

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND ECONOMIC PLANNING

DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK (DPAF)

FY 2012-2013

March 2014

Table of Contents

A.	Background	3
B.	Overall FY 2012/2013 DPAF Results	3
C.	FY 2012/2013 Aggregate DPAF Results	5
D.	Individual DPAF Results	12
	African Development Bank	12
	Belgium	14
	European Union	16
	Germany	18
	Global Fund	20
	Luxembourg	22
	Netherlands	24
	Japan	26
	Sweden	28
	Switzerland	30
	South Korea	32
	United Kingdom	34
	United Nations	36
	United States of America	38
	World Bank	40

A. 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. Launched in 2009, 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), recognizing that the DPAF aims to be inclusive, bringing together all donors and all aid modalities.
2. The DPAF exercise for FY 2012/2013 was undertaken based on donor reporting of aid data and self-reporting on the DPAF indicators at project level in the Development Assistance Database (DAD). The DPAF exercise for FY 2012/2013 was initiated in August 2013 with a request for Development Partners to update their information in the DAD. After the initial round of data entry by DPs, a verification process was undertaken by the Government. A preliminary draft of the DPAF FY 2012/2013 was shared with each DP, following bilateral consultation and discussions to finalize the individual DPAF results. The final draft of the DPAF report was then shared with the DPCG Heads of Cooperation/Agency for their review/inputs before finalization.

B. Overall FY 2012/2013 DPAF Results

1. The DPAF is presented both in aggregate form (comprising all development assistance to Rwanda), and disaggregated by donor to allow for comparison, individual reflection on performance, accountability and peer pressure, which are recognized as key ingredients to the successful implementation of the Paris Declaration and Rwanda's Aid Policy at the country level. This also follows the good practice of mutual accountability framework as identified through the UN Development Cooperation Forum (UNDCF)'s mutual accountability review.
2. The DPAF mainly focuses on OECD/DAC donors who are signatories to Paris Declaration. Sixteen (16) Development Partners participated in this exercise. The DPAF also excludes humanitarian assistance provided by UN Agencies such as UNHCR and WFP.

The total ODA to Government sector under the FY 2012/2013 DPAF review significantly reduced to USD 908,854,112.20 compared to USD 1.17Billion in FY 2011/2012. The substantive reduction was primarily due to budget support cuts and collective delays in disbursements.

3. It was further noted that most of the Budget Support donors did not comply with the Budget Support Memorandum of Understanding which, in its sixty first paragraph states that any budget support withdrawal or termination will not impact on the timely disbursement of funds already committed. Budget support cuts, delays in disbursements and reprogramming of funds from budget support to project support had a negative impact of predictability. Some of planned programmes could not be implemented as a result of fiscal constraints posed by suspension or reprogramming of budget support funds. This contributed to reduced growth of the economy from earlier projected 7.5% to 6.6%.
4. Despite the decline in total ODA to Government sector, generally the aggregate DPAF results for FY 2012/2013 on the use of country system indicators continued to improve. The large contributor to this has been Global Fund which has sustained its 100 percent score on the use of country system indicators targets. Global Fund is fully managed by the Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) of Ministry of Health.
5. The indicator on the division of labor still falls short of the target of 3 sectors of active intervention per donor. This is attributed to the fact that many donors were still implementing their country assistance strategies at the time (2010) GoR agreed with donors to reduce the number of interventions in sectors. Moving forward, this indicator is expected to improve as GoR has agreed with donors on the new division of labor aligned to the EDPRSII.

Final results from the FY 12/13 round of monitoring generated on 25-Mar-14.

This table offers a like-for-like comparison (actuals and targets are calculated only for those 14 donors who completed their support to Rwanda in the DAD).

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10 Actual	FY10/11 Target	FY10/11	2011/2012 Target	FY11/12	2012/2013 Target	FY12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	364,378,069,542		350,446,379,924		437,145,259,312		418,671,997,607
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	67%	100%	64%	85%	63%	85%	72%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	65%	85%	73%	85%	77%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	40%	59%	34%	50%	57%	50%	60%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	53%	60%	47%	54%	67%	54%	68%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	57%	70%	59%	67%	68%	67%	69%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	63%	71%	62%	69%	70%	69%	70%
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level					TBD	TBD	TBD
	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)	44%	100%	67%	100%	69%	100%	60%
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	73%	83%	63%	87%	100%	87%	87%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	1	0	2
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	21%	45%	49%	48%	58%	48%	54%
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	26%	84%	67%	87%	100%	87%	100%
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL.	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	3.4	3	3.5
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	70%	70%	75%
<i>Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:</i>									
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)	100%	100%	29%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	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%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	26%	50%	43%	50%	40%	50%	17%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	86%	100%	91%	100%	92%	100%	66%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	86%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	29%
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012		80%		

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

C. FY 2012/2013 Aggregate DPAF Results

This section summarizes the key findings/results for each indicator from the aggregate DPAF assessment for FY 2012/2013.

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

This indicator was previously considered as a proxy for measuring alignment. However, in the context of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, this indicator measures the extent in which aid is on budget which is subject to parliamentary scrutiny. Thus, 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. 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. However, in Rwanda context, the revised Finance Law is made in the mid-year to allow for more realistic budget and not being done retroactively. Thus, 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 budget preparation process of the GoR allows those external funds that are not executed/ implemented 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 implemented by the Government agencies. However, ODA on Budget from the perspectives of parliamentary scrutiny 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.

Although the indicator on Aid on Budget appears to have improved from 63 percent in FY2011/12 to 72 percent in FY2012/13, the percentage increase does not necessarily mean more ODA funds were recorded on budget, instead due to delays in disbursement, less funds were recorded in the DAD as disbursed which reduced the denominator. The revised budget also included firm commitments from donors yet they did not disburse by the end of the fiscal year; this led to a large figure on the numerator and a small figure on the denominator hence leading to increased percentage which does not reflect the reality. Countries that did not disburse yet their commitments were captured on budget include Belgium and Sweden. However, it should be noted that Global Fund significantly improved the overall score on aid on budget due to its improved alignment to GoR budget procedures.

A2: % of ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies

This indicator measures the percentage of ODA delivered/implemented by Government Agencies. The overall assessment for this indicator for FY2012/13 falls below target by 8 percentage points due to donors directly implementing projects; agencies that are involved in direct implementation of projects include GIZ, KOICA, INGOs/NGOs for USAID financed projects, JICA, and BTC.

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

Use of national budget execution procedures: Donors are considered to use national budget execution procedures only when at least 3 of the 4 criteria below are satisfied:

- Funds are included in the annual budget approved by parliament;
- Funds are subject to established country budget execution procedures;
- Funds are processed (e.g. deposited and disbursed) through the established country treasury system (in Rwanda, the single treasury account);
- You do NOT require the opening of separate bank accounts for your funds.

The purpose of this indicator is to measure 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. Many of the project funds that are not considered using the national budget execution procedures are due to the fact that these funds were not processed (deposited and disbursed) through the established country treasury system (central treasury). Direct payment falls into this category, as well as project funds that are disbursed into a special project account even if it is held within the BNR are not considered using the national budget execution procedures. For support provided to decentralized entities, those funds channeled through the Rwanda Local Development Support Fund (RLDSF) in line with the Aid Policy as well as channeled directly into district accounts are considered using the budget execution procedures.

DPAF FY 2012/2013 observed slight improvement in the performance of this indicator, from 57% to 60%, meeting the target set for FY 2012/2013 which is 50%. This improvement is mainly due to the Global Fund's continued project support. All their project support (100%) is considered using the national budget execution procedure because their project account is linked with the Project Treasury Single Account (PTSA). However, at individual DP level, the UK/DFID was also a significant contributor to the improvement of this indicator; 97% of the UK/DFID's ODA was recorded in the national budget in FY2012/13 which represents 12% increase compared to previous FY2011/12.

B2: % 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 between the OAG and responsible Ministries. In these cases, such funds are considered using the GoR audit procedures.

ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures slightly increased with 68%, meeting the target set for this year as well as the Paris Declaration target (60%). This increase attributes largely to the World Bank, Global Fund and AfDB's project support, which is now fully using the GoR audit procedure. At individual DP level, a number of DPs compared to FY2011/12 have increased use of national audit procedures this is due to increase of ODA disbursed through budget support and/or large programme-based support. While the use of national audit procedures has been increased at aggregate level, relatively small stand-alone projects continue to require specific audit procedures. Further policy and procedural changes are needed to start using the national audit procedures even for small stand-alone projects. In addition, efforts to formulate a programme-based support as well as increasing the number of projects that are managed by the SPIUs would also result in further improvement in this area.

B3: % of ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems

ODA is considered disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems, are those that don't require

- (1) Maintenance of a separate accounting system to satisfy donor reporting requirements
- (2) Creation of a separate chart of accounts to record the use of donor funds.

The DPAF target set for this indicator was slightly maintained with 69% in FY2012/13. This is due to a consistent number of large volume of ODA to the Government of Rwanda which has continued to use GoR financial reporting systems. It is however worth noting that many Development Partners still lag behind in the usage of GoR financial reporting system; mainly due to relatively small stand-alone projects. 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. In addition, increasing the number of projects that are managed by the SPIUs will also result in further improvement in this area. However, there remains need for changes in policy/procedures by some Development Partners in order to start using the financial reporting system of the Government of Rwanda.

B4: % 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 according to the national procurement procedures as they were established in the general legislation and implemented by the government.

This FY the use of procurement procedures recorded a similar percentage of 70% with that of FY2011/12. Individual DP level also recorded a slight increase in the share of ODA delivered using the national procurement procedure this is partly due to the increased share of ODA through budget support; a closure of a large project that required using its own procurement procedure, and policy and procedural changes. However, those partners have seen the reduction in this area mainly due to the reduced share of ODA provided through budget support. This implies that more efforts are needed to apply using the national procurement procedures to project modality. Further improvement and speed of procurement at sector and district level would also facilitate increased number of projects using the national procurement procedures.

C1: % of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level

This indicator is one of the indicators introduced to the Global Partnership Monitoring Framework, which was agreed in June 2012 through the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness. However, at the time of the DPAF assessment, the methodology to assess this indicator had not yet globally been defined. Therefore, the DPAF 2012/2013 did not assess this indicator.

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 indication of future aid flows plays 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. Un-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 MINECOFIN, such non-binding indications of future aid flows on Budget Support is 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 2012/2013 aggregate result indicated that at least 60% of DPs are providing the indicative projections for the 3-year MTEF period. The systematic process through DPCG to collect this information more broadly was introduced during FY 2010/2011. However, the compliance to this process was low, resulting in a number of Development Partners not reporting this information through the MTEF template provided by the MINECOFIN. Improvement in this systematic process of MTEF external resource projections in a coordinated manner would further improve the availability of non-binding forward looking information. Furthermore, the MTEF module developed in the DAD also aims to improve this process. This module was completed in the DAD but is pending the finalization of the SmartIFMIS and DAD integration which is expected to be functional by the beginning of FY 2014/2015 that will be followed by the training of the end users. With the functionality of the integrated SMARTIFMIS and DAD, DPs will only be providing their MTEF projections through the MTEF module in the DAD that will be the source of information for planning and budgeting purposes.

C3: % of ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled

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. It is worth noting that the methodology used for this indicator is slightly changed. Previously, the indicator measures the gap between aid scheduled and aid effectively disbursed and recorded in countries accounting systems. However, in line with the Global Busan Monitoring Framework, this indicator is measured based on whether DPs actually disbursed what they scheduled/planned for disbursement. Thus, it is based on DP self-reporting.

The result for the DPAF 2012/2013 indicated that there was a reduction of ODA scheduled for disbursement which was actually disbursed as recorded by DPs from 100% in FY 2011/2012 87% in FY 2012/2013. The main reason for reduction was associated to DPs aid suspensions and cuts that happened in FY 2012/2013. However, it is worth noting that some DPs disbursed more than what was scheduled to be disbursed in this fiscal year due to the fact that there were some un-met commitments of the FY 2011/2012 that were effected in FY 2012/2013.

D1: Number of missions without GoR authorization held during Silent Period.

Rwanda's Aid Policy discouraged Development Partners to field any missions that require meeting with the Government agencies during the silent period. In Rwanda, silent period is observed in the months of April and May, allowing the Government officials to focus on budget preparation process. This indicator measures the number of missions that were held during the silent period without Government authorization. It recognizes that some missions are missions that are held aligned to the Government planning and budget processing with view to reduce uncoordinated and parallel missions. It also recognizes that there are missions requested by the Government to inform the GoR planning and budget process.

Many Development Partners have reduced such missions during the silent period. During the FY 2012/2013, there was only one Development Partner who held two missions during the silent period without GoR authorization. All in all, the Development Partners have shown compliance to the silent period policy.

D2: % of missions that are joint (PD Indicator I0a)

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 slightly decreased from 58% to 54% compared to the last FY 2011/2012. However, the target set for FY 2012/2013 of 48% was attained. The DPAF FY 2012/2013 indicates that there were still Development Partners that do not undertake joint missions especially World Bank and UN. Out of 29 missions World Bank only 9 missions were jointly undertaken (approx. 30%) and out of 9 missions for UN only 2 were jointly undertaken (approx. 22%).

D3: % of analytical work that are joint (PD Indicator I0b)

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 donor(s) as a percent of the total number of analytic work. The DPAF FY 2012/2013 indicates that the level of joint analytic work has remained the same at 100% as last FY 2011/2012 meeting the target of 87%. However, the Government still observes the tendency of Development Partners undertaking parallel analytic work and/or pushing the Government to undertake the specific analytic work that is of interest to DPs. Further efforts are needed to work on joint analytic studies through the enhanced sector coordination and harmonization efforts and ensure such analytic studies are planned within the context of sector programme/planning processes.

Division of Labour Indicators

E1: Average number of sectors of intervention per Donor as per the Division of Labour

The concept of the Division of Labour in Rwanda was first discussed in the Development Partners Retreat (DPR) in February 2010, which was followed up by bilateral consultation and negotiation between the MINECOFIN and individual donors. The sector allocation of DPs (DoL) – the outcomes of bilateral negotiation of DP sector engagement was presented and endorsed in July 2010. Since then most of new development cooperation frameworks/country assistance strategies were aligned to the agreed DoL sectors. The DoL principles called for more appropriate distribution of Development Partners' support across sectors in line with the national priorities, more sizable support in any given sector, and support provided in a way that reduces transaction costs posed on the Government side. The principle of maximum 3 sectors per DP and neutral impact on the DPs' ODA volume further guided the Government and Development Partner's negotiation and agreement of their development cooperation framework. Existing contract/ projects that have been run prior to the DoL agreement would run their course to complete the implementation/contract, even if these projects may be operational in sectors outside of the agreed DoL sector.

The basis for this assessment is the information recorded in the Development Assistance Database (DAD). During the assessment, a challenge encountered in effectively assessing this indicator partly due to DPs not reporting project information (particularly sector) appropriately. This is caused mostly by the fact that Development Assistance Database's

sector classification is different from the EDPRS sector classification as well as DoL sector classification. In addition, the DAD does not adequately capture relevant information that informs the DoL assessment better; such as whether a project is part of regional programmes or projects governed under a country-level development cooperation framework.

At aggregate level, on average Development Partners engage in 3.5 sectors per Development Partners. It is however important to note that the assessment covers all the projects (except for budget support, support to basket funds, project support to those that are not part of DoL sector, as well as regional projects) that were reported in the DAD regardless of whether a project is within a previous country programme framework or a new one under a new country programme framework. Therefore, it was observed that some Development Partners are assessed as involving more than 3 DoL sectors, despite that projects formulated and agreed under a new country programme are strictly aligned to the agreed DoL sectors. The purpose of the DPAF assessment is to simply capture the status in FY 2012/2013, where old projects continue until an existing contract ends and new projects that are aligned to DoL sectors are being formulated/launched. Therefore, even if some of the Development Partners are reported to be involving more than 3 sectors as their old projects phase out, they are expected to be fully compliant with the DoL sectors in very near future. In September 2013 the second phase of the DoL that is aligned to EDPRS II was approved by Development Partners and MINECOFIN. As many Development Partners are formulating their new development cooperation framework/ country assistance strategies in the context of the EDPRS II, more improved alignment to the DoL is expected.

E2: Total Funding per Sector (Monitoring Only)

The revised DPAF framework agreed to track this for monitoring purpose. This information will be made available in an annual ODA report.

E3: Average number of projects per sector

The revised DPAF framework agreed to track this as a new indicator. However, this information will be made available in an annual ODA report under the Division of Labour section, which can be presented in a more effective manner.

E4: Average size of initiatives provided to the sector

The revised DPAF framework agreed to track this as a new indicator. However, this information will be made available in an annual ODA report under the Division of Labour section, which can be presented in a more effective manner.

E5: Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL three sectors, GBS and SBS represents

The revised DPAF framework agreed to track this as a new indicator. It measures the proportion of DP's total aid portfolio that the funding to DoL sectors, GBS and SBS represents. The target for FY 2012/2013 was to have more than 70% of total aid portfolio for Rwanda to go to the DoL three sectors, GBS, and SBS represents. The DPAF FY 2012/2013 indicated that 75% of total ODA for Government Sector was provided to the DP's agreed DoL three sectors, GBS, and SBS.

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.

Given that Budget support fully uses country systems, it 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. For the MTEF period for FY 2012/2013 to FY 2014/15, all Budget Support Partners were able to provide the information on anticipated volume of sector and general budget support over the next 3 year MTEF period at least 6 months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year.

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.

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. FY 2012/13 noted significant reduction in BS disbursed in the first quarter of the FY. The percentage reduced from 40% in FY2011/12 to 17% in FY12/13 due to delayed disbursements that were earlier planned to be disbursed in the first quarter. Delayed disbursements from multilateral institutions like AfDB and World Bank significantly reduced the percentage of BS disbursed in the first quarter of FY2012/13. There were no cases on frontloading recorded during FY2012/13.

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 months of the GoR fiscal year, and measures the proportion of Budget Support that was disbursed in a quarter for which it was scheduled. There was a significant reduction in this indicator attributed to the delayed disbursements from AfDB and DFID and suspension of budget support from Germany, all these donors had planned to disburse in the first six months of the fiscal year. This indicator reduced from 92% in previous FY2011/12 to 66% in FY2012/13.

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 partners met this indicator.

G6: % of BS donors adhering fully to partnership framework

Budget support donors who did not adhere fully to the partnership framework include; WB, DFID, AfDB, Germany. DFID disbursed only 8% using GBS modality the rest was disbursed in form of SBS and project support, GBP 5 million part of the GBP 37 million was not disbursed. All World Bank and AfDB Committed funds for GBS were reprogrammed to SBS. Germany did not disburse Euro 7 million planned for GBS during FY 12/13, these funds were later reprogrammed for project support in the next following FY 2013/14.

Rwanda Donor Performance Assessment Framework (DPAF)

Preliminary zero results by donor for FY12/13.
The tables were prepared using the data entered in the Development Assistance Database (DAD) as of 30 December 2013.

These reports were generated automatically on
25-Mar-14 and should be considered final draft



www.devpartners.gov.rw

D. Individual DPAF Results

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - AFDB
Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 25-Mar-14.

Summary: 14 out of a total of 18 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	34,095,187,248		41,766,731,634		64,825,245,521		49,864,951,549
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	88%	100%	51%	85%	77%	85%	68%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	100%	85%	94%	85%	90%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	35%	59%	15%	50%	68%	50%	100%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	35%	60%	82%	54%	100%	54%	100%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	84%	70%	82%	67%	100%	67%	100%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	77%	71%	82%	69%	100%	69%	100%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	TBD
	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	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	62%	83%	60%	98%	112%	98%	100%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	9%	45%	100%	55%	100%	55%	N/A - No missions
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	N/A - No analytic work	84%	N/A - No analytic work	86%	N/A - No analytic work	86%	100%
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	4	3	5
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	85%	70%	83%
F. (Sector-specific indicators)	...	(To be determined in consultation with sector clusters)							
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)	Yes	Yes	No	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	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	35%	50%	0%	50%	64%	50%	26%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	100%	100%	0%	100%	64%	100%	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	baseline	64%	baseline	

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

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

African Development Bank (AfDB)

There was a decrease in ODA to Rwanda in FY 12/13 as compared to the previous years largely because ADF-12 was coming to an end –significant percentage of resources had already been spent in the previous years.

AfDB continues to perform well in the use of country systems hence strengthening ownership and sustainability. However, AfDB still uses direct payments method to contractors which undermines GoR-DPs agreement of using Government Accounts during the 2010 Development Partners Meeting (DPM).

On the budget support indicator, AfDB has disbursed the amount that was committed however it fell short of the target that calls for disbursements in the first quarter of GoR FY- Disbursement was made in the Third quarter of FY2012/13. Also AfDB did not align to the Partnership framework I (BSHG MoU)-AfDB had committed to disburse General Budget Support but later changed to Sector Budget Support yet GoR had already captured the GBS. This undermined predictability.

¹ Paragraph 61 states that any donor may withdraw or terminate its budgetary support for the EDPRS by giving the other signatories notice of its intention to withdraw or terminate support. Any such withdraw or termination will not impact on timely disbursement of funds already committed.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - BELGIUM

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 25-Mar-14.

Summary: 9 out of a total of 18 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	27,351,502,855		17,533,380,571		18,575,321,951		9,837,291,092
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	72%	100%	54%	85%	72%	85%	53%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	19%	85%	14%	85%	6%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	19%	59%	19%	50%	14%	50%	6%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	19%	60%	19%	54%	14%	54%	0%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	19%	70%	19%	67%	14%	67%	0%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	96%	71%	100%	69%	98%	69%	93%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	TBD
	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)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	75%	83%	83%	98%	80%	98%	122%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	0%	45%	100%	55%	100%	55%	N/A - No missions
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	N/A - No analytic work	84%	N/A - No analytic work	86%	100%	86%	100%
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL.	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	5	3	6
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	63%	70%	63%
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)	#REF!	Yes	No	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)	#REF!	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	60%	50%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	0%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	0%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	#REF!	Yes	Yes	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	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	baseline	0%	baseline	

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

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

Belgium

The total volume of Belgium ODA on budget reduced by 47% in 2012/2013 from RFW 18.5 billion to RFW 9.8 billion, this was due to the consequences of budget austerity measures imposed by their government that delayed budget support thus a significant reduction of total ODA. Percentage of ODA recorded in the budget reduced from 72% to 53% as percentage of total ODA to the government sectors this was due six (6) big projects that were not considered on Budget that totals around €6.5 mio. Reduction in the level of budget support portion caused a significant decrease in the use of country systems in areas of budget execution, auditing procedures and financial reporting while the use of national procurement systems decreased silently compared to last FY 2011/2012 although, still higher than the target with 93%. Belgium continues to use the national procurement systems to deliver their technical cooperation as well as project support. Belgium ODA met the predictability target for the FY 2012/2013, with more than what was scheduled to be delivered in the planned year.

The implementation of DoL is still at a transition stage, in FY 2012/2013 Belgium disbursed in 5 sectors. It is worth noting that under a new cooperation framework approved in May 2010, Belgium will fund only the DoL sectors as agreed in 2010, while old projects in other sectors are phasing out, as funds allocated for these projects under the previous cooperation framework are executed and that these projects will be phasing out. Thus, Belgium will be fully compliant with the DoL sectors under the new indicative program.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 25-Mar-14.

Summary: 14 out of a total of 17 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	48,492,088,219		55,275,391,733		49,637,664,775	50,395,924,740	
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	92%	100%	71%	85%	95%	85%	84%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	99%	85%	94%	85%	86%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	72%	59%	87%	50%	70%	50%	67%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	72%	60%	87%	54%	70%	54%	67%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	72%	70%	87%	67%	70%	67%	67%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	72%	71%	89%	69%	71%	69%	67%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	TBD
	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)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	73%	83%	91%	98%	100%	98%	100%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	0%	45%	100%	55%	N/A - No missions	55%	N/A - No missions
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	25%	84%	50%	86%	N/A - No analytic work	86%	N/A - No analytic work
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL.	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	7	3	5
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	74%	70%	94%
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)	Yes	Yes	Yes	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	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	0%	50%	67%	50%	90%	50%	0%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	70%	100%	83%	100%	96%	100%	100%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	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	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	Baseline	90%	Baseline	

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

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

European Union

The total volume of ODA that was included in the national budget was increased by 2% from Frw 49.6 billion in FY 2011/2012 to Frw 50.4 billion in FY 2012/2013. Aid on budget has seen a decline by 11% although it is still above the target. EU Delegation continues to use country systems of using GoR budget execution, financial reporting and audit procedures; however, on the indicator of the sub-indicator on using GoR procurement systems target was slightly missed.

With regard to predictability, the EU Delegation disbursed all the scheduled commitments/disbursement, recording 100% predictability. The EU Delegation also did not undertake any missions or analytic studies during the FY 2012/2013.

The implementation of DoL is still at a transition stage, in FY 2012/2013 EU Delegation disbursed in 5 sectors from 7 sectors in 2011/2012. It is worth noting that most of their projects that were agreed prior to the DoL agreement are phasing out. EU and Rwanda cooperate through Country Strategy Paper and 10th EDF National Indicative Programme currently runs from 2008-2013. EU Aid resources under the 10th EDF are channeled through: General Budget Support, Rural Development and Transport Connectivity and Regional Integration. These interventions are complemented by other non-focal area programmes such as Trade, Justice. However, an increased alignment/compliance to an agreed DoL is expected under the 11th EDF, which will respond to Rwanda's new EDPRS II.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - GERMANY

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 25-Mar-14.

Summary: 9 out of a total of 19 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual	KEY:
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	11,207,036,863		12,090,114,378		15,690,871,131		9,360,066,657	Target Met
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	62%	100%	67%	85%	74%	85%	60%	Target Not Met
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	68%	85%	67%	85%	60%	Target Not Met
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	65%	59%	68%	50%	59%	50%	48%	Target Met
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	63%	60%	69%	54%	68%	54%	61%	Target Met
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	63%	70%	69%	67%	60%	67%	54%	Target Not Met
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	63%	71%	69%	69%	60%	69%	51%	Target Not Met
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%		Not applicable
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	TBD	Not applicable
	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)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Target Met
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	68%	83%	68%	98%	122%	98%	61%	Target Not Met
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	1	0	0	Target Met
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	25%	45%	67%	48%	57%	48%	86%	Target Met
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	0%	84%	100%	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	100%	Target Met
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL.	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	4	3	5	Target Not Met
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	70%	70%	97%	Target Met
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)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Target Met
	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	Yes	Yes	Yes	Target Met
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year:	48%	50%	0%	50%	68%	50%	0%	Target Not Met
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	Target Not Met
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Target Met
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Target Not Met
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	baseline	100%	baseline		Not applicable

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

Germany

Germany's total ODA to Rwanda decreased from 36 million USD in FY 2011/12 to 24 million USD in FY 2012/13 due to the suspension of its general budget support programme. Accordingly, aid recorded on budget decreased from 74% in FY 2011/12 to 61% in 2012/13, falling short of the 85 percent target. This is also due to the fact that technical cooperation programmes are in part directly executed by GIZ.

Germany's performance on ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures indicator is now below target due to the timelag of reprogrammed General Budget support into TVET and decentralization support programmes which will be disbursed starting in FY 2013/14.

Germany has delivered only 60% of the ODA compared to its prior commitments for this financial year. A significant share of these commitments (14 mio. USD) was planned to be disbursed for the two Energy transmission lines connecting Rwanda, DRC and Burundi in the context of the regional NELSAP interconnection programme. These programmes have been delayed due to several factors, among them the high efforts of coordination necessary between the 3 countries to make this regional programme work. The procurement of works and goods in particular is very delayed compared to the original schedule, which has in turn delayed disbursement, since construction contracts have not been signed.

It is indicated that Germany is currently involved in 4 sectors. However, support to the health sector has been terminated end of 2012, so that from 2013 onwards, they are fully compliant with the DoL agreement. Their score on the percentage of total portfolio funding DoL sectors is significantly above target (99%), which indicates that their support has realigned to the agreed three DoL sectors.

Germany's budget support indicators have been missed due to the suspension of its GBS programme.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - GLOBAL FUND

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 10 out of a total of 11 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	24,005,619,588		17,980,751,443		44,617,075,024		76,738,565,718
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	52%	100%	27%	85%	39%	85%	98%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	100%	85%	100%	85%	100%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	59%	0%	50%	100%	50%	100%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	100%	60%	0%	54%	100%	54%	100%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	100%	70%	100%	67%	100%	67%	100%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	100%	71%	95%	69%	100%	69%	100%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	TBD
	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	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	52%	83%	74%	98%	199%	98%	77%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	N/A - No missions	45%	N/A - No missions	48%	N/A - No missions	48%	N/A - No missions
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	N/A - No analytic work	84%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	1	3	1
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	100%	70%	100%
<i>Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:</i>									
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	N/A	Yes	N/A	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)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	N/A	50%	N/A	50%	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	100%	N/A	100%	N/A
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	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	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%	N/A	100%	N/A

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

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

Global Fund

The Global Fund aid on budget significantly increased from RwF 44.6million in FY2011/12 to RwF 76.7million in FY2012/13. The percentage of ODA recorded in the national budget met the target with 98% compared to that of 39% in FY2011/12, however the Fund appears not have reached the target set for % ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled because of incorrect registered data . Global Fund continued using national systems and thus exceeding targets for proper use of national systems and institutions, the Fund uses MoH's Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) which fully implements and manages the Funds for Global Fund.

The Rwandan Country Coordinating Mechanism of Global Fund (CCM-Rwanda) is in charge of delivering ODA. Nine out of a total of 11 targets established for Global Fund in 2013 were met.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - LUXEMBOURG

Final results from FY11/12 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 5 out of a total of 12 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual	KEY:
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	#N/A		1,519,248,800		0		0	Target Met
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	#N/A	100%	76%	85%	0%	85%	0%	Target Not Met
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	45%	85%	46%	85%	4%	Target Not Met
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	59%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	Target Not Met
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	60%	0%	54%	0%	54%	0%	Target Not Met
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	0%	70%	19%	67%	0%	67%	0%	Target Not Met
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	0%	71%	19%	69%	0%	69%	0%	Target Not Met
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems	0%	0	2	85%		85%		Target Not Met
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				Baseline	TBD	Baseline	TBD	Not applicable
	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	No	Yes	No	Target Not Met
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	95%	83%	53%	98%	125%	98%	151%	Target Met
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0	Target Met
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	0%	45%	0%	48%	N/A - No missions	48%	100%	Target Met
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	N/A - No analytic work	84%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work	Target Not Met
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	2	3	2	Target Met
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	62%	70%	73%	Target Met
<i>Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:</i>										
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)		Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Target Not Met
	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	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Target Not Met
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		50%	N/A	50%	N/A	50%	N/A	Target Not Met
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		100%	N/A	100%	N/A	100%	N/A	Target Not Met
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Target Not Met
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Target Not Met
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%	N/A	100%	N/A	Target Not Met

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

Luxembourg

Luxembourg's total ODA volume to the government sector decreased at 1.6million USD in FY2012/13 compared to 3.4million USD in FY2011/12, while ODA on budget continued to decrease at 0%. The use of country systems also declined due to a total of 2 projects all implemented by Lux-Dev and using Lux procedures. Despite these declines Luxembourg continued to increase the % of ODA delivered in FY2012/13 as scheduled.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - NETHERLANDS

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 9 out of a total of 18 targets established for this donor in 2012 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator	FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual	
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	21,808,813,993			18,826,709,005		25,661,757,871	8,782,895,118
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	90%	100%	92%	85%	92%	85%	34%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	68%	85%	76%	85%	55%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	74%	59%	65%	50%	57%	50%	55%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	65%	60%	67%	54%	58%	54%	56%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	75%	70%	67%	67%	57%	67%	56%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	83%	71%	88%	69%	68%	69%	58%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems	0	0	0	85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	TBD
	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)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	85%	83%	70%	98%	92%	98%	90%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	0%	45%	80%	48%	100%	48%	100%
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	0%	84%	0%	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	4	3	4
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	79%	70%	72%
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)	Yes	Yes	No	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	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	100%	50%	100%	50%	100%	50%	0%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%	100%	100%	

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

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

Netherlands

Netherlands ODA recorded in the national budget reduced in FY2012/13 compared to the previous FY 2011/12 by 51 percentage points. Netherlands continues to use country systems of using GoR budget execution and audit procedures; however, on this indicator, Netherlands falls short of sub-indicators on using GoR financial reporting and procurement systems.

Regarding budget support, Netherlands did not disburse sector budget support to the justice sector as earlier committed. Netherlands suspended SBS to justice on the account of UN report that accused Rwanda to be involved in DR-Congo conflict. This suspension greatly undermined aid effectiveness indicator on predictability which further led to the reduction of priority programs that were earlier planned. The ultimate effect is slowdown in economic growth.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - JAPAN

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 5 out of a total of 12 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10 Actual	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	2,388,000,000		623,157,720		0		3,360,000,000
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	16%	100%	9%	85%	0%	85%	16%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	100%	85%	100%	85%	100%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	23%	59%	18%	50%	0%	50%	5%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	23%	60%	18%	54%	0%	54%	0%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	23%	70%	18%	67%	0%	67%	0%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	23%	71%	21%	69%	11%	69%	0%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	
	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	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	6%	83%	10%	98%	56%	98%	162%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	N/A - No missions	45%	N/A - No missions	48%	N/A - No missions	48%	100%
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)		84%	0%	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	5	3	4
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL, 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	84%	70%	82%
<i>Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:</i>									
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	N/A	Yes	N/A	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)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	N/A	50%	N/A	50%	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	100%	N/A	100%	N/A
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	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	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%	N/A	100%	N/A

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

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

Japan

Japan's ODA to Rwanda increased from US\$ 20million in FY2011/12 to US\$32million in FY2012/13, ODA that was included in the national budget also increased from Rwf 0 in FY 11/12 to Rwf 3million this is due to the Grant Aid through UNDP for REMA on Climate Change which also applies to the low end increase in the % of aid on budget of 16%. ODA delivered on schedule significantly increased from 56% in FY 2011/12 to 162% in FY2011/13 because in some of their projects, solely disbursement is recorded while overall commitment of each of the projects was recorded in the first year.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - SWEDEN

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 6 out of a total of 11 targets established for this donor in 2012 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	1,115,950,549		9,343,781,896		1,527,941,720		6,950,081,749
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	25%	100%	92%	85%	13%	85%	18%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	87%	85%	91%	85%	80%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	17%	59%	48%	50%	74%	50%	100%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	68%	60%	54%	54%	69%	54%	100%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	90%	70%	87%	67%	69%	67%	100%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	90%	71%	87%	69%	79%	69%	100%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems	0	0	0	85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	TBD
	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	Yes	Yes	No
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	34%	83%	72%	98%	85%	98%	21%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	N/A - No missions	45%	100%	48%	75%	48%	100%
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	N/A - No analytic work	84%	0%	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL.	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012		4		0
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	92%	70%	0%
<i>Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:</i>									
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	N/A	Yes	N/A	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)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	N/A	50%	N/A	50%	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	100%	N/A	100%	N/A
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	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	100%	N/A	100%	N/A

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

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

Sweden

The total volume of Swedish ODA for Government sector reduced from 18.6 million USD to 1.9 million USD. However, the ODA that was included in the national budget increased by 78% from Frw 1.5billion in FY 2011/2012 to Frw 6.9billion in FY 2012/2013. Sweden's percentage aid on budget increased slightly from 13% to 18%. Their DAD record indicated that 0% of their ODA for Government sector is delivered by the GoR Agencies. However, use of country systems has shown significant increase with 100% as recorded in DAD and due to how this indicator is differently understood. This is due to their contribution to the Trade Mark East Africa program all support to other programs was suspended basing on the UN report. It is however worth noting that Sweden reported only one disbursement. No other disbursement was recorded in 2012/2013.

With regard to predictability, Swedish has delivered only 21% of the ODA compared to its prior commitments for this financial year.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - SWITZERLAND

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 4 out of a total of 12 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual	KEY:
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	602,764,961		638,014,000		2,043,549,500		0	
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	39%	100%	49%	85%	49%	85%	0%	
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	68%	85%	16%	85%	9%	
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	21%	59%	60%	50%	8%	50%	0%	
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	42%	60%	59%	54%	8%	54%	0%	
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	42%	70%	60%	67%	16%	67%	0%	
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	42%	71%	68%	69%	8%	69%	9%	
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%		
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	TBD	
	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	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	72%	83%	67%	98%	65%	98%	102%	
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0	
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	N/A - No missions	45%	N/A - No missions	48%	N/A - No missions	48%	100%	
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	N/A - No analytic work	84%	0%	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work	
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL.	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	4	3	4	
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	94%	70%	81%	
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	N/A	Yes	N/A	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)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	N/A	50%	N/A	50%	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	100%	N/A	100%	N/A	
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	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	100%	N/A	100%	N/A	

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

Switzerland

The total volume of ODA on budget for Switzerland in FY2012/13 was at 0% compared 2 billion Rwf in FY2011/12. The use of country systems had low performance most likely due to inaccurate recorded data in the DAD but also because only one project implemented in FY2011/12 “strengthening public health in Karongi and Rutsiro” was recorded in the DAD. We’ve seen a significant increase in predictability of 102% of ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled in FY2012/13 compared to 65% in FY2011/12. Switzerland disbursed more than what they committed to disburse, high predictability is mostly due to the fact that not all their commitments were comprehensibly recorded in the DAD in FY2011/12.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - SOUTH KOREA

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 31-Mar-14.

Summary: 3 out of a total of 10 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		2007 Baseline	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 11/12 Target	FY 12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	A1	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)			0		0
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	29%	85%	0%	85%	0%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		85%	100%	85%	12%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	19%	50%	0%	50%	0%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	19%	54%	0%	54%	0%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	19%	67%	0%	67%	0%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	19%	69%	0%	69%	0%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems		85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level	Not available	baseline	TBD	baseline	
	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	No	Yes	No
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	13%	98%	100%	98%	100%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period		0	0	0	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	0%	48%	N/A - No missions	48%	N/A - No missions
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)		87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL	Establish baseline 2008	3	1	3	3
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)		70%	N/A	70%	N/A
<i>Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:</i>							
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	N/A	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	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		50%	N/A	50%	N/A
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		100%	N/A	100%	N/A
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		Yes	N/A	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	100%	N/A	100%	N/A

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

The final results above are based on MINECOFIN data and the DAD data entry completed by SOUTH KOREA

South Korea

This is South Korea's second time to participate in the DPAF exercise; we have seen great strides towards increase in ODA to Rwanda from US \$3.5million in FY 2011/12 to US\$ 7.6million. The reason for this increase is because South Korea participated in the 3 DoL sectors while in the previous year participated in 1 DoL sector. A sharp decline however was seen on % ODA delivered by GoR agencies, this is due to correct data for FY 2012/13 reported in the DAD by South Korea compared to FY2011/12 which had a contradiction of understanding on this indicator. % of ODA delivered on schedule has remained consistent with reaching the target; however it lags behind on using country systems and having aid on budget. Four out of a total of 10 targets established were met, it should be noted that an increase in the usage of GoR systems and informing the GoR through the MTEF on disbursement schedules will ensure better performance.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - UNITED KINGDOM

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 15 out of a total of 18 targets established for this donor in 2012 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	44,038,243,673		43,612,340,403		63,675,997,540		64,219,969,237
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	94%	100%	85%	85%	85%	85%	96%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	78%	85%	98%	85%	100%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	84%	59%	75%	50%	94%	50%	91%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	86%	60%	77%	54%	94%	54%	91%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	86%	70%	77%	67%	94%	67%	91%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	87%	71%	79%	69%	95%	69%	91%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	TBD
	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)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	86%	83%	72%	98%	105%	98%	86%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	100%	45%	100%	48%	100%	48%	100%
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	100%	84%	86%	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL.	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	3	3	3
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	95%	70%	97%
<i>Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:</i>									
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)	Yes	Yes	No	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	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	93%	50%	99%	50%	55%	50%	79%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	100%	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	65%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%	45%	100%	

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

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

United Kingdom

The percentage of total ODA from UK/DFID that was recorded in the national budget in FY 2012/13 is at 96 percent; this represents 11 percentage increases if compared to the previous FY 2011/12. This enhances GoR ownership of its development and accountability to the people of Rwanda. UK surpassed all targets on the indicator of using country systems. This reduces transaction costs and also acts as an incentive for GoR to continue improving national systems.

Although UK managed to disburse over 85 percent of committed budget support, it did not meet the target of budget support disbursed within the first six months of FY2012/13, this negatively affected predictability. UK did not adhere to the Budget Support MoU between GoR and Budget support donors as it reprogrammed 75 percent of committed General budget support to Sector budget support and project support.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - UNITED NATIONS

Final results from FY11/12 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 5 out of a total of 11 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12 Actual	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual	KEY:
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	24,487,145,322		11,974,044,519		4,108,304,348		11,753,254,565	
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	44%	100%	36%	85%	15%	85%	42%	
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	87%	79%	83%	85%	98%	
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	0%	59%	7%	50%	17%	50%	52%	
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	15%	60%	31%	54%	34%	54%	35%	
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	15%	70%	36%	67%	55%	67%	56%	
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	37%	71%	72%	69%	86%	69%	74%	
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%		
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline		baseline	TBD	
	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)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	27%	83%	51%	98%	80%	98%	81%	
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0	
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	23%	45%	44%	48%	25%	48%	22%	
	D3	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	93%	84%	87%	87%	100%	87%	100%	
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	Refer to the footnote	3	N/A	
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	Refer to the footnote	70%	N/A	
<i>Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:</i>										
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)		Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	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	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.		50%	N/A	50%	N/A	50%	N/A	
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.		100%	N/A	100%	N/A	100%	N/A	
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)		Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)		Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	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	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%		100%	N/A	

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

United Nations

The 2012/13 DPAF report covers the support provided by the following resident UN agencies that self-reported in the Development Assistance Database; IFAD, UNDP, UNFPA, UN HABITAT, UNICEF, WHO, FAO, and UNIDO. The notable observation is that there has been a significant increase on aid on budget compared to previous FY where UN ODA as a percentage of the total ODA was 42% compared with 15% previous FY. It is also observed that UN ODA for GOR sector delivered by GoR agencies is maintained above the target where it is 98% of the ODA to GOR sector.

The analytic work of the Agencies has also been increasingly coordinated partly demonstrated by the synergies during the elaboration of the UNDAP process. However, UN delivery of ODA has consistently not met the target related to ODA disbursed using financing reporting system as well as ODA disbursed in year it was scheduled – it scored 81% against 98% target. The UN Agencies need to address the predictability concerns as it affects the Implementing agencies ability to plan and budget.

The notable improvement has been largely in the joint planning where the UN was able to deliver a joint response to GoR EDPRS II under a common framework of UNDAP which is aligned to Government priorities but also likely to enhance synergies and reduce duplication and overlap. But concerns of numerous small projects by the Agencies still persist as they compete for the attention. The revitalization of the One UN Steering Committee is expected to bring much scrutiny in the allocation of the One UN Fund which has been boosted by Development Partners to implement UNDAP.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - UNITED STATES

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 5 out of a total of 12 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11 Actual	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12 Actual	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020	Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)		3,502,114,000		5,803,914,598		17,213,690,184
	A1 % ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	100%	3%	85%	4%	85%	24%
	A2 % ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies	75%	0.2%	85%	0.0%	85%	0%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1 % ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	59%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
	B2 % ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	60%	0%	54%	0%	54%	0%
	B3 % ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	70%	0%	67%	0%	67%	0%
	B4 % ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	71%	0.2%	69%	0%	69%	0%
	B5 % of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems			85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1 % of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level			baseline	TBD	baseline	
	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)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes
	C3 % ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	83%	12%	98%	100%	98%	92%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1 Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period		To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	0
	D2 % of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	45%	100%	48%	100%	48%	100%
	D3 % of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	84%	38%	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1 Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	3	3	3
	E5 Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)		To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	94%	70%	92%
<i>Key Results area G applies only to donors providing budget support to Rwanda:</i>							
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)	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	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	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G3 % of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year.	50%	N/A	50%	N/A	50%	N/A
	G4 % of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	100%	N/A	100%	N/A	100%	N/A
	G5 Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A
	G6 Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	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	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%		100%	N/A

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

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

United States of America

US Government funds particularly those disbursed by USAID are not disbursed using GoR agencies and procedures and processes. Notably, the ODA to GoR Sector disbursed by GoR Agencies and the ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems related indicators has remained unmet in the DPAF. However, a small percentage of USG funds mostly of Center for Diseases Control (CDC) funds are on budget under the Ministry of Health.

The use of country systems has remained an issue with USAID as the ODA is disbursed using Implementing Partners (mainly PVOs) who are largely American-based International NGOs as well as American-based private contractors.

However, recently the USG has initiated a discussion of how a Government to Government financing (G2G) could be enabled. If this materializes, it will be broadly in line with the Busan Partnership Framework that puts emphasis and requires the use of country systems as a default approach. This shift could remarkably contribute to enhancing aid effectiveness in Rwanda as the USG funds account to almost $\frac{1}{4}$ of the total ODA received in Rwanda and this could increase Government ownership and accountability for results.

INDIVIDUAL DONOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK - WORLD BANK

Final results from the 2011/2012 round of monitoring as of 26-Mar-14.

Summary: 10 out of a total of 18 targets established for this donor in 2013 (and for which data were available) where met.

Results Area	Indicator		FY 09/10	FY 10/11 Target	FY 10/11	FY 11/12 Target	FY 11/12	FY 12/13 Target	FY 12/13 Actual
A. Financing national strategies in support of the MDGs and Vision 2020		Volume of ODA on-budget (RWF)	122,062,660,288		111,182,709,140		140,977,615,333		110,195,306,998
	A1	% ODA recorded in the national budget (PD indicator 3) (ratio inverted where % disb > % budgeted)	85%	100%	100%	85%	96%	85%	95%
	A2	% ODA for GoR sector delivered by GoR agencies		75%	98%	85%	100%	85%	99%
B. Use of national systems and institutions for strengthened ownership, sustainability and reduced transaction costs	B1	% ODA disbursed using GoR budget execution procedures (PD indic 5a)	83%	59%	62%	50%	67%	50%	56%
	B2	% ODA disbursed using GoR auditing procedures (PD indic 5a)	100%	60%	100%	54%	100%	54%	100%
	B3	% ODA disbursed using GoR financial reporting systems (PD indic 5a)	100%	70%	100%	67%	100%	67%	100%
	B4	% ODA disbursed using GoR procurement systems (PD indic 5b)	88%	71%	72%	69%	86%	69%	85%
	B5	% of ODA disbursed that are recorded in the GoR systems				85%		85%	
C. Facilitating longer-term planning and implementation through predictable development financing	C1	% of ODA covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at the country level				baseline	TBD	baseline	
	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)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	C3	% ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled (PD indic 7)	92%	83%	85%	98%	78%	98%	89%
D. Reduction of transaction costs and strengthening of partnerships through the adoption of harmonised approaches.	D1	Number of missions without GoR authorisation held during Silent Period			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	0	0	0	2
	D2	% of total missions that are joint (PD indic 10a)	14%	45%	31%	48%	33%	48%	31%
	D4	% of donor analytic work that is coordinated (PD indic 10b)	0%	84%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work	87%	N/A - No analytic work
E. Streamlining delivery at the sector level through effective use of comparative advantage	E1	Average number of sectors of intervention per donor (Aggregate and individual DP level) as per the DoL.	NO DATA	3	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	3	5	3	5
	E5	Percentage of their total aid portfolio for the country that the funding to DoL 3 sectors, GBS and SBS represents (Individual DP Level)			To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	70%	79%	70%	65%
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)	Yes	Yes	No	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	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G3	% of BS disbursed within the first quarter of the GoR fiscal year:	0%	50%	5%	50%	0%	50%	0%
	G4	% of BS disbursed within first six months of the GoR fiscal year for which it was scheduled.	83%	100%	60%	100%	100%	100%	0%
	G5	Donor adheres fully to common conditionality (CPAF and SBS MoUs)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	G6	Donor adheres fully to partnership framework (BSHG MoU)? (Y/N)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	G7	% of BS disbursed in or before the month it was scheduled and within the GoR FY it was planned		n/a	To be assessed in DPAF FY2011-2012	100%	100%	100%	

KEY:

Target Met
Target Not Met
Not applicable

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

World Bank

Under DPAF for FY2012/13, the World Bank has performed well on various set of indicators in and remained among the top DPs with ODA recorded in the national budget, disbursing using the national budget execution procedures as well as the ODA that is disbursed using national procurement systems and financial reporting arrangement. The targets for FY2012/13 have been met or exceeded on these indicators which demonstrate World Bank commitment to aid effectiveness principles.

However, it has fallen short on predictability indicators particularly on the percentage of ODA delivered in the year for which it was scheduled where it realized 89% against 98% target but if compared to FY11/12 which it has scored 78%, it is worth to note that progress was made on the indicator. Communication of non-binding commitments for the next 3 years – precisely the next IDA cycle has not happened as early as GoR expected and creates a forecasting challenge to the planning and budgeting on the side of the recipient.



Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning - External Finance Unit
P.O. Box 158 Kigali - Rwanda | Tel: +250 (0) 252 577 994 | Fax: +250 (0) 252 577 581
E-mail: efu@minecofin.gov.rw | www.minecofin.gov.rw | www.devpartners.gov.rw