higher than currently assessed and this information will be embodied in national financial calculations and budget allocations output 1.1, 4.5)
Limited technical and institutional capacity for modern conservation practice in and out the PAs	M/S	The capacity building activities will pay particular attention to the skills needed for effective management of Rwanda's overall protected area system (outcome 1, outcome 4), and to ensure that skill sets remain in the broader PA sector. Training inputs cover ALL PAs.
Sectoral ministries fail to incorporate biodiversity in sectoral plans/ programmes	M/S	The project will promote inter-departmental collaboration and information exchange (outputs 1.5, 1.6)
Regional insecurity may prevent work in some areas	M/S	Increased community recognition of PA values will promote support for conservation during times of disturbance (outcome 3)

<b>Overall Risk Rating</b>	<b>M/S</b>	
----------------------------	------------	--

Risk rating: H (High Risk), S (Substantial Risk), M (Modest Risk), N (Negligible or Low Risk)  
Risks refer to the possibility that assumptions defined in the logical framework may not hold.

### **PART III: Management Arrangements: Execution and Implementation**

The Ministry of Water, Lands, Forests, and Environment (MINITERE) will execute the project through the Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA). GOR will execute the project following UNDP guidelines for nationally executed projects. This will be NEX with UNDP support. MINITERE will be accountable to UNDP for the disbursement of funds and the achievement of the project goals, according to the approved workplan. A National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) will be formed, chaired by MINITERE. The NPSC will be comprised of REMA, MINITERE, ORTPN, MINICOM, MINALOC, MINICOFIN, MININFRA, UNR, selected Districts, NGO representatives, civil society, and UNDP. The NPSC will perform two main tasks; firstly ensure that the project is implemented according 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, data-base 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.

**Project Monitoring and Log-Frame Indicators:** The Log-frame, see later sections has details of impact indicators. These will be reviewed in the initial Inception Workshop for this project, and will incorporate guidance from Council Members, GEFSEC and STAP, including best practice on BD1 projects.

## **FINANCIAL MODALITIES:**

The overall budget and work-plan are presented in this ProDoc on pp 21 ff as Section III

## **BUDGET BY OUTCOME**

<b>Project Outcomes</b>	<b>Amount (US\$)</b>		<b>Total (US\$)</b>
	<b>GEF</b>	<b>Co-finance</b>	<b>Total</b>
1. Capacity and resources of institutions and stakeholders	1,300,000	1,080,000	2,380,000
2. Local economic benefits	1,800,000	3,350,000	5,150,000
3. Protected Areas biodiversity	1,400,000	3,100,000	4,500,000
4. Project management costs	950,000	450,000	1,400,000
<b>Grand Total Full Project</b>	<b>5,450,000</b>	<b>7,980,000</b>	<b>13,430,000</b>

## **CO-FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS**

**Background:** The considerable levels of Co-finance in this Protected Areas Project for Rwanda are quite complex in their arrangement. They involve two Government Ministries / Agencies, who provide much additional support to project objectives over and above past levels of investment (the business as usual baseline scenario); plus six separate inputs from several International and National NGOs. We note that such financing continues to evolve, and now (in mid 2006) there are some changes from the pattern in the Brief written in April 2005.

Secondly, the explanation of co-finance in the Brief (both the full brief and the Executive Summary) was not fully clear, and co-finance amounts were not linked to Project Outcomes<sup>3</sup>. This annex provides that further explanation and clarification.

Thirdly the project preparation process took a precautionary view of co-finance:

- Firstly, we took note of business as usual financing levels of government and separated that from NEW projected levels of planned expenditure. Much of this increase was into new activities proposed by the PDF process (eg sustainable financing strategies, emphasis on training and capacity, new tourism linkages, new emphasis on M and E process).
- Secondly, we noted NGO planned patterns of expenditure in relation to the log-frame activities of the project, but reduced these by 20% as a precaution against over-optimistic budgeting in some

<sup>3</sup> As raised by GEFSEC in their updated review sheet of July 2006

cases (in early 2005 global funding pattern was still not high). In some cases figures were increasingly realistic, (eg WCS).

- Thirdly, inputs such as CARE are for a whole District, so we extracted pro-rata amounts which would go to villages bordering the Protected Area.

**The Co-Finance Letters:** These were in a separate file deposited with GEFSEC at the time of Re-Submission. The file had 9 letters after the Letter of Endorsement. These were::

Letter From	\$ Amount in letter	Total \$	Accept \$	Notes on Acceptance Criteria
1 MiniTere	330,000pa x 6yrs *	1,980,000	330,000	This is NEW financing – over baseline
2 ORTPN	750,000 pa x 6 yrs*	4,500,000	550,000	As above , note both 1,2 are in kind
3 HELPAGE	2,500,000 (ex €)	2,500,000	2,500,000	This was all new \$\$ for project period
4 CARE	300,000 pa x 6 yrs	1,800,000	300,000	Finances to villages by PA, not full district
5 DED	200,000 total	200,000	0	This finance finishes in 2006/7 not included
6 IGCP	1,875,000 total	1,875,000	1,500,000	Suggestion that donations reducing by 20%
7 MG Vet P	190,000 x 6 yrs	1,140,000	500,000	Not all co-finance links to project log-frame
8 DianFosseyI	325,000 x 6 yrs	1,950,000	1,200,000	Suggestion that donations may reduce
9 WCS	1,200,000 total	1,200,000	1,100,000	Increased level replaces <b>DFGF- E **</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>17,145,000</b>	<b>7,980,000</b>	The figure of 7,980,000 is Project Brief

\* This is in kind and should not exceed 20% of total co-finance

\*\* Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund (E) wrote an initial letter, but withdrawn as needed to come from their Europe HQ not from Rwanda Officer, letter had not arrived at time of submission.

**Changes in Co-Finance Since 2005 :** We learn that additional finance is available (eg Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund - Europe is supporting Virunga Nat Park, and USAID will fund eco-tourism around the Nyungwe National Park). Increased decentralisation from Government has led to further increases in field staffing (at sector level). ORTPN and MINITERE have increased staffing levels and operational funds.

These increases, when realised will be captured in the annual PIR exercise, reporting on leveraged co-finance back to GEFSEC (this was explained in the Brief itself of 2005).

**Linking Co-Finance to Project Outcomes :** This was only done at the aggregated level of the Project Brief, (ie combining ALL co-finance against the four outcomes of the project log-frame). The project brief had this table:

Co-financier source	Class	Type	Amount \$	Status	Notes in July 2006
1 ORTPN	Govt	In-kind	550,000	Committed	
2 REMA/MINITERE	Govt	In-kind	330,000	Committed	
3 HELPAGE	NGO	Grant	2,500,000	Committed	
4 CARE	NGO	Grant	300,000	Committed	
5 IGCP	NGO	Grant	1,500,000	Committed	
6 WCS	NGO	Grant	500,000	Committed	Now increased due to 6
7 MGVP	NGO	Grant	500,000	Committed	
8 DFGF-I	NGO	Grant	1,200,000	Committed	
9 DFGF-E	NGO	Grant	600,000	Committed	Now deleted as no letter

NOTES (these were in yellow in the resubmission, referring to earlier review queries)

\*\* This project takes a conservative view of co-financing and the system boundary. We note ORTPN co-finance letter says 750,000\$ pa over 6 years, which is 4.5 million \$. A large part of this is baseline; we estimate some 550,000\$ is co-finance to new PA System Management Processes over the project period.

MiniTerre letter indicates financing of 330,000 pa over 6 years. A large part of this is baseline input, new finance into the PA areas, through the PDF activities are estimated as 330,000\$ for the period,

Similarly, NGOs are basing their committed co-finance around their 2004/5 financial year investment figures. Eg: MGVP (the veterinary programme) estimate > 190,000\$ pa for 6 years or 1,600,000\$– we scale that down to 500,000\$, as the financial climate for NGOs is uncertain. Again for DFGF-I, we reduce 325,000 pa for 6 years to 200,000\$ pa.

We believe this is prudent, and IF MORE co-finance does take place, then this can be easily captured in the annual PIR processes, reporting back to Council. The amounts given here differ from the letters attached.

## NEW TABLE SHOWING OUTCOME COSTING BY GEF and CO-FINANCE

FINANCE	OUTCOME COSTING \$				Totals \$
	1	2	3	4	
<b>GEF Input</b>	<b>1,300,000</b>	<b>1,800,000</b>	<b>1,400,000</b>	<b>950,000</b>	<b>5,540,000</b>
MINITERE	50,000	50,000	30,000	200,000	330,000
ORTPN	230,000	50,000	70,000	200,000	550,000
<b>Total Govt Input</b>	<b>280,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>400,000</b>	<b>880,000</b>
Helpage		2,500,000			2,500,000
CARE		300,000			300,000
IGCP	500,000		1,000,000		1,500,000
WCS	300,000	450,000	300,000	50,000*	1,100,000
MGVP			500,000		500,000
DFGF – I			1,200,000		1,200,000
<b>Total NGO Input</b>	<b>800,000</b>	<b>3,250,000</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>7,100,000</b>
<b>All Co-Finance</b>	<b>1,080,000</b>	<b>3,350,000</b>	<b>3,100,000</b>	<b>450,000</b>	<b>7,980,000</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,380,000</b>	<b>5,150,000</b>	<b>4,500,000</b>	<b>1,400,000</b>	<b>13,430,000</b>

\* Input to documentation, lessons learned and dissemination.

## New Table: Primary Focal Areas and Key Issues for Co-finance Inputs

Agency	Area	Focus	Logframe	Pattern of Activity
ORTPN	Total	PA Mgmt	1.1-1.9 2.6-2.8 3.1-3.5	Increased numbers of field staff and central staff; increased PA management operations; more tourism support; community revenue sharing links to PA management. More emphasis on M and E and on sustainability of financing. Linkages to Min Finance and Local Govt.
MiniTerre	Total	Environment Forest, & Project Mgmt	1.2-1.6, 1.8 2.1-2.5 3.4 4.1-4.5	More central REMA staff; increased provincial and district foresters under NEW decentralisation policies; increased activity in buffer forest, linked to watershed management, Overall environmental management – including EIA processes & oversight; project office and management
CARE	North VNP	Community Develop	2.3-2.8	Local economic development of communities, including AIG, provision of water, and health services around Virunga NP in north. Tree planting and energy efficiency are included.
Helpage	South NNP	Community Develop	2.3-2.8	Local economic development of communities, including AIG, provision of water and energy efficiency; mostly around Nungwe NP, bit at Virngas NP.
IGCP	North VNP	BD	1.2-1.5 3.1, 3.3-3.5	Virunga NP management support to ORTPN at provincial and park levels; capacity building at central and local levels; community outreach processes,
MVS	North	BD	3.1,3.3-3.5	Veterinary support to mountain gorillas in VNP; monitoring of



	VNP			human/wildlife disease transmission; capacity building of PA staff.
DFGF I	North VNP	BD	3.1,3.3-3.5.	Long-term monitoring of research gorillas; training at central/field level.
WCS	South NNP	BD	1.1-1.7; 2.1-2.3,2.6, 3.2, 3.5, 4.5	Nyungwe NP management support; biodiversity monitoring; threat analysis, conservation advocacy, capacity building at central and field levels; community outreach and support.

## **PART V: Legal Context**

This Project Document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article I of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the Government of Rwanda and the United Nations Development Programme, signed by the parties on 2 February, 1977. The host country implementing agency shall, for the purpose of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement, refer to the government co-operating agency described in that Agreement.

*The UNDP Resident Representative in Kigali is authorized to effect in writing the following types of revision to this Project Document, provided that he/she has verified the agreement thereto by the UNDP-GEF Unit and is assured that the other signatories to the Project Document have no objection to the proposed changes:*

- a) Revision of, or addition to, any of the annexes to the Project Document;*
- b) Revisions which do not involve significant changes in the immediate objectives, outputs or activities of the project, but are caused by the rearrangement of the inputs already agreed to or by cost increases due to inflation;*
- c) Mandatory annual revisions which re-phase the delivery of agreed project inputs or increased expert or other costs due to inflation or take into account agency expenditure flexibility; and*
- d) Inclusion of additional annexes and attachments only as set out here in 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.

## PART II: Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
<i>Goal</i>	<b>The sustainable management of natural resources protects biodiversity while contributing to economic and social development of all segments of society.</b>				
	Indicator	<u>Baseline</u>	<u>Target</u>	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Objective of the project</b> <b>Increased management effectiveness in the national PA network and improved partnerships, between the different PA authorities and other stakeholders provides improved conservation of biodiversity from human induced threats</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At EOP there will be improved METT scores for both montane parks.</li> <li>ORTPN with approved business plan in place and functioning.</li> <li>Business plan and other financial processes lead to increased tourism revenues to PAs.</li> <li>District Dev Plans have positive strategies for biodiversity conservation with stakeholder partnerships</li> </ul>	<p>NNP = 54.3 PNV = 55.5</p> <p>No overall Bus Plan</p> <p>Baseline (2004) tourism revenue was 16 mill USD (see annex 1 of Brief)</p> <p>No districts with such plans</p>	<p>All relevant questions show improved scores, and total to &gt; 80</p> <p>Bus Plan in place</p> <p>50% of govt target of 100 mill USD (ie= 50 mill USD) of tourism revenue</p> <p>At least half of 14 target districts have stakeholder MOUs, and at least 10 have BD issues in their Dist Dev Plans</p>	<p>MTR and T Review</p> <p>Govt Reports, and actual plan</p> <p>Financial records from Govt</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External pressures on national parks do not increase significantly.</li> <li>Political stability and law and order in region is maintained, so no events to reduce tourist visitation.</li> <li>The overall macro-economic climate remains conducive to development</li> </ul> <p>NOTE that tourism revenues are gross figures into Rwanda, not earnings into ORTPN</p>

<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 agreed.</p> <p>The current available national budget for PA management is US\$ 4million. 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. 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 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. Improved records show increase in first year, &amp; 50% decrease by EOP</p>	<p>METT score data.</p> <p>District data</p> <p>Project reviews and reports</p>	<p>Continued political will in districts to foster co-management and enterprise</p>

<b>Outcome 3</b> <b>Protected Area management and conservation of biodiversity in forest parks is expanded and reinforced through knowledge based adaptive management practices and field demonstration.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management effectiveness index of both site PAs increased.</li> <li>• Functioning knowledge management system institutionalized and is accessible to partners.</li> <li>• Monitoring system and applied research designed, &amp; system used to monitor key conservation management indicators (biological, threats indices, tourism impacts, resource management and community -related activity).</li> <li>• Park Mgmt Plans for Nyungwe &amp; Volcanoes adapted &amp; updated.</li> <li>• Park business plans are developed, &amp; implemented.</li> <li>• Area bamboo &amp; natural vegetation successfully regenerated increase as result project interventions.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial scores (see the Brief)</p> <p>No such system</p> <p>No integrated system</p> <p>No detailed Mgmt Plans. No park business plans</p> <p>Initial estimates exist for both PAs</p>	<p>Scores show increase on all management topics</p> <p>A system in place. And has fed information into planning decisions &gt;3 times per park</p> <p>M and E data are available through TRA, impact assessments etc, and feed into management process, &gt;3 times per park</p> <p>Management Plans exist and updated &gt;once</p> <p>Park business plans exist &amp; used</p> <p>Increase by 25%, sites and responsibilities in Inception Report</p>	<p>METT scores by MTR and TR.</p> <p>Project reports, PIR etc, ORTPN reports.</p> <p>Management plan processes and revisions.</p> <p>Business plans available. Field Monitoring Protocols</p>	<p>Protected Areas do not have major external / internal shocks.</p> <p>Institutions retain similar mandates.</p>
<b>Outcome 4</b> <b>Project effectively managed, with strong learning, evaluation, adaptive mgmt and dissemination components in place.</b>	<p>Reports on time, Funding flows with no delays Conservation publications Lessons learned published Web-site in place and used Learning events for staff Study tours for partners implemented.</p> <p>Albertine Rift Programme and EAC aware of Project impacts</p>	<p>To be set up with incoming PIU</p> <p>Information flow on set-up</p>	<p>To be detailed in the Inception Report</p> <p>Annual reporting</p>	<p>Quarterly reports through UNDP Steering Committees</p> <p>PIR to GEF and UNDP HQ</p> <p>Publications</p>	<p>Project support from institutions is maintained.</p>

<b>SECTION III: 1: Total Budget and Work-Plan at Outcome Level – All Years</b>
--

## 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)
<b>Outcome 1</b>	<b>Institutions and key stakeholders at central, district and local levels have capacity to manage and conserve natural resources in and around Protected Areas</b>		<b>1,300,000</b>			
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	
<b>Outcome 2</b>	<b>Socio-economic value and financial benefits of the Montane Forest Protected Area System to local communities increased and negative impacts reduced</b>		<b>1,800,000</b>			
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/HELPAE/NGOs		250,000	50,000	
Output 2.5	Micro-Hydro project in Districts by Nyungwe initiated (co-finance)	DISTRICTS/ELECTROGAZ/MININFRA/KIST		250,000	25,000	
Output 2.6	Barriers to community tourism reduced in selected areas	Districts/ORTPN/WCS/HELPAE/Canada COOP.		150,000	25,000	

Output 2.7	Communities provided with skills to enable them to participate in improved natural resources management	DISTRICTS/NGOS/PMU/MINALOC		150,000	40,000	
Output 2.8	Community benefit from ORTPN revenue sharing	DISTRICTS/ORTPN/NGOs		200,000	30,000	
<b>Outcome 3</b>	<b>Biodiversity of Nyungwe and Volcanoes Protected Areas System conserved through knowledge-based adaptive management practices</b>		<b>1,400,000</b>			
Output 3.1	Adaptive park management plans for PA system updated through incorporation of research and monitoring data	ORTPN/NGOs		100,000	25,000	
Output 3.2	Adaptive park management plans implemented in Nyungwe National Park	ORTPN/WCS		400,000	50,000	
Output 3.3	Adaptive park management plans implemented in volcanoes National Park	ORTPN/NGOs		300,000	30,000	
Output 3.4	Effective methods of ecosystem restoration determined and piloted	ORTPN/WCS		200,000	40,000	
Output 3.5	Protected area management authorities implementing a monitoring system for biodiversity, key indicator species and environmental services	ORTPN/NGOs		400,000	60,000	
<b>Outcome 4</b>	<b>Project effectively managed, monitored, evaluated and reported</b>		<b>950,000</b>			
Output 4.1	Project management systems established and maintained	PMU/REMA		700,000	250,000	
Output 4.2	Project strategic and annual work planning	PMU		25,000	10,000	
Output 4.3	Project monitored and evaluated; lessons learnt integrated into adaptive management processes	PMU		150,000	0	
Output 4.4	Project reports produced, reviewed and disseminated	PMU		50,000	5,000	
Output 4.5	Project Reports lessons and results disseminated widely	PMU		25,000	0	
	<b>Total</b>		<b>5,450,000</b>		<b>1,020,000</b>	



**Section III: Part 2**  
**Work Plan by Output**

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
<b>1</b>	<b>Institutions and key stakeholders at central, district and local levels have capacity to manage and conserve</b>																								
<b>1.1</b>	A conservation financing plan developed and implemented			X	x	x	x	x	x				x				x				x				x
<b>1.2</b>	Staff of MINITERE, ORTPN and other partner/support agencies trained				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<b>1.3</b>	ORTPN and MINITERE/REMA update/produce strategic plans						x	x	x	x		x	x							x	x			x	x
<b>1.4</b>	District Development Plans updated to reflect biodiversity and communities in forest management			X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x														
<b>1.5</b>	Effective coordination and information exchange structures developed			X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x				x		x	
<b>1.6</b>	Political will and support for Rwanda's Protected Area			X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<b>1.7</b>	An information management system developed & used in PAs			X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<b>1.8</b>	National and District level policies and legislation harmonised			X	x	x	x	x	x																
<b>1.9</b>	A comprehensive National Law on Wildlife and Protected Areas developed and adopted				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x								
<b>2</b>	<b>Sustainable socio-economic value and financial benefits of the Montane Forest PAs</b>																								
<b>2.1</b>	Collaborative Forest Management plans developed			X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x								

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
2.2	CFM plans piloted in selected communities					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2.3	Sustainable income generating / value adding activities developed and piloted			X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2.4	Water and Energy supply project in districts surrounding Volcanoes				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2.5	Micro-Hydro-electric supply project in Districts surrounding Nyungwe							x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2.6	Barriers to community tourism reduced in selected areas				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x												
2.7	Communities provided with skills to enable them to participate in improved natural resources mgt.				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2.8	Communities benefit from ORTPN PA revenue sharing programme			X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3	<b>Biodiversity of Nyungwe and Volcanoes Protected Areas system conserved</b>																								
3.1	Adaptive park management plans for Protected Area System updated				x				x				x				x			x	x				x
3.2	Adaptive park management plans implemented in Nyungwe N.P				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3.3	Adaptive park management plans implemented in Volcanoes N.P				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3.4	Effective methods of ecosystem restoration determined and piloted				x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3.5	Protected area management authorities implementing a monitoring system				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

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
<b>4</b>	<b>Project effectively managed, monitored, evaluated and reported</b>																								
<b>4.1</b>	Project management systems established and maintained	x	x	X	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	*	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<b>4.2</b>	Project strategic and annual work planning completed	x	x	X				x				x				x				x				x	
<b>4.3</b>	Project monitored and evaluated; lessons learnt integrated into adaptive management processes				x				x			x	x				x				x			x	x
<b>4.4</b>	Project reports produced, reviewed and disseminated; steering committee meetings		x		x		x		x		x		x		x		x		x		x		x		x
<b>4.5</b>	WWF/WB Tracking Tool Used				x				x				x				x				x				x

X = Output under preparation, development and application

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

## Section IV: Additional Information

### PART I: SUMMARY OF LOCAL PROJECT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (LPAC)

The LPAC process, is in two parts. The first part brought together ALL stakeholders to agree the main objectives and modalities for the project. This included co-financiers, central and local government, and NGOs. The minutes are summarized below (in French).

The second part took place later, focusing on the implementation modalities. A summary of the recommendations is provided

#### I: RAPPORT DE L'ATELIER FINAL DES PRINCIPAUX INTERVENANTS DANS LE PROJET « STRENGTHENING BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION CAPACITY IN THE MONTANE FOREST PROTECTED AREA SYSTEM OF RWANDA »

#### TABLE DES MATIERES

1.	Introduction .....	2
1.1	Importances des Aires Protégées du Rwanda .....	2
1.2	Raison d'être du projet .....	3
2.	Atelier final des principaux intervenants .....	4
3.	Objectifs du projet et résultats atteints.....	5
3.1	Objectifs.....	5
3.2	Résultats atteints par composantes.....	5
4.	Présentation du projet global GEF .....	9
5.	Liste des participants .....	10

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Importance des Aires Protégées du Rwanda

Les forêts de montagne regroupent : la forêt naturelle de Nyungwe, la plus étendue avec 970 km<sup>2</sup> en 1999, la forêt des Volcans (125 km<sup>2</sup>) de Mukura (1.600 ha) très secondarisée et menacée par l'action anthropique et la forêt de Gishwati. Ces écosystèmes de forêts de montagne font partie des forêts afro-montagnardes du Rift Albertin et constituent un important habitat de la biodiversité. Ces forêts de montagne représentent une écologie complexe. Les forêts constituées en Parcs Nationaux (forêt de Nyungwe et des Volcans) sont assez bien conservées et constituent des modèles d'écotourisme alors que les réserves forestières (Mukura et Gishwati) sont soumises à une dégradation environnementale et changent rapidement suite à la déforestation accélérée, l'érosion des sols, les glissements de terrains et la perte des habitats et de l'érosion génétique.

### 1.2 Raison d'être du projet

La phase PDF-B du projet a officiellement démarré en Avril 2004 à la suite de l'approbation par le Secrétariat du GEF d'un concept paper qui lui a été soumis en 2000 par le MINITERE appuyé dans cette tâche par le WCS. Le Gouvernement du Rwanda a manifesté depuis de nombreuses années sa volonté de d'appuyer la conservation des Aires Protégées de Montagne du Rwanda qui jouent un rôle crucial dans

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 œuvre 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

Le présent PDF-B du GEF/PNUD avait pour objectif d'aider à une meilleure compréhension du contexte de la gestion des Aires Protégées du Rwanda et de formuler un projet global qui réponde aux besoins en renforcement des capacités des intervenants dans le domaine. Le résultat principal à la fin d'un exercice d'une année était d'aboutir à la formulation d'un projet global visant à assurer la conservation in situ de la diversité biologique au Rwanda à travers le renforcement des capacités institutionnelles de gestion des aires protégées, la mise en place de mécanismes assurant la gestion durable technique et financière des aires protégées, et les modes de collaboration des composantes locales, nationales et régionales.

Le projet se devait de se focaliser principalement sur les aires protégées d'un intérêt mondial significatif, à savoir le Parc National de Nyungwe et le Parc National des Volcans, conformément à la priorité stratégique I du GEF/PNUD.

### **Résultats atteints par composantes**

**Evaluation du cadre légal sur les Aires Protégées du Rwanda** : un résumé des principales lois se rapportant aux aires protégées et à la conservation de la nature a été réalisé en 1999 (via la GTZ en appui au MINITERE). Cette évaluation a été effectuée essentiellement pour le Parc National de l'Akagera. Un besoin en analyses a été souligné, se rapportant en particulier à la description détaillée des lacunes existantes dans la cohérence des législations et des politiques, et des zones conflictuelles entre les politiques existantes, les lois et les programmes au niveau central et des structures décentralisées. Ceci est particulièrement important au regard de la législation récente se rapportant à la décentralisation.

**Evaluation du cadre institutionnel de gestion et de conservation des Aires Protégées du Rwanda** : une révision des structures et des responsabilités actuelles des institutions qui ont pour mandat la gestion des Aires Protégées et les forêts naturelles a été menée. Ceci a permis de mettre en évidence les progrès déjà effectués au niveau institutionnel mais aussi de souligner les faibles capacités de certaines institutions (REMA, structures décentralisées, Service de Protection des Forêts...) ainsi que les lacunes dans le cadre institutionnel existant qui est à l'origine des chevauchements et autres problèmes liés à la conservation. Des recommandations visant à un renforcement des responsabilités institutionnelles ainsi que des relations inter-institutionnelles ont été donnés.

### **Evaluations des besoins pour les deux principales Aires Protégées de montagne**

- a) Les besoins en formation du personnel de l'ORTPN, du MINITERE et des entités décentralisées riveraines des Aires Protégées pour la conservation de la biodiversité ont été évalués et des propositions de renforcement des capacités par des programmes de court et de longue durée ont été développées.
- b) Les besoins en informations prioritaires ont été identifiés avec la participation des principaux intervenants dans la conservation des Parcs de Nyungwe et des Volcans. Une attention particulière a été donnée à l'identification des thèmes de recherche appliquée nécessaires pour améliorer la conservation de la biodiversité de ces Parcs et assurer une meilleure gestion. Une évaluation des capacités en collecte et traitement des données GIS et leur analyse a été effectuée en vue d'améliorer l'utilisation de cet outil et le partage des informations que l'on peut en tirer.
- c) Des enquêtes socio-économiques ont été effectuées auprès des populations riveraines des deux Parcs par le programme du GEF du Rift Albertin des rencontres participatives avec les représentants à la base (Comités de Développement Communautaire) ont permis de valider ces résultats, de mettre à jour les résultats et de prendre en compte les besoins socio-

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**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Objet de la rencontre</b>	<b>Intervenants impliqués</b>
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...

14 Avril 2004	Première réunion du comité de pilotage	Autorités locales , ONGs et représentants du MINITERE, MINALOC, Bureau du Premier Ministre et UNDP
18 Mai 2004	Réunion de présentation du projet PDF-B phase aux intervenants et aux bailleurs	Donors (USAID, UNDP, EU, ambassades and cooperation representations), Government representatives, representatives of local and provincial authorities, PA managers, NGOs, research institutions, Private sector representatives
20 au 31 Mai 2004	Rencontres informelles avec les intervenants et mise en place des task forces	ONGs travaillant dans VNP, NNP, ANP, bailleurs (EU, USAID, ambassades du Canada et des Pays-Bas, SIDA, projet DEMP
20 Juin 2004	Présentation des résultats préliminaires de l'évaluation des capacités en GIS pour la gestion des APs	Task forces conservation APs : ORTPN, REMA, MINITERE, DFGF-I, IGCP, MGVP, UNR,...
2 Juillet 2004	2ème rencontre du comité de pilotage. Présentation des résultats de l'analyse légale sur les APs	Autorités locales, ONGs et représentants du MINITERE, MINALOC, Bureau du Premier Ministre et UNDP
15 au 17 Juillet 2004	Séminaire sur la recherche et les informations prioritaires sur les APs du Rwanda. Discussion sur les recherches prioritaires	Task forces PAs conservation : ORTPN, REMA, MINITERE, DFGF-I, IGCP, MGVP, UNR, KIE...
20 Août 2004	Présentation des résultats préliminaires de l'analyse institutionnelle de la gestion des APs	Task force institutionnelles : Bureau du Premier Ministre, MINITERE, REMA, MINALOC, ORTPN, MINICOM,
28 Septembre 2004	Présentation des résultats préliminaires de l'évaluation des capacités de gestion des problèmes liés au PNA et de sa zone tampon	Task forces PAs conservation : ORTPN, REMA, MINITERE, DFGF-I, IGCP, MGVP, UNR, conservateur PNA et les autorités locales
30 Septembre 2004	3 <sup>rd</sup> rencontre du steering committee. Présentation des résultats préliminaires de l'analyse des études socio-économiques des populations riveraines des APs	Autorités locales, ONGs et représentants du MINITERE, MINALOC, Bureau du Premier Ministre et UNDP
05 Octobre 2004	Présentation des résultats préliminaires sur la gestion financière durable des APs	Task force gestion financière durable : MINECOFIN, MINITERE, ORTPN, Central Bank, NGOs
08 Octobre 2004	Présentation des résultats préliminaires des analyses de la gestion durable de la zone tampon de Nyungwe	Task forces conservation communautaire et conservation APs : autorités locales, ORTPN, MINITERE, MINALOC, REMA, DFGF-I, IGCP, MGVP, UNR
29 Octobre 2004	Présentation des résultats préliminaires de l'évaluation de l'état sanitaire des écosystèmes du PNA	Task forces PAs conservation : ORTPN, REMA, MINITERE, MINAGRI, DFGF-I, IGCP, MGVP, DED, NVP
15 au 26 Novembre	Rencontres informelles avec les	DFGF-I, IGCP, MGVP, Helpage Rwanda,



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 comite 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 PDF-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	Mukasine Hélène	District de Buhoma	08523131
2	Karara Apollinaire	Maire de district de Rusenyi	08540744

3	Karikuruhu Vedaste		
4	Ngaruye Claude	Province Ruhengeri	08639557
5	Bigendako M-Josée	IRST Butare	08461189
6	Ruburika Anthony	Maire Rukara	08501448
7	Gahima Manasseh	Maire Gabiro	08455396
8	Edwin Mitchell	MINITERE/DEMP	08770338
9	Anna Behm Masozera		08448543
10	Mukwiye Martin	Province Kibungo	08444420
11	Ndizeye Willy	CDF	08560972
12	Dr Tony Mudakikwa	ORTPN	08306928
13	Usengumuremyi Maximilien	MINECOFIN	08533542
14	Twesigye Bakwatsa Charles	Consultant MINECOFIN	08849028
15	Dukundane Alexis	MINALOC	08594104
16	Mberabagabo Richard	Maire Kinigi	08479467
17	Sengoga Fulgence	ARECO/Rwanda Nziza	518310
18	Ndayambaje J.Damascène	ISAR	08487721
19	Nkinzehwiki Francois	Virunga Wildlife Clubs	08409496
20	Twarabamenye Emmanuel	UNR-CGIS	08856784
21	Kabutura Michael	Reason	08867949
22	Gatebuka Louis	MINICOM	08422947
23	Von Koenig Christof	DED Akagera	08898924
24	Ndagijimana Jean Damascene	Maire Gatara	08455173
25	Havugimana Eniezel	Gasabo	08524171
26	Gasigwa Wellars	Vis Maire Mudasomwa	08841762
27	Mutebutsi Obedy	IRC/Rwanda	08535980
28	Nsanzabaganwa Epimaque	Province Gikongoro	08612292
29	Gasaraba John	Maire Mutobo	08639730
30	Mukunzi Yussuf	Sy Consult	582567
31	Mbonyintwali Aphrodise	Care Intl.	08519859
32	Bill Weber	WCS	08772035
33	Rukazambaga Gilbert	Vice Maire Bugarama	08635883
34	Liz MacFie	IGCP Nairobi	(254)202710367
35	Rurangwa Raphaël	IGCP Rwanda	08300842
36	Bishangara Cyprien	MINITERE	08530290
37	Mbanza Ismail	Province Cyangugu	08763597
38	Katie Fawcett	DFGF-Intl.	08307526
39	Andy Plumptre	WCS	070-77509754
40	Ian Munanura	PCFN/WCS	08306662
41	Laurent Rudasingwa	UNDP	590432
42	Ruzinjirabake Fabien	ACNR	08831173
43	Tim Muzira	USAID	08303233
45	Mugabukomeye Benjamin	ORTPN / PNA	08303904
46	Ruzigandekwe Fidele	ORTPN /RWA	08306913
47	Shawn Taylor	WCS	
48	Felicia Nutter	MGVP	08307572
49	Bizimungu Francois	ORTPN/PNN	08301130
50	Gasogo Anasthasie	UNR/Dept Biologie	08559359
51	Harerimana Innocent	District Cyabubare	08746448
52	Rwabutogo Marcel	District Mutura	08587390
53	Amy Vedder	WCS	001-718-2207159
54	Laure Lindaro	Union Europeene	585738
55	Uwimana Suzanne	MINITERE	08486431
56	Nikuze Théoneste	ARASI	08517495
57	Hitiyise Muvunyi Alexis	Maire Nyamasheke	08538792
58	Heidrun Simm	DED/GTZ	08307489

59	Munyengabe 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 Masozera	WCS	08306663
67	Francoise Kayigamba	WCS	08350023
68	Sentama Vedaste	WCS	
69	Hakizimana Emmanuel	ORTPN/RWA	08306929
70	Mukankomeje Rose	REMA	
71	Patricia Hajabakiga	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.

## **PART II: Terms of Reference for Institutions, and for Key Project Staff**

*Project Overview.* The Protected Areas Biodiversity (PAB) project seeks to assist the Government of Rwanda to strengthen its capacity to manage its forest protected areas – notably the Volcanoes National Park and the Nyungwe National Park. GEF investments target the sustainability of the entire PA system, with particular attention to three key sectors: 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. Project activities include support for capacity-building at all levels, increased collaboration between central-central and central-local government bodies, and a complementary set of income and employment generating activities in targeted PA-neighbor communities.

The Executing Agency for the Project is the Ministry of Environment, Lands, Forests, Water, and Mines (MINITERE). The lead Implementing Agency is the Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA). Major project activities will be conducted in collaboration with the Rwandan Office of Tourism and National Parks (ORTPN). For at least the first three years of the project (continuation subject to a mid-project review), REMA will be assisted in its implementation role by a Project Management Unit (PMU).

*PMU Terms of Reference.* The PMU is seen as the hub in a decentralized, collaborative, multi-faceted initiative. Where expertise exists within existing Rwandan government agencies, NGOs, or private sector entities, the PMU role is to coordinate and oversee the implementation of project components through subcontractual arrangements. Where this expertise does not exist, the PMU will assist its government partners to identify and recruit outside experts to provide the needed skills in a transparent, open process. Most importantly, the PMU will organize the training needed to assure the development of Rwandan capacity to meet future needs where this capacity is currently lacking or insufficient. The PMU team must therefore possess both depth and breadth of African experience and technical expertise in order to provide the range of services required for this project. Details of expected PMU services are provided below, with more detailed lists of required experience/expertise in the individual ToRs that follow.

The PMU must:

- Assist and support REMA in all aspects of its role as the Lead Implementing Agency for the PAB project, including organization of Steering Committees, workshops, and conferences, as well as the production of diverse reports, technical papers, etc.
- Provide linkage to ORTPN, which is mandated to manage the PAs
- Provide (through its staff, support organization, and outside contacts) expertise in: biodiversity conservation, research and analysis, protected area management, multi-disciplinary training, conservation finance, ecotourism, community-based conservation, geographic information systems, and monitoring and evaluation
- Work collaboratively with government agencies (including those responsible for parks, tourism, forestry, water, environment, finance, and decentralization), NGOs (international, national, and regional), local districts and associations, and the private sector
- Negotiate, develop and oversee MOUs with diverse partners to implement project components where in-country capacity exists
- Identify and recruit sources of outside expertise where internal technical capacity is insufficient
- Assess capacity building needs and develop appropriate training programs to fill existing gaps
- Demonstrate and apply established fiscal management and accounting procedures, subject to regular external audits and review
- Have familiarity with UNDP accounting and financial management procedures

- 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 8 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

Ministry Finance  
Ministry for Local Government  
Representatives of Provinces where project is working  
Representatives of Conservation and Development NGOs, involved in the project.

Detailed TOR will be spelled out in the Inception Report and approved at the first PSC.

The PSC will set up a sub-committee the Project Management Committee, which will meet quarterly to receive and approve quarterly reports and work-plans. Key members include MiniTerre, REMA, UNDP, ORTPN and the PMU staffing.

The Steering Committee will receive reports from the meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee meetings.

### **Technical Advisory Committee**

This will be chaired by the Project Coordinator in REMA. Membership will include the PMU and UNDP and ORTPN, together with the Conservation Agencies working at main sites, including Park Wardens, District Environment Officers and INGOs and NGOs. The TAC may hold separate meetings at each site.

The TAC will ensure commonality of purpose in conservation initiatives at each site, and ensure the sharing of conservation information and data. The TAC will be a major modality for internal M and E process for the project, including the METT Tracking Tools.

Minutes of the TAC will be sent to the PSC for acceptance and approval of policy level recommendations.

## **PART IV**

### **Updated 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.

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
<u>USA</u> 1) Include more specific indicators, such as number of DFM plans etc. 2) Increase the level of analysis of incentives / dis-incentives, which affect the application of sustainable use strategies.	These are useful comments. 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). New indicators of forest area restored and bamboo, natural forest regeneration are included in the log-frame. 2) Further analysis will be undertaken in the Inception Report process, and results built into the work plans.
<u>Germany</u> asked for changes in the implementation process, specifically: 1) The need to monitor local livelihoods was stressed, emphasizing linkages between poverty and resource use. 2) Indicators that are to be developed in the inception process should focus on results, not outputs. 3) The inception process should capture the issues of land use and incentives in the M&E process as indicators.	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.