



Division of Labour

in Rwanda







EU Fast Track Initiative

- Commenced 2008
- Lead facilitator DFID
- Support facilitator EC
- Non-EU involvement incl WB, AfDB, UN, CIDA
- Progress at 2nd monitoring round (Sept 09):
 - Donor mapping and sector leads established
 - Re-programming underway
 - Self-assessment complete but not validated
 - Sector definitions not agreed with GoR







Rwandan Government leadership - 2009

GoR Strategic Options Paper to take forward DoL over 2-3 year period - published 2009

- broadly agreed by donors
- recommended high level Govt committee to agree policy parameters for DoL exercise
- regular meetings of senior civil servants to monitor DoL and negotiations with donors
- Govt to consult donors on criteria to use in allocating sectors based on self assessment







2009 assessment of DoL – the process so far

- Enabling factors:
 - Strong govt leadership and commitment
 - DoL already in place for budget support
- Challenges:
 - Impact of withdrawals on quality
 - Keeping overall aid level constant
- Role of HQ:
 - as a group: ensuring HQ staff policy commitment to division of labour
 - Within donor agency: taking decisions where country office does not have the power to







Developments in 2010

- February 2010 GoR proposal on division of labour:
 - maximum 3 sectors per donor
 - exceptions: regional projects; cross-cutting activities; basket funds; emergency assistance; currently ongoing projects; silent partnerships
- Process of joint and bilateral dialogue on DoL since February
- Draft EU proposal on DoL, led by EC
- Budget Support Harmonisation Group joint position on DoL now mostly agreed with GoR





DoL proposal 30 March 2010

Proposed sectors for future support

| • | Education | Health & population | Social protection | Employment and capacity building | Youth, Sports& Culture | Transport and ICT | Energy | Water and Sanitation | Agriculture | Forestry, Land and Environment | Manufacturing, Services & off- farm industry | CDF&Decentraliz ation | Justice Reconciliation, Law and Order |
|---------|-----------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| Belgium | | x | | | | | Х | | | i | | | |
| Canada | | | | | | | | | х | | | | |
| Germany | x | | | x | | | | | | | | x | |
| Japan | х | | | | | x | | | х | | | | |
| NL | i | | | | | | х | | | | о | x | х |
| Sweden | i | | i | | | | | | | x | | | o |
| DIFD | x | i | х | | | | | | ο | | | | |
| US | | x | | x | | | | | х | | | | |
| ADB | | | | | | x | х | x | | | | | |
| EC | | | | | | x | | o | х | | | | x |
| WB | | | | | | x | x | | x | | | | |
| France | | | | | x | | | | | | | | |
| Austria | | | | | | | | x | | | | | |
| Lux | | X | | | | | | | | | | | |







Next steps and challenges

- Agreement on 3 sector 'allocations' by June meeting of coordination group
 - Likely to be most problematic for non-EU donors with cross-cutting, projectised programmes eg USAID, UN, Japan
 - Japan seeking advice on silent partnership arrangements
 - USAID considering sector budget support in agriculture







A positive, constructive process...

- Impact of strong partner government leadership
- Effective aid management & coordination architecture in Rwanda
- Importance of EU support highlighted by GoR
- Good progress in Kigali should be supported by HQ
- A possible DoL case study for EU DGs?

