

DISTRICTS IMIHIGO EVALUATION REPORT 2010-2011

July, 23rd 2011

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Background	3
1.2. Focus of evaluation exercise and composition of teams.....	3
2. Methodology.....	4
2.1. Design of evaluation template.....	4
2.2. Instruments of evaluation.....	4
2.3. Imihigo documents	4
2.4. District Reports	4
2.5. Tender Documents and Contracts	5
2.6. Cross cutting issues.....	5
2.7. Office/Documentary verification process.....	5
2.8. Field visits of selected key activities	6
2.9. Scoring and harmonization of scores.....	6
3. Districts performance and ranking.....	6
3.1. Economic Development Pillar Performance	6
3.2. Social Development Pillar Performance	7
3.3. Governance and Justice Pillar Performance	8
3.4. Overall Districts Performance	9
3.5. Districts Performance trend.....	11
4. Key achievements, challenges and recommendations	12
4.1. Key Achievements.....	12
4. Recommendations	14
4.3.1 Quality Assurance Team.....	14
4.3.2 Capacity building.....	14
4.3.3 Funding and implementation responsibility:.....	15
5 Linking Imihigo with development strategies such as EDPRS, MDGs, DDP,	15
6 Conclusion.....	15

ABBREVIATION

9YBE	: 9 year basic education
BNR	: Banque National du Rwanda
DAP	: District Action Plan
DDP	: District Development Plan
EDPRS	: Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
H.E	: His Excellency
JADF	: Joint Action Development Forum
MDGs	: Millennium Development Goals
MINALOC	: Ministry of Local Government
MINECOFIN	: Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MINEDUC	: Ministry of Education
MINICOM	: Ministry of Commerce and industry
MININFRA	: Ministry of Infrastructure
MTEF	: Medium Term Framework
NDIS	: National Decentralization Implementation Secretariat
PFMC	: Public Finance Management Committee
PSF	: Private Sector Federation
RALGA	: Rwandese Association of Local Government Authorities
RCSP	: Rwanda Civil Society Platform
RGAC	: Rwanda Governance Advisory Council
SACCOs	: Savings and Credit Cooperatives
TIG	: Travaux d'Interet Generaux

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Imihigo is a Rwandan-cultural based performance approach which was re-initiated in 2006 by H.E, the President of the Republic of Rwanda. This was as a result of the concern about the rate and quality of execution of government programs and priorities. Its main objective was to make public agencies and institutions more effective and accountable in their implementation of national programs and accelerate the socio-economic development agenda as contained in the Vision 2020 and EDPRS and the MDGs. Since 2006, imihigo performance approach has been used by local government authorities for both planning and implementation of national programs based on districts' priorities. Every year, the National Evaluation Team carries out the Districts' Imihigo assessment.

The National Evaluation Team carried out the Districts Imihigo evaluations from 2006 to mid 2009 focusing on only 10 best performing Districts selected through the evaluations carried out by Provinces and Kigali City during which 2 top performing districts in each province and Kigali City were identified. However, concerns relating to this approach of sample evaluation were raised as it was deemed not to be comprehensive enough. It was on that basis that subsequent evaluation of Imihigo by the National Team was made more comprehensive by extending it to all the 30 Districts using a uniform and harmonized methodology.

This revised approach, which was used in the evaluation of Imihigo of 2009-2010, helped to identify the challenges faced and how they could be remedied in the design and implementation of successive Imihigo, and hence accelerate the achievement of sustainable development.

1.2. Focus of evaluation exercise and composition of teams

The focus of the evaluation exercise was to assess the extent to which the 2010-2011 Imihigo were implemented and identify key achievements, challenges and improvements made in comparison with the previous year. A special consideration was included in the evaluation for emerging priorities which were not catered for in the imihigo such as the 9 year basic education program, eradication of grass thatched houses (Nyakatsi), Joint Action Development Forum (JADF), Rural Settlement (Imidugudu), Budget Execution, Public Finance Management Committees (PFMC) meetings and functioning, Socio-economic integration of and support to Vulnerable groups, and the functioning of Community Assemblies (Inteko z'Abaturage).

In order to make Imihigo evaluation more objective and comprehensive, and to render the results more credible, just as in the previous year's evaluation, detailed terms of reference for the 2010-2011 evaluation were developed and a nation-wide District Imihigo evaluation exercise was conducted by an expanded multi-sectoral team of experts (expanded) drawn from Government, Private sector and Civil society institutions. The team was composed of experts from the Office of the President, Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC), Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN), Ministry of Trade and industry (MINICOM), Ministry of Infrastructure (MININFRA), Ministry of Education (MINEDUC), National Decentralization Implementation Secretariat

(NDIS), Rwanda Governance Advisory Council (RGAC), Rwandese Association of Local Government Authorities (RALGA), Rwanda Civil Society Platform (RCSP) and Private Sector Federation (PSF). The evaluation was launched on 13th June 2011 and ran until 8th July 2011.

The evaluation team was divided into 3 sub-teams with representatives from the above mentioned institutions in each group. At commencement of the evaluation exercise, the three sub-teams worked jointly in evaluating Kicukiro District in order to ensure that all members mastered the evaluation methodology and criteria. After this, the sub-teams were dispatched with two three each evaluating 10 districts, while the 3rd sub-team evaluating 9 districts and Kigali City.

The evaluation exercise was significant as it revealed the degree to which District priorities and targets were realized against what they had planned to implement. The exercise acknowledged key achievements in the areas of planning, implementation, reporting and communication. It, however, also revealed the challenges that hampered the attainment of targets. Useful advice and remarks to address the challenges were made by the team to the District's leadership and staff at the end of each District's evaluation exercise.

2. Methodology

In an attempt to render the results of the evaluation credible and acceptable, an objective approach was adopted, which included the following process:

2.1. Design of evaluation template

Based on the format of Imihigo, an evaluation template was designed and used across all Districts. The template provided for scores to be assigned to performance in implementation of set targets.

2.2. Instruments of evaluation

Two days were spent in evaluating each District. The first day was committed to office evaluation (desk review of relevant documentation) and the second day was committed to the field visit evaluation.

2.3. Imihigo documents

This was the key document upon which evaluation was based. It contained development priorities identified by District Leaders for implementation in 2010-2011 in accordance with the 3 pillars of economic development, social welfare and good governance.

2.4. District Reports

Districts submitted the 2010-2011 Imihigo implementation reports of their activities. The reports also formed the basis upon which Districts performance was evaluated against

planned activities that were to be implemented in Imihigo. The evaluation team cross checked all Imihigo documents against the reports to ensure consistency.

2.5. Tender Documents and Contracts

The evaluation team also examined procurement documents and contracts as means of verification where procurement process had been undertaken in order to implement Imihigo. Where payment had been made payment vouchers were requested for as evidence of implementation.

2.6. Cross cutting issues

Based on the importance of cross cutting issues in transforming the lives of Rwandans, the programs were selected as part of the issues to be evaluated. These were evaluated independent of Districts commitment. The issues included those in economic, social, and good governance development areas.

In the area of economic development, the following were evaluated:

- Establishment and functioning of Umurenge SACCOs performance;
- Rural settlement (imidugudu) – sites identification and plots allocation.
- Greening and beautification

In the area of social development, the following were evaluated:

- 9 year basic education (9YBE);
- Housing construction for vulnerable persons (amacumbi y'abatishoboye);
- Payment of Teachers' salaries and arrears;
- Elimination of grass thatched houses.

In the area of governance (including justice), the following were evaluated:

- Cases registered and resolved by community assembly courts (Inteko y'abaturage);
- Functioning of Joint Action Development Forum (JADF); and
- The Functioning of Public Finance Management Committees
- Budget Execution.

2.7. Office/Documentary verification process

Evaluators verified whether the respective targets were realized as reported. District officials were allowed time to comment and elaborate on some of the issues whenever it was found necessary. This was especially when targets set were partially implemented or not at all.

2.8. Field visits of selected key activities

After the desk review of all relevant documentation, evaluators carefully selected key activities with an impact on the wellbeing of the population that were to be verified and assessed on the ground. Among others, these were 9YBE classrooms and toilets, Land use consolidation, infrastructure activities (markets constructed, roads, health centers), environment (terracing, trees planted) and housing for vulnerable persons, hillside irrigation dams, fish ponds, communal kraals and improved crop husbandry. The purpose of the field visits was to verify the reality on the ground against office evidence that were provided. After office and field evaluation, evaluators gave their appreciations and remarks emphasizing areas of strengths to be maintained and enhanced, and weaknesses that needed remedial action.

2.9. Scoring and harmonization of scores


During the evaluation exercise, each evaluator did his/her independent judgment on the rating of assessed activities. At the end of the second day in each district, the evaluators harmonized their scores to ensure there were no serious deviations and discrepancies which might be as a result of bias in favour of or against any given district. Harmonization also served as a corrective measure for an evaluator who had not accurately captured data from District documents and presentations.

3. Districts performance and ranking

3.1. Economic Development Pillar Performance

No	District	% in Economic Development
1	RULINDO	90
2	NYAMASHEKE	88
3	BUGESERA	86
4	KIREHE	85
5	KICUKIRO	83
6	NYAMAGABE	83
7	KARONGI	82
8	GASABO	82
9	HUYE	81
10	MUSANZE	81
11	RWAMAGANA	81
12	NYARUGENGE	80
13	KAYONZA	80
14	RUHANGO	80
15	NYANZA	79

16	NYAGATARE	79
17	NGORORERO	79
18	BURERA	79
19	RUTSIRO	78
20	KAMONYI	77
21	NGOMA	77
22	RUSIZI	76
23	MUHANGA	76
24	NYABIHU	76
25	RUBAVU	75
26	GISAGARA	75
27	GAKENKE	74
28	NYARUGURU	70
29	GATSIBO	69
30	GICUMBI	65
AVERAGE		78.9




The best performing district in the Economic Development Pillar scored 90% while the lowest performing one scored 65%. The average score for all districts in this pillar is 78.9%. This score reflects improved infrastructure in districts such as road networks, electricity and water supply, agro-processing plants, land use consolidation, and these have stimulated production and people's incomes as well as improved welfare.

3.2. Social Development Pillar Performance

No	District	% in Social Development
1	KICUKIRO	94.3
2	NYAMASHEKE	94.1
3	BURERA	89.9
4	BUGESERA	89.5
5	RULINDO	89.1
6	MUHANGA	88.4
7	KIREHE	88.0
8	RUTSIRO	87.8
9	GICUMBI	86.7
10	KARONGI	85.9
11	KAMONYI	85.9
12	HUYE	85.8
13	GATSIBO	85.1
14	RUBAVU	84.8
15	RUSIZI	82.2

16	GASABO	81.2
17	NYAMAGABE	80.9
18	RUHANGO	80.8
19	GISAGARA	80.6
20	NYAGATARE	80.5
21	NGORORERO	80.5
22	NYANZA	78.3
23	KAYONZA	76.8
24	NYARUGURU	74.9
25	MUSANZE	74.8
26	RWAMAGANA	74.6
27	NGOMA	74.2
28	NYARUGENGE	72.8
29	NYABIHU	68.8
30	GAKENKE	67.0
AVERAGE		82.1




In the Social Development Pillar the best performing district scored 94.3% and the lowest performing 67%. On average, performance in this pillar was 82%. This is remarkable and it implies that service delivery is on an upward trend. Health services have improved and education is accessed by the majority of the Rwandan population due to increased social services facilities. Besides, through various programs such as one cow per poor family, the eradication of grass-thatched houses, and other social welfare initiatives, Rwandans are getting better housed and fed.

3.3. Governance and Justice Pillar Performance

No	District	% in Governance and Justice
1	RULINDO	91.1
2	NYAMASHEKE	89.4
3	BURERA	89.1
4	MUHANGA	88.1
5	KICUKIRO	86.8
6	NYAMAGABE	86.1
7	KIREHE	86.0
8	RUHANGO	84.3
9	RUTSIRO	84.0
10	NGOMA	83.7
11	RUSIZI	83.7
12	KARONGI	83.6
13	NGORORERO	83.5
14	BUGESERA	83.1
15	GASABO	83.0

16	NYAGATARE	82.3
17	MUSANZE	82.2
18	RUBAVU	82.2
19	NYANZA	82.1
20	HUYE	81.9
21	KAMONYI	81.4
22	GICUMBI	80.8
23	RWAMAGANA	80.6
24	KAYONZA	80.0
25	NYARUGENGE	79.9
26	GATSIBO	79.3
27	NYARUGURU	77.7
28	GISAGARA	77.6
29	NYABIHU	76.3
30	GAKENKE	70.5
AVERAGE		82.7




Good governance and justice is the most critical pillar as the success in the other pillars depends on security, social justice, transparent problem solving and conflict resolution system and other governance parameters. Generally the existence of peace and harmony enabled by an elaborate administrative machinery and legal framework creates good working environment such that every member of the community is engaged productively.

The best performing district in the governance pillar scored 91% while the lowest scored 70.5%. The average performance in this pillar was 82.7%. This is clearly indicative of a very effective enabling environment.

3.4. Overall Districts Performance

No	District	Overall Performance of districts
1	RULINDO	90.616
2	NYAMASHEKE	89.419
3	KICUKIRO	86.262
4	BURERA	86.006
5	KIREHE	85.927
6	BUGESERA	84.632
7	NYAMAGABE	84.502
8	MUHANGA	84.465
9	KARONGI	83.284
10	RUTSIRO	82.684
11	RUHANGO	82.563
12	GASABO	82.396
13	HUYE	82.152
14	NGORORERO	81.839
15	NYAGATARE	81.240

16	RUSIZI	81.226
17	MUSANZE	81.173
18	NYANZA	80.912
19	NGOMA	80.730
20	KAMONYI	80.605
21	RUBAVU	80.328
22	RWAMAGANA	80.175
23	KAYONZA	79.623
24	NYARUGENGE	79.300
25	GISAGARA	77.062
26	GATSIBO	76.919
27	GICUMBI	76.662
28	NYABIHU	75.371
29	NYARUGURU	75.194
30	GAKENKE	71.221
AVERAGE		81.5




Overall, there was remarkable improvement in performance in all the districts where the average is 81.5%. Each district scored over 70% overall. The best performing district scored 90.6% while the lowest overall scored 71.2%. Poverty levels in all the districts appear to have dropped especially by the help of poverty reduction programs such as One Cow per poor family and VUP which programs were testified by the citizens that drastically changed styles of living, from impoverished to self sustaining status. Stocks of food could be seen in several granaries at village levels. Road network between sectors and districts is generally good and this makes inter-districts trade possible. Markets are full of foodstuffs and other trade items, and are generally bustling with business activities.

3.5. Districts Performance trend

No	District	% in Economic Development	% in Social Development	% in Governance and Justice	Overall Districts Performance 2010-2011 (in %)	Overall Districts Performance 2009 - 2010 (in %)	Performance Trend (in %)	Position Shift
1	RULINDO	90.2	89.1	91.1	90.6	69.5	21.1	9
2	NYAMASHEKE	87.9	94.1	89.4	89.4	79.3	10.1	-1
3	KICUKIRO	82.6	94.3	86.8	86.3	73.5	12.8	2
4	BURERA	78.5	89.9	89.1	86.0	70.5	15.5	4
5	KIREHE	85.1	88.0	86.0	85.9	72.4	13.5	1
6	BUGESERA	86.0	89.5	83.1	84.6	74.3	10.3	-2
7	NYAMAGABE	82.5	80.9	86.1	84.5	77.3	7.2	-4
8	MUHANGA	75.9	88.4	88.1	84.5	64.8	19.7	10
9	KARONGI	81.8	85.9	83.6	83.3	69.7	13.6	0
10	RUTSIRO	78.4	87.8	84.0	82.7	67.8	14.9	2
11	RUHANGO	79.7	80.8	84.3	82.6	60.5	22.0	14
12	GASABO	81.5	81.2	83.0	82.4	64.2	18.2	9
13	HUYE	81.4	85.8	81.9	82.2	64.2	18.0	9
14	NGORORERO	79.0	80.5	83.5	81.8	68.8	13.1	-3
15	NYAGATARE	79.3	80.5	82.3	81.2	71.2	10.0	-8
16	RUSIZI	75.9	82.2	83.7	81.2	66.2	15.0	0
17	MUSANZE	81.2	74.8	82.2	81.2	66.9	14.3	-4
18	NYANZA	79.4	78.3	82.1	80.9	66.6	14.3	-3
19	NGOMA	76.9	74.2	83.7	80.7	58.5	22.2	8
20	KAMONYI	77.3	85.9	81.4	80.6	64.3	16.3	0
21	RUBAVU	75.1	84.8	82.2	80.3	66.8	13.5	-7
22	RWAMAGANA	81.2	74.6	80.6	80.2	52.6	27.5	7
23	KAYONZA	79.8	76.8	80.0	79.6	65.8	13.8	-6
24	NYARUGENGE	80.2	72.8	79.9	79.3	54.5	24.8	4
25	GISAGARA	74.9	80.6	77.6	77.1	62.0	15.0	-1
26	GATSIBO	69.4	85.1	79.3	76.9	51.2	25.7	4
27	GICUMBI	65.0	86.7	80.8	76.7	78.0	-1.3	-25
28	NYABIHU	75.7	68.8	76.3	75.4	63.6	11.8	-5
29	NYARUGURU	70.3	74.9	77.7	75.2	59.2	16.0	-3
30	GAKENKE	74.0	67.0	70.5	71.2	64.4	6.9	-11
AVERAGE		78.9	82.1	82.7	81.5	66.3	15.2	

Almost all Districts improved in performance compared to last year: average of 81.5 % against 63.3%. 22 Districts out of 30 scored more than 80%, A number of Districts recorded high rate increase in performance, some districts' performance increased between 20 and 30% : Rwamagana 27.5%, Gatsibo 25.7%, Nyarugenge 24.8%, Ngoma 22.2%, Ruhango 22.0%, Rulindo 21.1%. Almost all districts registered performance increase, apart from

Gicumbi, which registered a decline of 1.3%. Some districts are commended for maintaining their performance momentum and remained among the 10 best performers: Nyamasheke, Kicukiro, Kirehe, Bugesera, Burera, Nyamagabe, Karongi.



In comparison with the previous year (2009-2010), districts performance in this year has significantly improved as can be seen from the above table and graph. The highest score in the 2009-2010 was 79% and within the 70% score there were only 8 districts, and the lowest score was 51.2%. On the other hand, the best performing district in 2010 - 2011 scored 90.6% and in the range of 80% and above there were 22 districts while the lowest score was 71.2%. Nonetheless, there are some districts which made a tremendous leap from their previous performance. Only one district registered a decline of -1.3%.

Imihigo, inherently create a competitive spirit within the Districts. It is therefore natural that Districts shift in the Imihigo performance ranking positions. Comparing 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 performance ranking, clearly show a significant position shift among some Districts. For example Ruhango District moved 14 positions upwards while Gicumbi moved 25 positions downwards.

4. Key achievements, challenges and recommendations

4.1. Key Achievements

In evaluation of Imihigo 2010-2011, the following achievements and best practices were observed in different districts:

- **Land use consolidation:** Land use consolidation has now become a common and widely acceptable practice. Using programs such as public works, TIG to make terraces, the supply of fertilizers and the cooperative system has enhanced the general response to the land use consolidation system and ensure food security.

- **Infrastructure (such as roads, health centres and food processing plants):** Most rural and town roads are in good condition. Of these, some are newly constructed while others have been rehabilitated by using TIG and Public Works programs. Health Centres in a number of sectors have been constructed and equipped. Small scale food processing plants have been constructed in partnership with the private sector and through cooperative system. Water pipes and electricity networks have been laid to reach areas of population concentration and Imidugudu sites.
- **Greening and Beautification:** Reasonable effort has been made in the premises of most public buildings such as District, Sectors and Cell offices, schools, health and trading centres to plant grass and flowers. In other places, especially at district level pavements have been laid.
- Land registration improved drastically where the lowest performing districts have registered land over 60%.
- **SACCOs:** Commendable progress has been made in mobilizing the community to join SACCOs and substantial funds have been mobilized. All the SACCOs have obtained provisional licenses from BNR to operate as savings and credit cooperatives, which has enabled them to mobilize more member subscriptions. As a result of this success in funds mobilization, a good number of SACCOs are now ripe to grant loan to members and have obtained BNR's permit to that effect.
- **Rural Settlement (Imidugudu):** There has been a general improvement in mobilizing citizens to build in areas set aside for communal villages. This has been accelerated by setting up basic infrastructure like roads, water supply and power. The eradication of grass thatched houses and the construction of houses for vulnerable people have also been a contributing factor to this success.
- **9YBE.** All Districts evaluated have made substantial progress in classroom construction. This has been made possible by the general willingness by the community to play a significant role in districts development programs, in particular, Imihigo. This is a consequence of aggressive sensitization and mobilization effort to get citizens own their development activities. Also benevolent programs such as Girinka and the general support to the vulnerable people have contributed a lot in changing the population's attitude towards the leadership and activities that bear general community benefits.
- **Payment of Teachers' Salaries and Arrears:** Great efforts have been made in ensuring that teachers are paid their monthly salaries in time. Most arrears have been cleared and the few left are being vetted by the Ministry of Economic Planning and Finance with the hope that soon, all teachers' arrears will be history.
- **Community Assemblies (Inteko z'Abaturage):** The function of Community Assemblies has been reasonably understood, and they gather once a month to resolve various community problems. This is evidenced by having very few unresolved problems reaching the district level. It was also found out that before any unresolved complaints/problems reach the district level, the "District Complaints Resolution Committee" comprising senior district officials goes down to lower levels to address those unresolved issues.

4.2 WEAKNESSES AND CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED

- There is a planning gap especially on setting and maintaining logic and consistence: objectives, baseline, output/targets & indicators;
- Setting unrealistic and over-ambitious targets by district was common. Some targets were not easy to be achieved in 12 months, for example construction of a 30 km road when there has not been any feasibility study, or reducing crime by 100%.
- In some districts too low targets were observed that would require less effort to implement. These targets would ordinarily be attained with little or no effort.
- The practice of consistent tracking implementation progress, reporting and filing is generally still weak;
- Some targets were not achieved because of disappointments by districts partners who did not fulfill their commitments in disbursing funds especially Central Government institutions and development partners, and this affected implementation of districts targets;
- There is a weakness of not setting targets based on uniqueness of rural and urban settings;
- Setting targets that are beyond districts full control was observed, for example construction of stadiums and development of Master plans, etc, whose implementation is fully managed by the central government;
- There was general lack of communication and reporting challenges faced that hindered implementation of the committed targets;
- There were big projects being implemented on ground that create significant impact on population but were missing in Imihigo documents;
- Targets on soil erosion control are vague and ambiguous which make them subject to subjectivity yet Districts report difficulty in ascertaining the exact situation on ground.

4 Recommendations

4.3.1 Quality Assurance Team

The challenges encountered pointed to lack of quality assurance services at the different stages of Imihigo designing and formulation. The Imihigo Evaluation Team conducted a quality assurance check on Imihigo 2011-12 design and formulation. This practice of engaging with District and Province leaders at different stages of Imihigo preparation in order to ensure that the Imihigo adequately reflect national priorities and are properly formulated and implemented should be institutionalized.

4.3.2 Capacity building

Districts are now staffed with qualified technical and professional staff. Technical knowledge and skills possessed by the technical staff should be shared with other staff such as those in planning and procurement for the effective designing, planning and implementation of Imihigo targets.

To ensure District self-assessment and assessment of the progress made by lower levels of administration, knowledge and skills in monitoring and evaluation are essential for District officials.

4.3.3 Funding and implementation responsibility:

Inside the Logical Framework of Imihigo, there should be columns indicating the source of funds for each of the activities and who will be directly responsible for its implementation.

4.3.4 The content of Imihigo:

Activities with greater impact on the general welfare of the population should be the main focus of Imihigo. For example, health and education infrastructure, infrastructure intended to improve sanitation like availing clean water to a bigger part of the population, including implementation of actions that would create jobs and improve general welfare of communities.

While activities/targets whose realizations have greater impact on the welfare of the local population and on development in general should be prioritized in Imihigo, it is crucial to ensure a clear distinction between activities in action plans and those in Imihigo. The action plans should be more comprehensive capturing specific activities to implement so as to achieve imihigo and routine activities, whilst Imihigo should focus on key priority areas.

Strategies designed to achieve planned targets should be put in place. Mere statement of having realized a target without demonstrating strategies or specific actions taken to attain it, does not promote objectivity and therefore, constrains objective evaluation.

5 Linking Imihigo with development strategies such as EDPRS, MDGs, DDP,

Imihigo should not be planned (designed, formulated and implemented) in isolation without drawing from existing plans or development strategies. Thus, there is need to link Imihigo with broader national and global development strategies such as **EDPRS, MDGs, DDP, MTEF, DAP**. Imihigo and existing development strategies have got to feed into each other to ensure a coherent development path.

6 Conclusion

On the whole, the concept of Imigiho as a development strategy has led to promising results by promoting a competitive spirit and creating focused and enthusiastic effort which are essential ingredients to sustainable development. Besides, the strategy has promoted an effective mechanism of monitoring and evaluation of development initiatives, which is essential to promote focused development. However, it is crucial to make committed resources for Districts available in a timely manner in order to ensure speedy and successful implementation of planned activities. It is also evident that governance has taken firm roots. Its importance must be emphasized in the attainment of targets in the other pillars as it creates an enabling environment.

Annex II: List of Evaluators

Team Leaders

1. MUFULUKYE Fred, Ministry of Local Government
2. RUGAMBA Egide, Ministry of Local Government
3. MURUNGI Peace, Prime Minister's Office

Team Members

4. UWINEZA Valens, President's Office
5. SEMAKUBA Francois, President's Office
6. UWIMANA Josephine, RALGA
7. NIYIGABA Jean, MININFRA
8. KANYESIGYE CYIZA Rhoda, Ministry of Local Government
9. NSEKANABO Emmanuel, RGAC
10. RUTAYISIRE ALAIN Didier, Ministry of Local Government
11. HAGUMA Robert, NDIS
12. MAZURU Thomas, Ministry of Economic Planning and Finance
13. NDAGIJIMANA Alexis -
14. MUSIIME James, Ministry of Local Government
15. KOMEZA Innocent, Private Sector Federation
16. UMURAZA Clarisse, Ministry of Economic Planning and Finance
17. NYIRATUNGA Iphigenie, Ministry of Infrastructure
18. KABAYIZA Barnabe, Ministry of Education
19. HIGIRO Ananias, Civil Society Platform
20. INGABIRE Jean Francoise, Ministry of Commerce and Industry
21. NGARAMBE Mathias, RALGA
22. AFRIKA Alexis, NDIS
23. AYEBARE Crispus, Ministry of Local Government
24. BUSINGYE Antony, RGAC
25. BIGANGU Prosper, Ministry of Local Government
26. Dr. NKURUNZIZA Jean, Ministry of Health
27. MUHIRWA Adolphe, MINEDUC
28. NIYONSENGA MWIMUKA Jimmy, MINICOM
29. BUDUGIRE William, PSF
30. UMULISA HUSNA Vestine, Civil Society Platform

Province / Kigali City Members

1. NYAMASWA RUKUNDO. Emmanuel, Western Province
2. BIZIMUNGU Abel, Southern Province
3. NDIMUKAGA Etienne, Northern Province
4. NTIRENGANYA Boniface, Eastern Province,
5. KAMANA Norbert, Kigali City.

Data Analyst: MUTARAMBIRWA MUGISHA Innocent