



2006 Survey on Monitoring The Paris Declaration

Country Chapters

RWANDA

The 2006 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration was undertaken in 34 countries that receive aid. The results of the survey are presented in two volumes. **Volume 1** provides an overview of key findings across 34 countries. **Volume 2** presents the baseline and key findings in each of the 34 countries that have taken part in the survey. This chapter is based primarily on the data and findings communicated by government and donors to the OECD through the Paris Declaration monitoring process. A more detailed description of this process, how this chapter was drafted and what sources were used is included in Volume 1, Chapter 2.

Both Volume 1 (Overview) and Volume 2 (Country Chapters) of the 2006 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration can be downloaded at the OECD website:

www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/monitoring

A second round of monitoring will be organised in the first quarter of 2008 and will be an important contribution to the Accra High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in September 2008.

27 RWANDA

WITH A POPULATION OF 9 MILLION, Rwanda has a gross national income (GNI) of USD 230 per person (gross national income per capita). In 2005/06, 56% of the population were living in absolute poverty, and 37% were below the extreme poverty line – that is, unable to afford enough food to eat every day. Total net official development assistance (ODA) to Rwanda in 2004 was USD 468 million: this accounted for 26% of GNI, and approximately half of the government budget. The nature, volume and management of aid to Rwanda have changed significantly since the genocide and civil war of 1994, and are increasingly focused on long-term development.

Responses to the 2006 survey in Rwanda accounted for 96% of ODA. Seventeen survey responses were looked at alongside World Bank desk reviews that form the basis for the baselines/targets for some indicators. Together, they demonstrate that the Rwandan government and its donors are ushering the aid effectiveness agenda forward, although there is still some way to go to meeting the Paris Declaration targets for 2010. The implementation of the newly agreed aid policy should provide a focus for these efforts. Key challenges and priority actions are summarised below

DIMENSIONS	BASELINE	CHALLENGES	PRIORITY ACTIONS
Ownership	Strong	Lack of clear links between local plans/budgets and national strategy.	Continue capacity building at the local level.
Alignment	Moderate	Limited use of national systems, low reporting of aid in the budget.	Improve data on aid disbursements, step up donor use of public financial management systems.
Harmonisation	Low-Moderate	Reliance on stand-alone project aid in most sectors.	Develop sector-wide approaches in health, agriculture, land and decentralisation.
Managing for results	Low-Moderate	Lack of capacity in line ministries.	Build on national monitoring and evaluation framework, bring other sectors up to the standard of education.
Mutual accountability	Low-Moderate	Lack of formal mutual accountability mechanism.	Establish mutual accountability mechanism focused on Rwandan priorities.

OVERVIEW
Box 27.1
Challenges
and priority
actions

OWNERSHIP

INDICATOR 1

OWNERSHIP IS CRITICAL TO ACHIEVING development results and is central to the Paris Declaration. It has been defined as a country's ability to exercise effective leadership over its development policies and strategies. Achieving this – especially in countries that rely heavily on aid to fund their development – is not a simple undertaking. Nor, of course, can it be measured by a single indicator. It requires a combination of cross-cutting factors that engage both donor and government. For donors it means supporting countries' leadership and policies. It also means basing their overall support on countries' national development strategies, institutions and systems. This is commonly referred to as "alignment". Donors are in a better position to do that when governments set out clear priorities and operational strategies – this is the main focus of Indicator 1 of the Paris Declaration, which is assessed below with reference to the World Bank's 2006 Aid Effectiveness Review of Rwanda.

Rwanda's long-term vision is set out in Vision 2020, and the goals provide the framework for the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). The PRSP includes a medium-term development strategy clearly derived from the long-term vision, and is updated annually. The new Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS), expected to be completed in 2007, builds on medium-term strategies developed by sector ministries. Some sector strategies are strong (for example, education and health), but others require further development. Five-year development plans are also being developed at the district level, drawing on recently published guidelines from central government to ensure fit with the EDPRS. The World Bank judges Rwanda's long-term vision and medium-term strategy to be "largely in place", but the government should prioritise improvements at the sectoral and district level to ensure that the process is fully institutionalised.

The first-generation PRSP goals were consistent with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and Rwanda has made progress towards achieving some of the targets, particularly in the social sectors. The PRSP strategy is built on six pillars: transformation of the agricultural economy, human development through education, economic infrastructure, human resources and capacity building, private-sector development and good governance. The PRSP also examines cross-cutting issues such as gender and the environment. The new Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy is expected to concentrate more on productive sectors as well as these cross-cutting issues, including by setting monitorable indicators and targets.

Rwanda's development strategy is linked to the budget process by a Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), in place since 2002. The MTEF is a key instrument for ensuring that resources are directed to priority areas, and that ministries' budget submissions are based on clearly articulated strategic planning choices and their own sectoral MTEFs. The 2005 budget framework clearly identifies the PRSP as its priority. Real progress has been made in developing sub-national budgeting processes linked to the MTEF.

Rwanda received a B rating in the World Bank's 2005 Comprehensive Development Framework assessment, which provides the baseline for Indicator 1. This means that it meets the target of having "largely developed" operational development strategies, but should aim to achieve an A rating by 2010. The new Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy should improve Rwanda's national development targets, and consistent efforts to strengthen planning and budgeting processes at the district level should be a priority.

ALIGNMENT

THE GOVERNMENT TAKES A STRONG ROLE in managing its aid. The External Finance Unit in the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning provides a focal point for government efforts to ensure that aid is aligned with its policies and systems. The new aid policy should further improve alignment.

BUILDING RELIABLE COUNTRY SYSTEMS

Indicator 2a provides an indication of the quality of Rwanda's public financial management (PFM) systems. The score is based on the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA Indicator 13). In 2005 Rwanda's rating was 3.5 on a six-point scale that ranges from 1 (lowest score) to 6 (highest score).

INDICATOR 2a

The government is currently carrying out a comprehensive reform of national PFM systems, partly geared to decentralisation, and has created new independent agencies to improve PFM including the Rwanda Revenue Authority, the National Tender Board and the Office of the Auditor General. In 2003, a Financial Accountability Review and Action Plan was launched to co-ordinate different efforts in this area, and the government is developing a new budget law to consolidate all existing laws governing PFM systems. A new financial management system (SIBET) has recently been introduced by the Ministry of Finance to monitor budget preparation and execution. The priority for the government should be to ensure the implementation and success of all these new mechanisms and institutions, in order to meet the target of 4.0 on CPIA Indicator 13 by 2010.

No score is currently available for Indicator 2b on the quality of Rwanda's procurement systems. According to the World Bank's Aid Effectiveness Review, the government has started to tackle problems with national procurement systems: it adopted a new national procurement code in 2004 and submitted a new public procurement law for parliamentary approval. The main problem now is one of capacity, although recent efforts to build capacity at the local level should foster progress in this area.

INDICATOR 2b

ALIGNING AID FLOWS ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES

Most donors in Rwanda have aligned their strategies with PRSP priorities. However, this has not yet, in most cases, been translated into real alignment with sector strategies or use of country systems. Indicator 3 is a proxy for measuring alignment: it actually measures the proportion of aid reported in Rwanda's budget.

The table provides government's budget estimates of aid flows for fiscal year 2005 (numerator) as a percentage of aid disbursed by donors for the government sector for the same period (denominator). This ratio tells us the degree to which there is a discrepancy between budget estimates and actual disbursements.

Are government budget estimates comprehensive and realistic?

	Government's budget estimates of aid flows for FY05 (USD m)	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in FY05 (USD m)	Baseline ratio*
	a	b	c=a/b (%) c=b/a
African Dev. Bank	37	40	94%
Belgium	13	15	84%
Canada	2	3	68%
European Commission	68	94	72%
France	1	3	45%
Germany	3	13	22%
Global Fund	13	30	44%
IFAD	6	7	80%
IMF	0	3	0%
Japan	1	2	36%
Netherlands	4	15	24%
Sweden	7	21	32%
Switzerland	0	2	0%
United Kingdom	57	81	70%
United Nations	4	29	15%
United States	1	84	2%
World Bank	55	112	50%
Total	272	554	49%

INDICATOR 3
Table 27.1

* Baseline ratio is $c = a / b$ except where government's budget estimates are greater than disbursements ($c = b / a$).

The discrepancy can be in two directions: indeed budget estimates can be either higher or lower than disbursements. In order to have a single measure of discrepancy that is always less than 100%, the ratio is flipped when budget estimates are higher than disbursements. The baseline value for Indicator 3 in Rwanda is 49%. Achieving the target agreed in Paris of 74% (halving the gap) for this indicator will require concerted efforts by donors and government.

In Rwanda, around half of the budget is funded with development assistance, so it is very important that the government gain an accurate picture of how much aid it receives, and that this aid be recorded in the budget. The government has emphasised the importance of on-budget aid in its new aid policy. Yet the survey results suggest that only 49% of aid disbursed for the government sector is recorded in the national budget.

This reflects a number of factors. First, donors often do not provide timely information on planned disbursements for inclusion in the budget. Second, some donors provide very little information on project support to the budget department and some have a poor record of project execution. As a consequence, project disbursements are discounted (at variable rates) in the budget preparation process. In addition, some projects (such as those funded by the United States) are implemented by non-governmental organisations and other partners financed directly by the donor. As a result, the government department responsible for monitoring project implementation (CEPEX) does not have information on projected disbursements against individual activities that it can then communicate to the budget department during the budget preparation process. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) discrepancy occurs because all assistance from the IMF is provided to the central bank rather than the treasury. The IMF's figure for ODA disbursements includes a technical assistance component. This technical assistance tends to be short term and *ad hoc*, responding to the central bank's needs as they arise. As such, the IMF's assistance does not find its way into the budget preparation process.

Although much off-budget aid may be aligned with government priorities, significant improvements in the quality and communication of data on aid flows will be needed if Rwanda is to meet the target of 74% of aid for the government sector recorded in the budget by 2010. The government is currently building a development assistance database to manage such data, and donors will need to ensure that they make full use of this system in order to meet the target.

INDICATOR 4
Table 27.2

How much technical assistance is co-ordinated with country programmes?

	Co-ordinated technical co-operation (USD m) a	Total technical co-operation (USD m) b	Baseline ratio* (%) c=a/b
African Dev. Bank	0	3	0%
Belgium	0	15	0%
Canada	0	0	--
European Commission	0	2	0%
France	0	3	0%
Germany	0	7	0%
Global Fund	0	0	--
IFAD	0	0	--
IMF	1	1	100%
Japan	1	2	52%
Netherlands	0	0	--
Sweden	0	1	11%
Switzerland	0	1	0%
United Kingdom	3	15	20%
United Nations	8	10	80%
United States	64	64	100%
World Bank	1	11	6%
Total	78	135	58%

INDICATOR 5
Table 27.3

How much aid for the government sectors uses country systems?

	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector (USD m) a	Public financial management			Baseline ratio (%) avg(b,c,d) / a	Procurement	
		Budget execution (USD m) b	Financial reporting (USD m) c	Auditing (USD m) d		Procurement systems (USD m) e	Baseline ratio (%) e/a
African Dev. Bank	40	24	24	24	61%	24	61%
Belgium	15	0	14	10	52%	11	75%
Canada	3	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
European Commission	94	26	26	26	28%	26	28%
France	3	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
Germany	13	5	5	5	37%	5	37%
Global Fund	30	0	0	0	0%	30	100%
IFAD	7	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
IMF	3	2	2	2	74%	2	74%
Japan	2	0	0	1	9%	1	26%
Netherlands	15	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
Sweden	21	16	16	16	75%	16	75%
Switzerland	2	2	2	2	67%	2	67%
United Kingdom	81	67	71	71	86%	71	87%
United Nations	29	0	0	0	0%	3	10%
United States	84	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
World Bank	112	65	65	65	58%	65	58%
Total	554	207	224	221	39%	255	46%

CO-ORDINATING SUPPORT
TO STRENGTHEN CAPACITY

Capacity building is one of the six key priorities identified in Rwanda's PRSP, and the new aid policy reflects government concerns that current capacity-building programmes do not adequately transfer knowledge and skills. The government has established a Multi-Sector Capacity Building Programme to provide a framework for technical assistance. This has encouraged technical assistance co-ordinated with country programmes – 58% of technical assistance provided in 2005 was co-ordinated, exceeding the target of 50% set in Paris. That said, this overstates the amount that is integrated into country-led or multi-donor programmes, as some donors counted all technical assistance in agreements with the government as “co-ordinated” for the purposes of the survey. (While donors were invited to include data on embedded technical assistance, this was not always possible. Field offices do not always have at their disposal detailed information on

the execution of projects by component, and identifying such embedded technical assistance becomes very difficult for donors with large and diverse portfolios.)

Examples of good practice in co-ordinated technical assistance in Rwanda include the Integrated Support Project to the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (a pooled instrument).

USING COUNTRY SYSTEMS

The Paris Declaration encourages donors to make increasing use of country systems where these provide assurance that aid will be provided for agreed purposes. Indicator 5 looks in particular at donors' use of countries' PFM and procurement systems.

Table 27.3 shows that 39% of aid to the government sector uses the government's budget execution, financial reporting and audit systems. Given that Rwanda scores 3.5 on Indicator 2a, the targets for 2010 on Indicator 5a are that 59% of aid makes use of national PFM systems (on average across the three systems in question).

A total of 46% of aid uses Rwandan procurement systems. Without data on Indicator 2b, no target can currently be set for Indicator 5b.

Almost all the aid which makes use of Rwandan PFM and procurement systems is general budget support. As outlined above, the government is taking steps to improve its systems, but efforts to increase the use of national systems outside budget support have had very limited success. A number of donors cite headquarters regulations or domestic legislative constraints as the main reason that they cannot use national systems, or are required to make additional requirements. Although the government must continue to improve its PFM and procurement systems, the onus is on donors to find ways to make greater use of national systems if the targets for Indicator 5a are to be met and progress is to be made on 5b.

AVOIDING PARALLEL IMPLEMENTATION STRUCTURES

The Paris Declaration invites donors to “avoid, to the maximum extent possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of aid-financed projects and programmes”. There are now 48 parallel project

implementation units (PIUs) in Rwanda. The vast majority of these are accounted for by the World Bank and the United Nations. In order to make progress towards the 2010 target of reducing the number of PIUs to 16, the government is discussing with donors the possibility of combining existing PIUs so that there would be only one per implementing ministry.

PROVIDING MORE PREDICTABLE AID

In 2005, 66% of aid scheduled for disbursement to the government sector was recorded by the government as disbursed within that financial year.

Where there are significant disparities, this is usually because information is not communicated for use in the budget execution report, or because the projects were not included in the budget in the first place (as with much of the United States’ assistance). In some instances, it appears that donors disbursed more than scheduled. This may occur for a number of reasons. In the case of some donors (such as the World Bank and African Development Bank), programming is undertaken on a multi-year basis, and any annual schedule is a crude estimate of anticipated disbursements. Where a project is implemented ahead of schedule, the actual disbursements may exceed what was anticipated by the donor.

The table above looks at predictability from two different angles. The first angle is donors’ and government’s combined ability to disburse aid on schedule. In Rwanda, donors scheduled USD 519 million for disbursement in 2005 and actually disbursed – according to their own records – slightly more than expected (USD 554 million). The discrepancy varies considerably among donors and is mainly due to late disbursements carried over to 2005 and to delays in implementing programmes. The second angle is donors’ and government’s ability to record comprehensively disbursements made by donors for the government sector. In Rwanda, government systems recorded USD 340 million out of the USD 554 million notified as disbursed by donors (61%), indicating that a significant proportion of disbursements were not captured, either because they were not appropriately notified by donors or because they were inaccurately recorded by government.

INDICATOR 6
Table 27.4

How many PIUs are parallel to country structures?

	Parallel PIUs (units)
African Dev. Bank	0
Belgium	0
Canada	0
European Commission	1
France	0
Germany	0
Global Fund	0
IFAD	3
IMF	0
Japan	0
Netherlands	0
Sweden	0
Switzerland	2
United Kingdom	1
United Nations	30
United States	0
World Bank	11
Total	48

INDICATOR 7
Table 27.5

Are disbursements on schedule and recorded by government?

	Disbursements recorded by government in FY05 (USD m)	Aid scheduled by donors for disbursement in FY05 (USD m)	Aid actually disbursed by donors in FY05 (USD m)	Baseline ratio*	
	a	b	b	c=a/b (%)	c=b/a
African Dev. Bank	38	--	40		
Belgium	16	20	15	79%	
Canada	1	3	3	39%	
European Commission	86	119	94	72%	
France	0	0	3		
Germany	0	4	13	5%	
Global Fund	0	26	30	0%	
IFAD	8	10	7	84%	
IMF	0	2	3	0%	
Japan	0	2	2	0%	
Netherlands	1	5	15	29%	
Sweden	16	19	21	87%	
Switzerland	0	2	2	0%	
United Kingdom	68	81	81	83%	
United Nations	6	28	29	21%	
United States	0	84	84	0%	
World Bank	100	113	112	89%	
Total	340	519	554	66%	

* Baseline ratio is $c = a / b$ except where disbursements recorded by government are greater than aid scheduled for disbursement ($c = b / a$).

Indicator 7 on predictability has been designed to encourage progress against both of these angles so as to gradually close the predictability gap by half by 2010. In other words, it seeks to improve not only the predictability of actual disbursements but also the accuracy of how they are recorded in government systems – an important feature of ownership, accountability and transparency. In Rwanda, this combined predictability gap amounts to USD 216 million (42% of aid scheduled for disbursement). Closing this predictability gap will require donors and government to work increasingly together on various fronts at the same time. They might work at improving:

- the realism of predictions on volume and timing of expected disbursements;
- the way donors notify their disbursements to government;
- the comprehensiveness of government's records of disbursements made by donors.

Against this backdrop, it is important to note, however, that due to Rwanda's cash budgeting system, this may somewhat understate the predictability of aid, particularly of project aid, where budget execution (rather than disbursement) figures have been used to reach this baseline. The baseline may also somewhat overstate the predictability of budget support – some donors delayed 2004 disbursements into 2005. It is certainly the case, however, that the in-year predictability of budget support was higher than that for other forms of aid. Budget support donors have also moved towards frontloading disbursements in the first quarter of the financial year, which improves the government's capacity to plan and budget effectively.

UNTYING AID

According to OECD data covering 59% of aid to Rwanda, 82% of aid is untied. Most initiatives aimed at untying aid are led by donor headquarters, and there has been little in the way of high-level dialogue in Rwanda.

INDICATOR 8

HARMONISATION

SOME 27 DONORS (including numerous UN agencies) are permanently represented in Rwanda, underlining the importance of co-ordination among donors in order to minimise the burdens on government of managing aid. Harmonisation is relatively limited in Rwanda, but steps are being taken to improve the situation.

USING COMMON ARRANGEMENTS

The proportion of aid using programme-based approaches (PBAs), and thus common procedures, stood at 42% in Rwanda in 2005 – significantly below the 2010 target level of 66%. The use of programme-based approaches in Rwanda is a fairly recent development, and so far aid disbursed in this way has mostly taken the form

of general budget support. Education is the only sector to have an active sector-wide approach (SWAp), built on the government's Education Sector Strategic Plan and governed by a memorandum of understanding between government and donors.

If the 2010 target for 66% of aid to be programme based is to be met, Rwanda will need to develop SWAps beyond education. A week-long event with government and donors was held in June 2006 to explore the possibility of developing SWAps in health, agriculture, land and environment, and decentralisation. Support for programme-based approaches in these sectors seems to be high, and their development would help Rwanda meet the target for Indicator 9.

INDICATOR 9
Table 27.6

How much aid is programme based?

	Budget support (USD m) a	Other PBAs (USD m) b	Total (USD m) c=a+b	Total disbursed (USD m) d	Baseline ratio (%) e=c/d
African Dev. Bank	24	0	24	40	61%
Belgium	0	0	0	16	0%
Canada	0	0	0	5	0%
European Commission	26	0	27	96	28%
France	0	2	2	4	43%
Germany	0	4	4	13	28%
Global Fund	0	30	30	30	100%
IFAD	0	0	0	7	0%
IMF	0	2	2	3	74%
Japan	0	0	0	3	0%
Netherlands	0	0	0	19	0%
Sweden	16	0	16	23	69%
Switzerland	0	0	0	3	0%
United Kingdom	67	1	68	83	82%
United Nations	0	0	0	29	0%
United States	0	0	0	84	0%
World Bank	65	0	65	112	58%
Total	198	39	237	571	42%

CONDUCTING JOINT MISSIONS AND SHARING ANALYSIS

Only 9% of donor missions to Rwanda were conducted jointly in 2005, which leaves much room for improvement if the 2010 target of 40% joint missions is to be met. The government already organises joint sector reviews on an annual basis, and encourages donors to use these in place of parallel missions. A number of donors participate in this process, and others have made suggestions for changes that would facilitate their participation. Donors and government should also place increasing emphasis on the Joint Budget Support Reviews held on a bi-annual basis in order to bring them closer to the target.

In Rwanda, 36% of donor analyses were conducted jointly in 2005, within reach of the 2010 target for 66% to be joint. Bilateral donors have made headway in co-ordinating analytical work with multilateral agencies, and UN agencies are now co-ordinating analytical work among themselves. The government has asked donors to post analytical work on the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning website to spark interest in further collaboration.

Table 40.7: How many donor missions are co-ordinated?

	Co-ordinated donor missions (missions) a	Total donor missions (missions) b	Baseline ratio (%) c=a/b
African Dev. Bank	0	14	0%
Belgium	0	3	0%
Canada	1	3	33%
European Commission	3	12	25%
France	2	4	50%
Germany	3	14	21%
Global Fund	1	2	50%
IFAD	0	7	0%
IMF	1	27	4%
Japan	0	12	0%
Netherlands	4	25	16%
Sweden	0	2	0%
Switzerland	0	6	0%
United Kingdom	2	8	25%
United Nations	10	68	15%
United States	0	0	--
World Bank	5	37	14%
Total (discounted*)	21	244	9%

* The total of co-ordinated missions has been adjusted to avoid double counting. A discount factor of 35% has been applied.

INDICATOR 10a
Table 27.7

How much country analysis is co-ordinated?

	Co-ordinated donor analytical work * (units) a	Total donor analytical work (units) b	Baseline ratio (%) c=a/b
African Dev. Bank	0	0	--
Belgium	1	1	100%
Canada	0	0	--
European Commission	0	0	--
France	0	0	--
Germany	1	8	13%
Global Fund	0	0	--
IFAD	2	3	67%
IMF	3	6	50%
Japan	0	0	--
Netherlands	0	0	--
Sweden	1	3	33%
Switzerland	1	2	50%
United Kingdom	1	1	100%
United Nations	17	35	49%
United States	2	2	100%
World Bank	4	7	57%
Total (discounted*)	25	68	36%

* The total of co-ordinated analysis has been adjusted to avoid double counting. A discount factor of 25% has been applied.

INDICATOR 10b
Table 27.8

MANAGING FOR RESULTS

INDICATOR 11 **MANAGING FOR RESULTS IS KEY** to enhancing aid effectiveness. The Paris Declaration recommends that donors work alongside partner countries to manage resources on the basis of desired results, and to use information effectively to improve decision making. Indicator 11 focuses on one component of managing for results: the establishment by the partner country of a cost-effective, transparent and monitorable performance and assessment framework. Rwanda scored a C rating in the World Bank's 2005 Comprehensive Development Framework assessment, which provides the baseline for this indicator. This puts it within reach of the target of achieving a B or an A by 2010.

According to the World Bank's 2006 Aid Effectiveness Review, the quality and availability of poverty and development data in Rwanda is

improving. The government has completed a National Statistical Development Strategy, and established a Rwandan National Institute of Statistics. Information on government policies is easily accessible, and the government plans to publicise the new Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy.

The government has laid the foundation for a monitoring and evaluation system that meets international standards, and the World Bank judges that significant progress has been made through sectoral monitoring and evaluation systems. However, the Bank cautions that capacity constraints in most sectors will need to be overcome if fully effective performance monitoring processes are to be established.

MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

INDICATOR 12 **THE PARIS DECLARATION CALLS** for donors and partner countries to be accountable to each other for the use of development resources, and in a way that tends to strengthen public support for national policies and development assistance. This in turn requires governments to take steps to improve country accountability systems and donors to help by being transparent about their own contributions.

Indicator 12 measures one important aspect of mutual accountability: whether country-level mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments take place. Existing donor-government fora (including sector working groups, the Development Partners Co-ordination Group and the Budget Support Harmonisation

Group) in Rwanda provide opportunities for discussion of mutual progress, though the focus of discussions remains on the performance of the government, with little scope for discussion of donor performance against commitments. No formal mutual accountability mechanism currently exists in Rwanda, but discussions are ongoing within government, and with donors, to design a mechanism suited to Rwanda's particular needs. It is expected that this will draw on independent elements of review, with the aim of ensuring a balanced assessment of the performance of both the government of Rwanda and its donors.

BASELINES AND TARGETS

THE TABLE BELOW presents the 2005 baselines and targets for Rwanda. The information is discussed in detail in the above chapter and draws from various sources of information. The main source is the baseline survey undertaken in Rwanda under the aegis of the National Co-ordinator (Jean-Jacques Nyirubutama).

INDICATORS	2005 BASELINE	2010 TARGET
1 Ownership – Operational PRS	B	A
2a Quality of PFM systems	3.5	4.0
2b Quality procurement systems	Not available	Not applicable
3 Aid reported on budget	49%	74%
4 Co-ordinated capacity development	58%	50%
5a Use of country PFM systems (aid flows)	39%	59%
5b Use of country procurement systems (aid flows)	46%	Not applicable
6 Parallel PIUs	48	16
7 In-year predictability	66%	83%
8 Untied aid	82%	More than 82%
9 Use of programme-based approaches	42%	66%
10a Co-ordinated missions	9%	40%
10b Co-ordinated country analytic work	36%	66%
11 Sound performance assessment framework	C	B or A
12 Reviews of mutual accountability	No	Yes

Table 27.9
Baselines
and targets

ACRONYMS

CPA	Country Policy and Institutional Assessment
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
GNI	gross national income
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MTEF	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
ODA	official development assistance
PFM	public financial management
PIU	project implementation unit
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SWAp	Sector-Wide Approach