



REPUBLIC OF RWANDA

DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK (DPAF) FY 2010-2011

November 2011

Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
GOVERNMENT OF RWANDA

DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT
FRAMEWORK (DPAF)
FY 2010-2011

November 2011

Background

1. The Donor Performance Assessment Framework (DPAF) forms a part of a mutual review process designed to strengthen mutual accountability at the country level, drawn from international and national agreements on the quality of development assistance to Rwanda. The DPAF reviews the performance of bilateral and multilateral donors against a set of established indicators on the quality and volume of development assistance to Rwanda, while the Common Performance Assessment Framework (CPAF) drawn from the M&E framework of Rwanda's Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) reviews performance against a set of agreed indicators and targets on EDPRS outcomes and policy actions. The primary forum for dialogue around the DPAF is the Development Partners Coordination Group (DPCG), recognising that the DPAF aims to be inclusive, bringing together all donors and all aid modalities. The primary forum for dialogue around the CPAF is the Joint Budget Support Review (JBSR).
2. The DPAF exercise for FY 2010/2011 was undertaken based on donor reporting of aid data and self-reporting on DPAF indicators at project/programme level in the Development Assistance Database (DAD). The DPAF exercise for FY 2010/2011 was initiated in May 2011 with a request for Development Partners to update their information in the DAD as well as reporting on the DPAF indicators. After the initial round of data entry by DPs, a verification process was undertaken by the Government. A preliminary draft of the DPAF FY 2010/2011 was shared and discussed at the DPCG October meeting. This meeting recommended further bilateral verification process to further improve the quality of information provided in the DAD and to discuss the preliminary results. After bilateral verification process, the DPAF FY 2010/2011 was finalised.

Overall FY 2010/2011 DPAF Results

3. The DPAF is presented both in aggregate form (comprising all development assistance to Rwanda reported in the DAD), and disaggregated by donor to allow for comparison, individual reflection on performance, accountability and peer pressure, which are recognised as key ingredients to the successful implementation of the Paris Declaration and Rwanda's Aid Policy at the country level.
4. The total ODA to Government sector under the FY 10/11 DPAF review was 938 Million USD, slightly decreased from 941 Million USD. Given the fact that previous DPAF FY 09/10 included the WFP operation in Rwanda which was now considered as humanitarian therefore outside of the DPAF exercise, this slight reduction does not mean that ODA portfolio for Rwanda was actually decreased. The volume of WFP operation excluded from the exercise is around 20 million USD. This means that more ODA for Government sector was disbursed in FY 2010/2011 or more accurately reported in the system. Fifteen (15) Development Partners participated in this exercise.
5. In general, the DPAF FY 2010/2011 results have seen the reversal of trend in many of the indicators, including aid on budget and the use of country systems. Consequently, most of the indicators did not meet the targets set for FY 2010/2011, while some DPs have shown further improvement since FY 2009/2010. At aggregate level, the share of Budget Support has decreased from 36% in FY 2009/2010 to 29% in FY 2010/2011. This aggregate level reduction is due to the nominal reduction of volume of ODA provided through budget support.
6. Through the closer look at the individual performance of Development Partners, it appears that the partners who have improved their performance or met their targets maintain the high level of the share of budget support and basket funds in their ODA portfolio and/or their project support that is implemented by Government agencies using the country systems (such as financial reporting, auditing,

and procurement). It is worth noting that the significant improvement observed in FY 2009/2010 DPAF was due to the considerable increase of the share of budget support in relation to the total ODA for the Government sector coupled with policy or procedural changes undertaken by some of Development Partners. However, the analysis of the individual performance of Development Partners for FY 2010/2011 noted that there has not been significant policy or procedural changes undertaken by Development Partners since FY 2009/2010. Most of the improvement recorded under this FY 2010/2011 DPAF assessment is due to different understanding of definitions of indicators.

7. It is worth noting that the reduction of volume and share of the Budget Support was mostly due to procedural or programming cycle related issues. The level of general budget support was reduced partly due to AfDB GBS operation ended in the previous FY, while their new GBS operation was under preparation. The substantive amount of sector budget support in education was also not disbursed due to the procedure of handing over of the FTI managing DP which is taking longer than expected. The outlook for budget support operation in FY 2011/2012 indicates that the level of budget support (if all disbursed without delay) will be slightly lower than FY 2009/2010 but higher than FY 2010/2011. However, there appears to be a shift towards more sector budget support.
8. The result of the DPAF FY 2010/2011 in comparison with the previous year demonstrates that there remains a considerable challenge in a way aid is provided to Rwanda, particularly through the project modality. To this end, accelerated efforts are needed to ensure that project support, even if budget support is GoR's preferred aid modality, is provided in line with the global commitments in the Paris and Accra. This requires increased policy and procedure changes on part of Development Partners as well as the Government.
9. Building on the previous DPAF exercise for FY 2009/2010 and dialogue through the Government of Rwanda and Development Partners Meeting (DPM) and Retreat (DPR), various initiatives have been agreed and started their implementation. These include: (1) systematic communication of forward-spending information to cover at least 3 year on a rolling basis and according to GoR's Fiscal Year, (2) the introduction of the Project Treasury Single Account, and (3) implementation of the Single Project Implementation Units (SPIUs). The DPM also agreed to increase the portion of aid to the Government sector that is delivered by Government agencies as well as efforts to increase aid on budget, use of country procurement systems as well as fully relying on reporting and audit requirements to country systems. These initiatives have not yet kicked-in to start having impacts on the DPAF performance.

FY 2010/2011 Aggregate DPAF Results

A1: Volume of ODA on Budget (RWF)

ODA on Budget is defined in the context of Rwanda as ODA (external grants and loans) included in the Finance Law, which is approved by the Parliament in accordance with the Organic Law no. 37/2006 of 12/09/2006 on State Finances and Property ("the "Organic Budget Law"). The aggregate volume of ODA on Budget by DPs participating in the DPAF has been decreased to 347,079,095,493 RWF compared to 364,374,069,542 RWF in the FY 09/10

A2: % of ODA Recorded in the national budget (PD Indicator 3)

This indicator is a proxy for measuring alignment. It measures the total volume of ODA recorded in the Rwanda national annual budget (the Finance Law) approved by the Parliament in accordance with the Organic Law No. 37/2006 of 12/09/2006 on State Finances and Property. While the OECD-DAC guideline on this indicator notes that subsequent revisions to the original annual budget – even when approved by the legislature- should not be used, given the fact that the revised Finance Law is made in the mid-year to

allow for more realistic budget (not being done retroactively), the revised Finance Law approved by the Parliament is used as the basis for this indicator. It measures the percentage of ODA recorded in the revised Finance Law out of ODA disbursed for the Government sector.

The target for 2011 for this indicator was set at 100% of ODA to the Government Sector was to be recorded in the Finance Law, in line with the Article 6 and Article 29 of the Organic Budget Law, where all revenues of the state shall be included in the budget (Article 6) and state revenues for inclusion in the budget include domestic and external donations and loans (Article 29).

The budget preparation process of the GoR allows those external funds that are not executed by the Government to be included in the budget documents as an *information annex*. This provision is made to enhance **transparency** of external resources provided to the Government sector, even if such resources are not executed by the Government agencies. However, ODA on Budget from the perspectives of enhancing alignment and accountability, such resources to the Government sector are not reflected in the Finance Law approved by the Parliament. This is due to the fact that it is the Budget Agency /the Government of Rwanda administrations that are held accountable for executing budget approved by the Parliament and Budget Agencies do not control such resources that are not executed by the Government.

While considerable efforts have been made to enhance the budget preparation process and enhance comprehensiveness of the budget documents, the aggregate level of % of ODA on budget was reduced from 67% to 64%. This reduction is mostly due to delayed disbursement of budget support that was on budget. The delay of budget support disbursement was partly due to DP procedure (i.e. delayed approval process) but also due to GoR procedure (i.e. ratification process and delayed request for disbursement, etc.). At the same time project support continues to face challenges to be adequately reflected in the national budget. This may be due to the reality that some of the projects are not delivered (executed) by Government agencies, which are considered off-budget. In addition, timing of financing approval/agreement and different programming cycle continues to pose challenges for the Government to be able to reflect adequately the resources executed by Government agencies in the national budget.

The closer look of delayed budget support disbursement also reveals that there is a scope for improved communication of DPs commitment on budget support. Some of the sector budget support which DPs intended to frontload for the subsequent FY was communicated as disbursement for FY 2010/2011. Furthermore, tentative communication of commitment on general and sector budget support made through Budget Support Harmonisation Group was noted to be too premature to be committed in the national budget. While the deadline for provision of commitment and projections for budget support in line with agreed timeline should continue to be respected (i.e. 6 weeks after the backward JSBR for provision of commitment information, and 6 month prior to the subsequent FY for provision of projection information for 3-year MTEF period), timely formal communication of any changes should be further enhanced.

The aggregate level 64% of ODA to Government sector on budget continues to be below the DPAF target as well as the Paris Declaration target. It is off-track to meet both DPAF and PD target (of at least 85% of ODA to Government Sector on Budget).

A3: % of ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies)

Noting on that one of the key conditions for aid on budget is ODA for the Government sector to be delivered by GoR agencies. To this end, the 9th Government of Rwanda and Development Partners Meeting (DPM) in Nov 2010 agreed to increase the portion of ODA for Government sector that is delivered by GoR agencies to 85% in FY 2011/2012.

The DPAF assessment noted that a slight increase in the portion of ODA for Government sector delivered by GoR agencies from 65% in FY 2009/2010 to 66% in FY 2010/2011. This means that 34% (in an amount of USD 319 Million USD) was executed by agencies other than Government agencies.

B1: % of ODA disbursed in the context of a Programme-Based Approach (PD Indicator 9)

The Government of Rwanda and its Development Partners have agreed to strengthen the use of Programme-Based Approaches (PBAs) across government sectors, with particular focus on development of Sector-Wide Approaches (SWAPs) in a number of sectors. Rwanda's target of the use of PBAs is 71% of ODA to Government Sector is disbursed in the context of a Programme-Based Approach.

While Rwanda's Aid Policy indicates un-earmarked general budget support, followed by sector budget support as preferred aid modalities, no particular aid modalities automatically qualify as PBAs. A range of aid modalities can be designed to exhibit the features of PBAs, including (1) clear country-owned programme (e.g. sector policy) with a single budget framework that captures all resources both domestic and external, (2) use of local systems for programme design and implementation, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and (3) use of a formal process for donor coordination and harmonization of donor practices. In this context, the DPAF FY 2010/2011 exercise continues to use a broader scope of the PBAs to include project support provided in the context of a Sector-Wide Approach if a project delivery modality meets the specific conditions set for PBAs.

The DPAF FY 2010/2011 aggregate result on B1 indicates the significant improvement from 48% in FY 2009/2010 to 67% in FY 2010/2011. However, it is worth noting that the functionality of SWAPs in facilitating sector-level harmonization, coordination and alignment varies significantly across sectors and that understanding of definitions of PBAs equally varies across sectors and Development Partners. Due to this, it appears that no meaningful conclusion can be arrived as to whether the sector-level coordination, harmonization and alignment were significantly improved as indicated by the improved results of the DPAF FY 2010/2011. It is in this context that further attention and reflection may be considered in assessing the functionality and quality of SWAPs in facilitating sector-level harmonization, coordination and alignment in support of the Government-led sector programmes at sectoral level.

B2: % of ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD Indicator 5a)

This indicator measures the extent in which ODA disbursed to the Government sector is managed in accordance to the national budgeting procedures established in the general legislation and implemented by government. This means that programmes supported by donors are subject to normal country budget execution procedures, namely procedures for authorization, approval and payment. As such, ODA to Government sector which is directly executed by DPs or implemented by agencies/institutions other than Government agencies (including district authorities) and in-kind support to Government sector do not qualify to be using the GoR budget execution procedures. In addition, a number of project support executed by Government also did not qualify to be using the GoR budget execution procedures, if they were not included in the Finance Law approved by the Parliament, not channeled through central treasury, and/or requiring opening of separate bank accounts for managing their funds. In addition, direct payment is also not considered as using the GoR budget execution procedures in line with the OECD-DAC definitions.

General Budget Support, Sector Budget Support as well as some of the funds disbursed to multi-donor basket funds are qualified to be using the budget execution procedures. However, most of the project funds were not qualified as using the budget execution procedures even if funds are executed by the Government agencies in accordance to national budget execution procedures. This is due to the fact that most of the project funds are not processed (deposited and disbursed) through the established country treasury system (central treasury). Thus, direct payment is not considered as using the budget execution procedure. For support provided to decentralized entities, those funds channeled through the Common Development Fund (CDF) in line with the Aid Policy as well as channeled directly into district accounts are considered using the budget execution procedures.

The DPAF FY 2010/2011 noted on the reduction in the performance of this indicator, from 40% to 34%. This is due to the reduction observed in terms of the share of budget support. Only limited volume and number of project are processed through the established country treasury system.

With the SmartFMS in place, the use of budget execution procedures will be further facilitated, with the procedures for authorization, approval and payment undertaken using the SmartFMS. In addition, the introduction of the **Project Treasury Single Account (PTSA)** will further strengthen management of aid flows through facilitating project aid flows through established treasury system and procedures.

B3: % of ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures

ODA is considered disbursed using GoR auditing procedures, if funds are subject to audit carried out under the responsibility of the Office of Auditor General (OAG) and do not require additional audit arrangements under normal circumstances, and funds do not require different audit standards from those adopted by the OAG and/or do not require changing audit cycle of OAG to audit the funds. In case where OAG is not able to audit the funds, an alternative arrangement is agreed upon between the OAG and responsible Ministries. In these cases, such funds are considered using the GoR audit procedures.

Due to the considerable reduction in terms of the share of budget support in the total ODA for Government sector, the DPAF FY 2010/2011 results noted on the reduction in this indicator, from 53% to 47%. However, the reduction is relatively smaller in comparison to the reduction observed on the share of budget support. This implies that more project funds are now subject for audit carried out under the responsibility of the OAG. However, there remain many cases where project support is subject to additional / parallel audit arrangements for some of DPs who provide considerable level of ODA in the form of Budget Support.

B4: % of ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems

ODA is considered disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems, if donors do not impose additional requirements on governments for financial reporting. In particular donors do not require (1) maintenance of a separate accounting system to satisfy donor reporting requirements, and (2) creation of a separate chart of accounts to record the use of donor funds. Improvements had been made in this indicator. However, the result of the DPAF FY 2010/2011 indicates that the target set for the FY was not met at aggregate level, while it met the PD target set for 2010.

However, the improvement since FY 2009/2010 was made despite the overall reduction of the share of budget support. This means that more project support is using GoR financial reporting systems. Continuous efforts made by Government to ensure all resources executed by Government agencies included in the national budget will further facilitate the SmartFMS to effectively report on execution.

B5: % of ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems.

ODA is considered to be using the national procurement systems, if the funds do not make additional, or special, requirements on the Government of Rwanda for the procurement of works, goods and services, and the funds are managed only according to the national procurement procedures as they were established in the general legislation and implemented by the government.

Several DPs, due to policy changes and efforts undertaken in the increased use of national procurement systems, have achieved 100% using the procurement procedure. However, at aggregate level, the use of procurement procedure remains at around the same level (62%) as the FY 2009/2010. However, this level of use of the procurement procedure was made despite the overall reduction of the share of budget support. This implies that more project support is now using GoR procurement procedures.

The target for FY 2010/2011 was not met, and the future target for FY 2011/2012 is set at more ambitious level. This means that further procedural and policy changes are needed to increase the use of national procurement procedure as well as the portion of ODA for Government sector delivered by GoR agencies. As discussed in the Joint Budget Support Review, several DPs noted on the need for further improvement and speed of procurement at district and sector level. Further efforts on the both sides are therefore needed to meet the target set for FY 2011/2012.

B6: Number of parallel PIUs (PD Indicator 6)

The Paris Declaration invites Development Partners to “avoid to the maximum extent possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of aid-financed projects and programmes”. PIUs are typically entities set up to perform project management tasks and tasks subsidiary to the implementation of a project (for example, monitoring and reporting, accounting, procurement). PIUs are said to be parallel when accountability of PIUs is towards external funding agencies/donors rather than to the country implementing agencies. In several sectors, it had been noted that the use of PIUs has limited the ownership and accountability of Government agencies over development projects financed by DPs.

The DPAF FY 2010/2011 observed that different interpretation of parallel PIUs may be used between the DPs and GoR. The results reported under the DPAF FY 2010/2011 uses the GoR’s interpretation of parallel PIUs which focuses on ownership and accountability over development projects externally financed.

With the Government decision and accelerated efforts to implement Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIUs) in harmonizing, simplifying and aligning tasks subsidiary to the project implementation (i.e. monitoring and reporting, accounting, etc.), joint efforts have started to phase out a project specific implementation unit all together (regardless of whether it is integrated or parallel) by the end of FY 2011/2012.

B7: % of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD Indicator 4)

While the DPAF FY 2010/2011 results indicates that 97% of Technical Cooperation was provided through coordinated programme, the definition of coordinated TC continues to pose challenges in making the assessment of this indicator credible. Some DPs have applied the definition at overall strategic agreement level to indicate that all their TC are coordinated, while others have applied the definitions around TC provided in the context of SWAp or other forms of coordinated framework.

In particular, it poses challenges as to how we define “control by relevant authorities”. Some DPs indicate that having the TC agreed at overall strategic agreement level means that Government has a control over the TC, while GoR continues to experience challenges with regard to effective TC in support of capacity development. To this end, the focus on “control” was made at TC inputs level, including: (1) TC be provided at the request by relevant authorities, (2) scope of TC (i.e preparation of ToRs) is led by the relevant authorities, (3) relevant authorities engages in recruitment/procurement of TC, (4) daily management of TC inputs is monitored by the relevant authorities, and (5) the completion of TC assignment signed off by the relevant authorities. However, verifying whether self-reporting by DPs strictly adhere to the criteria at input level required engagement of sector Ministries, districts as well as project management units for a significant level of TC/TA operation, the DPAF FY 2010/2011 did not undertake this verification. In addition, it also posed whether the indicator is measuring intended outcome of the issues to be addressed through the indicator. Further reflection therefore is needed as to ways in which to assess whether TC/TA is contributing to long-term sustainable capacity development.

C1: % of donors delivering all ODA through Multi-Year binding agreements of at least three years.

Binding, multi-year cooperation agreements enhance predictability of aid for the Government of Rwanda, strengthening medium-term planning, budgeting and service delivery. Binding, multi-year cooperation agreements are said to be in place, when (1) all ODA to the government sector formed part of a written agreement or programme document signed with the Government of Rwanda (usually by MINECOFIN or in some cases by MINAFEET); (2) such an agreement covers all ODA intended for disbursement to the government sector over a period of three or more years; (3) such an agreement specifies – in financial terms – the total volume of ODA to be disbursed to the government sector over the course of the agreement; and (4) such an agreement is binding on the donor, meaning that except for basic clauses on underlying conditions, force majeure and any performance incentives such as variable tranches for budget support,

the volumes of ODA to the government sector provided for in the agreement are NOT subject to change.

More than half of DPs are able to deliver all of their ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years.

C2: % of donors providing non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year.

Non-binding indications of future aid flows play an important role in facilitating medium-term planning and budgeting. Non-binding indications of future aid flows are said to be in place when (1) the donor has communicated to the MINECOFIN in writing or via Development Assistance Database (DAD) an indication of likely disbursements of ODA to the government sector for the three years on a rolling basis; (2) such an indication covers all ODA expected to be disbursed for the government sector for at least three years; and (3) the volume of ODA for the government sector is specified clearly. Such an indication is not necessarily binding on donor, and is intended to provide a realistic estimate for planning purposes only.

Non-binding indications of future aid flows are integral part of realistic medium-term planning and budgeting. Non-availability of such information affects the strengths and effectiveness of Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), posing significant challenges to the strategic planning at national and sectoral level. Through the Budget Support Harmonisation Group, such non-binding indications of future aid flows on Budget Support is now communicated for three years on a rolling basis. However, broader and comprehensive indication of future aid flows has not always been made, except at sector level where the functions of SWAPs are strong.

The DPAF FY 2010/2011 aggregate result indicated that more than half of DPs are now providing the indicative projections for the 3-year MTEF period. However, at the time of collecting indicative projections for the 3-year for FY 2010/2011, there was no systematic process in collecting this information except for the BSHG process of collecting indicative projections for budget support. Therefore, this indicator relies on self-reporting by DPs which was difficult to be verified on the basis of evidence. However, this systematic process through DPCG was introduced in FY 2010/2011 for collecting information for FY 2011/2012-FY 2013/14 MTEF period. The assessment next year will therefore base its assessment on the availability of information provided through this systematic process.

C3: % of ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD Indicator 7)

This indicator specifically focuses on in-year predictability of aid flows to the government sector, and recognizes that shortfalls in the total amount of aid for the government sector and delays in the in-year disbursements of scheduled funds can have serious implications for a government's ability to implement its national development strategy as planned. This indicator therefore measures the gap between aid scheduled and aid effectively disbursed AND recorded in countries accounting systems. It recognizes that meeting this objective is not exclusively within donor's control and that it is a shared responsibility that requires joint efforts on various fronts at the same time, including: improving (i) the realism of predictions on volume and timing of expected disbursements, (ii) the mechanisms for notifying and recording donor-funded disbursements, and (iii) the comprehensiveness of government's records of disbursements made by donors.

The DPAF indicator measures % of ODA communicated to the Government as scheduled disbursement out of what was recorded as disbursed in the public accounts. Comparing with the result from the DPAF FY 2009/2010, the result of this year's DPAF has seen the reversal in its trend, coming down from 73% to 56%. This is most likely due to the scheduled disbursement as communicated by Development Partners was significantly higher than what was actually disbursed and recorded in the public account information. In-year predictability based on information provided by DPs (comparison of what was scheduled for disbursement vs what was actually disbursed and reported by DPs) indicates that this has reduced from 99% to 88%. The

total volume of external finance recorded in the public account information for FY 2010/2011 was around at the same level as the information recorded in the FY 2009/2010.

The data used for the DPAF FY 2010/2011 indicates that further efforts are needed to improve on the realism of predictions on volume and timing of expected disbursements and the comprehensiveness of government's records of disbursements made by donors through improving ways in which disbursements are made to the government sector that would facilitate timely and comprehensiveness of government's recording of receipt of disbursements made by donors. When comparing what was communicated to the Government as scheduled disbursement and what was actually disbursed, this has been reduced from 99% to 88%. When comparing what was actually disbursed and what was recorded in the public account, this has been slightly improved from 73% to 76%. Government makes continuous efforts to ensure all public resources are recorded in public account, not only cash disbursed to Government accounts but also direct payment and in-kind contribution. However, it has been challenging to ensure accurate recording of direct payment and/or in-kind contribution.

Further efforts are needed on: (1) enhancing realism of projections and timely communication on scheduled disbursements and (2) ways in which disbursements are made to the government sector in facilitating timely and comprehensiveness of government's recording of receipt of disbursements made by donors.

C4: % of ODA disbursements for years n and n-1 captured in DAD

This indicator was discontinued.

C5: % of committed/indicative ODA for years n to n+3 captured in DAD

This indicator was discontinued.

C6: DAD data quality index for year n

The **DAD Data Quality Index** gives an indication of the quality of data entered against qualitative fields, with a value close to 1 indicating high quality data, whilst a value closer to zero indicating very low quality data. As with all such indicators of data quality, these should be taken as an indication only. It is never possible to objectively 'measure' all aspects of data quality. Below is a description of the methodology adopted in deriving the indicator.

The **DAD Data Quality Index** assesses the quality of the data already entered into the DAD using a set of pre-determined criteria of a qualitative nature. The data input into most fields is reviewed by an analyst and given a score according to the amount of detail (in other words, the 'usefulness' of the data) provided, on the basis of pre-determined criteria. These scores are then aggregated to give an overall value ranging from **zero** to **one** (**0** suggesting that data is of very poor quality or non-existent, and **1** indicating that all of the data provided is of high quality).

Note that the **DAD Data Quality Index** does not offer any assessment of the accuracy of financial data provided, or the coverage of data (i.e. the extent to which a donor has provided details on all of its activities).

D1 rev: Total number of missions per million USD disbursed to the government sector

This indicator was discontinued.

D2: % of missions that are joint (PD Indicator 10a)

This indicator focuses only on the proportion of missions undertaken by two or more donors jointly or by one donor on behalf of another. The level of joint mission has been increased from 21% to 49%, meeting the target set for FY 2010/2011.

D3rev: Total number of analytical work per million USD disbursed to the government sector

The indicator was discontinued.

D4: % of analytical work that are joint (PD Indicator 10b)

This indicator measures the proportion of country analytic reports or reviews undertaken by two or more donors jointly or by one donor on behalf of other donors (s) as a percent of the total number of analytic work. The DPAF FY 2009/2010 indicates that the level of joint analytic work has been increased from 26% to 67% meeting the target of 66%.

Budget Support specific DPAF indicators

G1: % of BS Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question.

Budget support given that it fully uses the country systems requires timely and effective communication of indicative volume over the 3-year MTEF period in order to feed into the GoR's strategic planning and budget preparation processes at central and sector level. Over the years, the mechanism of receiving this information has been systematically put in place through the Budget Support Harmonisation Group (BSHG), where by a co-chair of BSHG coordinates and communicates on behalf of Budget Support DPs to the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning. This indicator therefore looks at both the comprehensiveness and timeliness of the information provided through this process.

Many Budget Support DPs were not able to provide information of anticipated volume of sector budget support particularly for the 3rd year (n+2). This is mostly due to programming cycle of DPs as well as policy/political changes in their HQs which provided constraints to release such information.

G2: % of BS donors confirming to the government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranches (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next financial year.

This indicator looks at the timeliness of confirmation of the amount of budget support to be disbursed in the next financial year. This information is provided through the BSHG framework, while updated information in terms of amount and timing is continuously provided to MINECOFIN in order to inform cash/treasury management as well as budget execution.

All the Budget Support donors met this commitment, providing timely confirmation on the volume of budget support. However, the closer look at individual donor performance reveals that there are cases whereby the information provided as planned for disbursement in the next financial year (n) through the BSHG was meant for frontloaded disbursement for the subsequent financial year (n+1). This practice has caused a significant challenge in ensuring accuracy and credibility of the budget planning, whereby the amount communicated as disbursed in the next financial year (n) was included as expected state resources in the national budget approved by the Parliament for the year (n), when the same disbursement from DP perspective was meant for the following financial year (n+1).

G3: % of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year

This indicator looks at frontloading of the Budget Support disbursement, measuring the proportion of Budget Support disbursed in the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year. The target set for this indicator was 50%, meaning that half of Budget Support disbursement is to be made within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year. The DPAF FY 2010/2011 noted that there has been an improvement on this indicator at aggregate level, from 26% in FY 2009/2010 to 43% in FY 2010/2011. 45% of General Budget Support was also made in the first quarter, improved from 23% in FY 2009/2010.

G4: % of BS disbursed within first 6 months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.

This indicator looks at predictability of the Budget Support disbursement for the first 6 month of the GoR fiscal year, and measures the proportion of Budget Support that was disbursed as it was scheduled. 91% of Budget Support disbursement for the first 6 month was disbursed timely as it was scheduled. This was a slight improvement from 86% in FY 2009/2010; however, being short of meeting the target of 100%.

G5: % of BS donors adhering fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoU)

This indicator assesses the extent in which the adherence of Budget Support donors to the common conditionality agreed jointly through the Budget Support harmonization Group dialogue. All the Budget Support partner met this indicator.

G6: % of BS donors adhering fully to partnership framework

All the Budget Support donors met this commitment.

Donor Performance Assessment Framework (DPAF) FY 2010-2011

AGGREGATE DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK Final results from the FY10/11 round of monitoring generated on 04-Jan-12.

This table offers a like-for-like comparison (i.e. 2007 baseline, 2008 actuals and targets are calculated only for those 14 donors who completed questionnaires in both years).

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10 Actual	FY10/11 Target	FY10/11 Actual	2011/2012 Target	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	192,913,125,382	364,378,069,542		350,446,379,924	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	52%	67%	100%	64%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	65%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	39%	48%	71%	66%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	41%	40%	59%	34%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	41%	53%	60%	47%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	43%	57%	70%	59%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	43%	63%	71%	62%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	41	31	14	26	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	84%	94%	50%	97%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Establish baseline in 2008	41%	100%	60%	100%
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Establish baseline in 2008	44%	100%	67%	100%
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	68%	73%	83%	63%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.93	1.00	0.95	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	196	113	Maintain or decrease	113	Maintain or decrease
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	23%	21%	45%	49%	40%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	75	39	Maintain or decrease	39	Maintain or decrease
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	45%	26%	84%	67%	66%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			100%	93%	Yes

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:

G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	100%	100%	29%	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		100%	100%	86%	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		26%	50%	43%	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		86%	100%	91%	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		86%	100%	100%	100%
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		100%	100%	100%	100%
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and withing the GoR FY it was planned			n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	

Rwanda Donor Performance Assessment Framework (DPAF)

Preliminary zero results by donor for FY10/11.

The tables were prepared using the data entered in the Development Assistance Database (DAD) as of 22 November 2011.

These reports were generated automatically on 22-Nov-2011 and should be considered final



www.devpartners.gov.rw

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - AFDB
Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 14 out of a total of 21 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	40,350,000,000	34,095,187,248		41,766,731,634	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	86%	88%	100%	51%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	100%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	54%	78%	71%	79%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	54%	35%	59%	15%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	54%	35%	60%	82%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	54%	84%	70%	82%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	54%	77%	71%	82%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	0	1	0	0.00	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	0%	100%	50%	100%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	83%	62%	83%	60%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.89	1.00	0.85	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	19	23	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	11%	9%	45%	100%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	2	0	For Tracking only	0	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	0%	N/A - No analytic work	84%	N/A - No analytic work	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:							
G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		35%	50%	0%	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		100%	100%	0%	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data completed by AFDB.

FOOTNOTE: AfDB portfolio has seen a reduction of ODA provided to Rwanda from FY 2009/2010 to FY 2010/2011 due to the fact that their previous CSP ended in 2010. The last year of the CSP normally sees the reduction of annual disbursement. The share of Direct Budget Support reduced from around 35-37% to 15%, given that there was no new GBS operation programme for this FY 2010/2011. However, through the Budget Support Harmonisation Group dialogue, planned GBS disbursement was communicated to the Government. Therefore, their GBS was on budget, while no disbursement was made. The use of budget execution procedures has seen a reduction since FY 2009/2010, due to the reduced direct budget support operation for FY 2010/2011. AfDB has indeed seen a significant improvement in the use of budget execution procedures since FY 2009/2010 DPAF and PD Survey 2010. However, it was later noted that AfDB considered direct payments as using national budget execution procedures. The Government of Rwanda's definition of the use of budget execution procedure is in line with the OECD-DAC definition. The DAC Secretariat has also confirmed that direct payment is not normally included as using national budget execution procedures. It has also been clarified since the last DPAF FY 2009/2010 that AfDB accepts the audit report prepared by OAG. However, AfDB undertakes internal audit in order to meet the requirements of their donors, and such an audit is undertaken as part of resource mobilisation and does not impose any additional audit requirements on the Government. The predictability remains at around the same level. In comparing what they communicated as their scheduled disbursement with what they actually disbursed as reported in the DAD (which is around 80%), this lower predictability relates to the challenges associated with recording accurately in the public account what was actually disbursed. This is mostly due to the fact that project disbursement is made through direct payment and challenges associated with recording direct payment in public account.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - BELGIUM

Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 11 out of a total of 21 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	13,583,000,201	27,351,502,855		17,533,380,571	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	77%	72%	100%	54%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	19%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)		34%	71%	100%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	15%	19%	59%	19%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	15%	19%	60%	19%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	15%	19%	70%	19%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	66%	96%	71%	100%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	18	16	8	16	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	0%	74%	50%	99%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	52%	75%	83%	83%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.95	1.00	0.99	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	4	2	For Tracking only		1 For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	50%	0%	45%	100%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	1	0	For Tracking only	Not applicable	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	100%	N/A - No analytic work	84%	N/A - No analytic work	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes

Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:

G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		60%	50%	0%	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		0%	100%	100%	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a		To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data completed by BELGIUM.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of Belgium's ODA for the Government Sector reduced by 16% from 65.8 million USD to 55.5 million USD, while the budget support level remains at around the same. Aid on budget has seen a reduction, mostly due to Belgium's disbursement to the health sector budget support made in FY 2010/2011 that was not on budget, given that this was a delayed disbursement for health sector budget support planned disbursement which was on budget in FY 2009/2010. Beyond sector budget support meeting the criteria of using the country systems, no project support uses the budget execution procedures, reporting systems and auditing procedures. Belgium considers its project support as using national procurement procedures managed through the comanagement ("co-gestion") arrangement, whereby it uses the GoR procurement procedures to select goods and/or services which BTC directly pays to the selected providers. With regard to the parallel PIUs, the Government considers their co-management arrangements as parallel PIUs. Given that there have not been any structural changes of this arrangement, the number remains the same. There was no communication of projections (anticipated volume of budget support) for sector budget support in health.

Donor Performance Assessment Framework (DPAF) FY 2010-2011

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - CANADA

Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 6 out of a total of 16 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	0	1,979,028,617		0	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	0%	59%	100%	0%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	81%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	0%	9%	71%	0%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	9%	59%	0%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	13%	9%	60%	51%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	13%	9%	70%	51%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	13%	54%	71%	51%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	1	2	1	1	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	57%	100%	50%	100%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	7%	38%	83%	0%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.98	1.00	0.95	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	0	1	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)		100%	45%	100%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	1	2	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	100%	50%	84%	0%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes

Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:

G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		N/A	50%	N/A	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		N/A	100%	N/A	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data completed by CANADA.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of ODA for the Government Sector increased by 16% from 5.8 million USD to 6.8 million USD. Canada's aid on budget has seen a reduction, mostly due to projects that were not included on budget and others whose contributions were made through silent partnerships (e.g. LWH) were not included on budget. However, their performance has seen an improvement in terms of use of financial reporting and auditing procedures due to the disbursements made to LWH. The use of procurement procedures has seen a slight reduction, due to some of the projects which are considered as using national procurement procedures that are not reported as such. Furthermore, it seems that there has not been any significant changes of the way funds are disbursed and projects are executed. This may be due to the different understanding of this indicator since the DPAF FY 2009/2010 exercise.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 18 out of a total of 22 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	33,423,000,000	48,492,088,219		55,275,391,733	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	80%	92%	100%	71%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	99%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	29%	72%	71%	86%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	32%	72%	59%	87%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	32%	72%	60%	87%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	32%	72%	70%	87%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	32%	72%	71%	89%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	1	0	0	0	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	100%	82%	50%	100%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	173%	73%	83%	91%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.89	1.00	0.92	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	1	1	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	0%	0%	45%	100%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	0	4	For Tracking only	2	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)		25%	84%	50%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes

Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:

G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		0%	50%	67%	
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		70%	100%	83%	
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by EUROPEAN COMMISSION.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of ODA for the Government sector was declined by 26% from 90.9 million USD in FY 2009/2010 to 67.7 million USD. Their share of budget support has been increased from 72% to 82% of their total ODA for the Government sector, while the total volume of budget support operations has been declined by about 10 million USD. The additional sector budget support is now operational in the environment and natural resources, which has also contributed to the increased share of the budget support. The use of country system remains to be mostly limited to budget support operation except for its contribution to basket fund on PFM and statistics and its contribution to water and sanitation fund. Their aid on budget result has noted the reversal in trends, declined from 92% to 71%. This is partly due to their planned sector budget support disbursement (total in amount of around 15 million USD) as communicated through the Budget Support Harmonisation Group did not materialized while the scheduled disbursement was included on the national budget. EC's own predictability (based on EC's reporting in the DAD) is around 95%. However, actual disbursement as recorded in the public account is larger than what EC has reported to have actually disbursed in the DAD. This is due to possible difference of interpretation of what is ODA for Government sector between EC and MINECOFIN. Some of the aid which is reported as actually disbursed in the public account was not recorded in the DAD. EC is the only Budget Support donor which provided the communication of projection (anticipated volume of budget support) for the 3-year MTEF period.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - GERMANY
Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 13 out of a total of 22 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	2,911,000,000	11,207,036,863		12,090,114,378	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	46%	62%	100%	67%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	68%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	26%	72%	71%	92%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	47%	65%	59%	68%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	47%	63%	60%	69%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	47%	63%	70%	69%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	47%	63%	71%	69%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	0	5	2	5	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	93%	58%	50%	94%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	78%	68%	83%	68%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.84	1.00	0.97	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	7	4	For Tracking only	9	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	71%	25%	45%	67%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	3	1	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	67%	0%	84%	100%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes

Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:

G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		48%	50%	0%	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		100%	100%	100%	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a		To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by GERMANY.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of German ODA for the Government Sector remains at the same level – 31 million USD, while its share of budget support remains at about half of the overall portfolio (49% in FY 2009/2010 and 47% in FY 2010/2011). However, the percentage of ODA recorded in the national budget remains much lower than the 100% target, and stood at 67%, despite a slight increase from the previous FY. This is in part attributed to the fact that German support provided through GIZ, a large share of it being TC, was not included on budget. Overall, the use of country systems (GoR budget execution, procurement and reporting) remains low and at similar levels to the previous FY. In general, the use of country systems remains largely limited to budget support and contributions to basket funds. By increasing the use of country systems, including procurement, financial reporting and budget execution, Germany could potentially see an increase in ODA on budget as the Government would have more control over those resources and activities. While Germany does not consider any of their project management units (PIUs) as being parallel, the Government of Rwanda considers five of their project management arrangements as parallel PIUs. Given that there has not been any structural changes to these arrangements, the number remains the same as in the previous FY. With regards to providing medium term projections (anticipated volume of budget support for at least 3 years), this was only achieved for GBS. For sector budget support, projections were only provided for 2 years. Part of the inability to provide medium term projections stems from the fact that their cooperation frameworks are only for two years, raising challenges in predictability in the medium term.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - GLOBAL FUND
Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 6 out of a total of 13 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	13,713,000,000	24,005,619,588		17,980,751,443	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	67%	52%	100%	27%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	100%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	100%	0%	71%	100%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	0%	59%	0%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	100%	100%	60%	0%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	0%	100%	70%	100%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	66%	100%	71%	95%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	0	0	0	0	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)		(N/A - no TC)	50%	(N/A - no TC)	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	123%	52%	83%	74%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.92	1.00	0.92	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	6	0	For Tracking only	0	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	33%	N/A - No missions	45%	N/A - No missions	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	6	0	For Tracking only	Not applicable	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	17%	N/A - No analytic work	84%	N/A - No analytic work	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes

Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:

G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		N/A	50%	N/A	
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		N/A	100%	N/A	
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by GLOBAL FUND.

FOOTNOTE: : The total volume of Global Fund's disbursement increased by 45% from 80.2 million USD to 116 million USD. Aid on budget remains to be a challenge. Their use of audit procedure has seen a significant reduction coming from 100% to 0%. However, this is due to the different understanding of the indicator. 0% use of audit procedure is in line with the verification process undertaken with the Global Fund HQ during the Paris Declaration Survey 2010 exercise.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - JAPAN
Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 4 out of a total of 14 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	2,615,000,000	2,388,000,000		623,157,720	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	29%	16%	100%	9%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	100%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	19%	23%	71%	95%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	19%	23%	59%	18%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	19%	23%	60%	18%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	19%	23%	70%	18%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	19%	23%	71%	21%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	0	2	1	n/a	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	100%	0%	50%	100%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	13%	6%	83%	10%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.85	1.00	0.91	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	8	0	For Tracking only	0	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	0%	N/A - No missions	45%	N/A - No missions	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	0	0	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)			84%	0%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes
Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:							
G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		N/A	50%	N/A	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		N/A	100%	N/A	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a		To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by JAPAN.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of ODA for the Government Sector reduced by 53% from 25.3 million in FY 2009/2010 to 11.9 million in FY 2010/2011. The share of non-project support has been reduced from 23% to 18%. This has directly impacted the DPAF performance in many indicators. The use of Programme-Based Approach (B1) and the coordinated TC (B7) has seen considerable progress. However, this is due to the different understanding of the indicators and it is not related to policy/procedural changes.

Donor Performance Assessment Framework (DPAF) FY 2010-2011

Donor code:

LUX

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - LUXEMBOURG Final results from FY10/11 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 5 out of a total of 15 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	Establish baseline 2009/2010	744,027,366		1,519,248,800	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)		52%	100%	76%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	45%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	Establish baseline 2009/2010	31%	71%	0%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)		0%	59%	0%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)		0%	60%	0%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)		0%	70%	19%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)		0%	71%	19%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)		0%	0	2	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)		0%	50%	74%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Establish baseline 2009/2010	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)		No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)		95%	83%	53%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.		0.92	1.00	1.00	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	Establish baseline 2009/2010	1	For Tracking only		2 For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)		0%	45%	0%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works		0	For Tracking only		0 For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)		N/A - No analytic work	84%	N/A - No analytic work	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)		Not available at the time of analysis	Yes	Yes	Yes
Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:							
G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2009/2010	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.			50%	N/A	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.			100%	N/A	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a		To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by LUXEMBOURG.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of ODA for the Government Sector increased by 38% from 2.5 million USD in FY 2009/2010 to 3.4 million USD in FY 2010/2011. Some improvement is seen in the use of procurement systems and financial reporting. Aid on budget has also been improved.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - NETHERLANDS

Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 15 out of a total of 22 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012 Target	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	3,291,000,000	21,808,813,993		18,826,709,005	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	42%	90%	100%	84%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	68%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	29%	76%	71%	75%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	74%	59%	65%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	62%	65%	60%	67%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	33%	75%	70%	67%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	48%	83%	71%	88%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	0	0	0	0	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD Indic 4)	100%	75%	50%	83%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	81%	85%	83%	70%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.96	1.00	0.98	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	20	2	For Tracking only	5	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	0%	0%	45%	80%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	1	1	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	0%	0%	84%	0%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes
Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:							
G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		100%	50%	100%	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		100%	100%	100%	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by NETHERLANDS.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of ODA for the Government sector reduced by 18% from 42 million USD in FY 2009/2010 to 34 million USD in FY 2010/2011. This is in part due to significant under-disbursement to the Energy Roll-out Programme, where delayed procurement issues in the sector meant that the Netherlands were unable to disburse as planned. Also, the Netherlands are undergoing a phasing out of a number of projects and programmes under the recent development cooperation framework, their second Multi-Annual Strategic Plan (MASP 2). The share of budget support has seen an increase from 27% to 39% with the volume of its justice sector budget support seeing a significant increase. The use of country systems is also extended to some of the major project support, such as its support to energy sector. In addition, their contribution to basket funds is also considered using the country systems. Thus the Netherlands were able to meet the targets for use of the budget execution procedures, use of audit procedures as well as procurement procedure. Netherlands' aid on budget has seen a slight decline, which is in part due to the fact that its support to the decentralisation basket fund (former CDF) was not on budget. The phasing out of the MASP 2 also meant that the Netherlands were unable to provide communications of medium term projections (anticipated volume of budget support) for the full 3-year MTEF period.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - SWEDEN
Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 05-Jan-12.

Summary: 10 out of a total of 16 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	5,700,000,000	1,115,950,549		9,343,781,896	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	52%	25%	100%	92%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	87%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	56%	54%	71%	84%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	59%	17%	59%	48%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	59%	68%	60%	54%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	59%	90%	70%	87%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	59%	90%	71%	87%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	0	1	0	0	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	6%	100%	50%	100%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	66%	34%	83%	72%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.88	1.00	0.85	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	10	0	For Tracking only	4	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	40%	N/A - No missions	45%	100%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	2	0	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	50%	N/A - No analytic work	84%	0%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes

Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:

G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		N/A	50%	N/A	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		N/A	100%	N/A	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by SWEDEN.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of Swedish ODA for the Government Sector almost doubled from 7.6 million USD in FY 2009/2010 to 14.8 million USD in FY 2010/2011. This is in part due to the phasing out of the old cooperation framework and introduction of the new Swedish Strategy for Development Cooperation with Rwanda, 2010 – 2013. The use of budget execution procedures has seen an increase due to new contributions to the VUP 2020 Umurenge Programme (VUP) and contributions to the Programmes under the Environment and Lands Sector. However, a notable reduction compared to the previous fiscal year was recorded in the use of GoR auditing procedures, which is in part due to significant contributions to the Research Cooperation programme that do not rely on GoR auditing procedures. The use of GoR financial reporting as well as GoR procurement systems remains at around the same level.

There was a reduction of Swedish parallel PIUs (to zero) as it was agreed that their National University of Rwanda support project, which was in FY 2009/2010 assessed as being a parallel PIU, was not such.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - SWITZERLAND

Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 4 out of a total of 15 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	0	602,764,961		638,014,000	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	0%	39%	100%	57%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	68%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	0%	21%	71%	100%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	21%	59%	60%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	42%	60%	59%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	0%	42%	70%	60%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	0%	42%	71%	68%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	2	2	1	1	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	0%	(N/A - no TC)	50%	0%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	0%	72%	83%	67%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.93	1.00	0.97	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	10	0	For Tracking only	0	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	0%	N/A - No missions	45%	N/A - No missions	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	0	0	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	50%	N/A - No analytic work	84%	0%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes
Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:							
G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		N/A	50%	N/A	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		N/A	100%	N/A	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a		To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and DAD data entry completed by SWITZERLAND.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of ODA for the Government Sector saw a slight reduction from 2.7 million to 2.1 million USD. The use of country systems has seen an improvement, due to the different understanding of the indicators. This improvement is not due to any major procedure and policy changes.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - UNITED KINGDOM
 Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 19 out of a total of 22 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	40,329,000,000	44,038,243,673		43,612,340,403	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	96%	94%	100%	85%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	78%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	86%	87%	71%	84%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	92%	84%	59%	75%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	98%	86%	60%	77%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	98%	86%	70%	77%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	100%	87%	71%	79%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	1	0	0	0	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	39%	94%	50%	100%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	94%	86%	83%	72%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	0.80 (2008 baseline)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	20	4	For Tracking only	1	For Tracking
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	20%	100%	45%	100%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	4	5	For Tracking only	7	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	50%	100%	84%	86%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes
Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:							
G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	50%	93%	50%	99%	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and DAD data entry completed by UNITED KINGDOM.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of the United Kingdom's ODA for the Government Sector slightly increased from 81.5 million USD to 88.5 million USD. The share of budget support has gone down from 82% to 63% due to significantly lower commitments and disbursements to SBS Health and Education compared to the previous fiscal year. Additionally, there were two newly-started large projects (e.g. Land Tenure and AFR) that contributed to this drop. This has also had an effect on the aid on budget indicator that has seen a significant reduction compared to the previous fiscal year. Another reason for this is the fact that significant contributions made to VUP and the Land Tenure Programme were not on budget. When comparing what was recorded on budget as well as in the GoR public accounts, one notes that DFID's actual disbursements were higher than both what was recorded on budget and what was accounted for in the public accounts. The lower score of indicator C3 compared to the previous DPAF reflects an issue of predictability as well as disbursement modality used for some of the projects that need to be improved moving forward. Part of the predictability issue is also due to the UK/DFID's planning cycle not being aligned to GoR's planning cycle. UK/DFID did not provide comprehensive and accurate (in terms of scheduled disbursements for specific FY) MTEF information in time for the budget preparation process for their sector budget support. Furthermore, their disbursements for the sector budget support that was made during the last quarter of the previous fiscal year (FY 2009/2010) was later claimed to be a frontloaded disbursement for FY 2010/2011. Due to this, the G5 assessed this disbursement made in FY 2009/2010 which was meant for utilisation in FY 2010/2011. There is need for further improvement on systematic and accurate communication on commitments of budget support in line with the GoR's FY. DfID recorded the highest score on indicator C6 (DAD data quality index). However, considerate amounts of time had to go into verifying and validating DAD data at a late stage of the DPAF exercise. Moving forward GoR will wish to see improved involvement from DfID early on in the exercise so as to reduce transaction costs and time spent on finalising the process.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - UNITED NATIONS

Final results from FY10/11 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 7 out of a total of 16 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	5,122,999,600	24,487,145,321.76		11,974,044,519	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	20%	44%	100%	36%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	87%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	32%	24%	71%	56%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	22%	0%	59%	7%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	22%	15%	60%	31%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	22%	15%	70%	36%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	42%	37%	71%	72%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	16	2	2	2	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	40%	63%	50%	73%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	13%	27%	83%	51%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.80	1.00	0.94	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	53	35	For Tracking only	32	For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	53%	23%	45%	44%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	53	28	For Tracking only	23	For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	47%	93%	84%	87%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes	Yes

Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:

G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.			50%	N/A	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.			100%	N/A	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a		To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by UNITED NATIONS.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of ODA for the Government sector increased by 6% from 180 million to 190 million USD. The share of budget support reduced from 83% to 62%. These are mainly due to the fact that disbursements on FTI were no longer made through the World Bank. The share of budget support (excluding the FTI disbursement) remains the same, suggesting that there has not been a significant shift in the ODA portfolio. Given that the use of country systems is not only limited to programme support (i.e. general and sector budget support) and is extended to project support in the case of the World Bank portfolio, the performance of all indicators remains at a high level; meeting the targets set for FY 2010/2011 (even if the use of budget execution and procurement procedures has seen a reduction of performance since DPAF 2009/2010). Challenges remain on the frontloading and predictability of budget support. However, it is expected that there will be some improvement in the next DPAF due to the recent agreement made to start frontloading the budget support from FY 2011/2012. The communication of projections (anticipated volume of budget support) was not provided for n+2 year (the last year for the 3-year MTEF period).

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - UNITED STATES
Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 2 out of a total of 15 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	61,000,000	0		3,502,114,000	
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	0%	0%	100%	3%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	0.2%	85%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	0%	7%	71%	13%	79%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	0%	59%	0%	85%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	0%	60%	0%	85%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	0%	0%	70%	0%	85%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	0%	4%	71%	0.2%	85%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	0	n/a	0	n/a	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	100%	100%	50%	100%	50%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	No	Yes	No	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	0%	1%	83%	12%	87%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	0.97	1.00	0.99	1.00
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	0	2	For Tracking only		1 For Tracking only
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)		100%	45%	100%	48%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	0	1	For Tracking only		8 For Tracking only
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)		100%	84%	38%	87%
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	No	Yes
Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:							
G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		N/A	50%	N/A	50%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		N/A	100%	N/A	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a		To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by UNITED STATES.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of ODA for the Government sector increased by 29% from 173 million USD to 223 million USD. Parallel PIUs is considered not applicable due to the disbursement modality USG/USAID uses which is mostly outside of GoR execution.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - WORLD BANK
Final results from the 2010/2011 round of monitoring as of 04-Jan-12.

Summary: 16 out of a total of 21 targets established for this donor in 2011 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indica	2007 Baseline	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	2011/2012
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	31,814,125,581	122,062,660,288		111,182,709,140
	A2	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	50%	85%	100%	100%
	A3	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies			75%	98%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed in the context of a PBA (PD indic 9)	57%	83%	71%	76%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	100%	83%	59%	62%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	55%	100%	60%	100%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	100%	100%	70%	100%
	B5	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	55%	88%	71%	72%
	B6	Number of parallel PIUs (PD indic 6)	3	0	0	0
	B7	% of TC provided through coordinated programmes (PD indic 4)	100%	100%	50%	70%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	All ODA through multi-year binding agreements of at least three years? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C2	Non-binding indication of future aid to cover at least 3 years ahead, on a rolling basis and according to GoR fiscal year? (Y/N)	Not available	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	119%	92%	83%	85%
	C6	DAD data quality index for year n.	Establish baseline 2008	1	1.00	0.97
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Total number of missions	50	42	For Tracking only	32
	D1.1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period				To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	24%	14%	45%	31%
	D3	Total number of analytic works	2	4	For Tracking only	0
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	100%	0%	84%	N/A - No analytic work
	D5	Silent period respected? (Y/N)			Yes	Yes
Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:						
G. Budget support provided in a manner that enhances ownership, predictability and reduces transaction costs.	G1	Donors informing the Government of the anticipated volume of budget support, both general and sector, to be provided over the next 3-year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year in question? (Y/N)	Establish baselines 2008	Yes	Yes	No
	G2	BS donors confirming to the Government within 6 weeks of the completion of the backward looking review the exact amount, including the amount granted under a variable tranche (if applicable) to be disbursed in the next fiscal year? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		0%	50%	5%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		83%	100%	60%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		Yes	Yes	Yes
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned	N/A		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and DAD data entry completed by WORLD BANK.

FOOTNOTE: The total volume of ODA for the Government sector was reduced from 97 million to 70 million USD. This is due to the WFP's support which was included in the previous DPAF exercise that was not considered under this DPAF given that this support is considered as humanitarian food support. While UN's aid on budget has seen a reduction of performance, the indicators related to the use of country systems has seen some improvement albeit still short of meeting the targets. This improvement is not due to any policy/procedural change(s) but rather due to the better understanding of indicators and more accurate reporting.

