

PD - AAZ-557

ISN 62091

Rwanda Communal Afforestation Project  
(USAID 698-0424.001)

Project Assistance Completion Report

Prepared by:

Yasuyo Tadokoro *Y.T.*

March 1989

Approved by:

*James A. Graham*  
James A. Graham

USAID Director

Cleared by:

PR Crawford, ADO *PRC*

HMPatrick, PDO *HMP*

BDHoward, PIM *BDH*

HMLightfoot, CONT *HML*

*REP*

## I. PROJECT HISTORY

### 1. Background:

The Rwanda Communal Afforestation Project was a subproject under the Energy Initiatives for Africa (EIA) Project. USAID and the Government of Rwanda (GOR) signed the Project Agreement on August 31, 1983 for the purpose of improving the effectiveness of the GOR forestry extension system in three communes of Cyeru, Butaro and Nyamugali in Ruhengeri Prefecture. The life of project was 4 years. USAID committed \$500,000 to the Project. The GOR proposed to contribute \$335,000 in salaries and services.

The project was managed by a GOR Project Manager under the direction of the Director of Forestry at MINAGRI. He supervised directly two extension officers, one in Cyeru and another in Butaro who, in turn, trained extension agents. Nyamugali Commune never received an extension officer because of budget constraints. The Project Manager served as extension officer for this commune and supervised four extension agents. A total of three Peace Corps volunteers were assigned to the project as technical advisors until October 1986. The project also hired a secretary, a driver, an office hand and a guard as project personnel. One cartographer employed by the GOR was assigned to the project to produce maps of existing woodlots in the Kirambo sous-prefecture.

Major components of the project's reforestation effort were 1) to plant 400 hectares of communal woodlots, 2) to plant up to 2,500 hectares of private farm land, and 3) to establish 37 sectoral nurseries. Project activities began April 1984. Most of the above output targets were accomplished by the end of the third year of the project life.

A midterm evaluation took place in October and November 1986. The evaluation team criticized indefinite statements of project goals, objectives or purposes in the Subproject Paper and the Project Agreement. The evaluation team proposed the project logical framework (Attachment 1) which was compiled of existing project documents in order for any future project

evaluation to have a clear perspective of the project. The evaluation report also criticized the lack of a technical management plan for the project's self- sustainability.

In response to the evaluation recommendations, the Director of Forestry established a management plan which laid out detailed activities of the Project Manager, extension officers, extension workers and other project personnel. His plan also included the commercialization of nurseries and cooperation with other USAID-funded projects in the area, e.g. FSRP and RRAM. With regard to training, a soil scientist from FSRP trained and supervised extension agents in agroforestry practices. This contributed to an emphasis on agroforestry activities in the project..

## 2. Current Status:

Most of the project output targets were met prior to the original Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) of September 30, 1987. However, this PACD was extended to September 30, 1988, without additional funding, solely to permit the completion of construction of a house in Butaro. The construction was deferred as a result of a midterm evaluation recommendation to leverage management improvements. Further delay occurred in processing requests for the release of USAID funds under the fixed amount reimbursement (FAR) system. A total life of the USAID project assistance was thus increased to 5 years.

The project is favorably viewed by the GOR, as the President of the Republic strongly supports reforestation efforts. The President visited the project site and stated that it was one of his favorite U.S. funded activities. Project implementation was undertaken by each commune, under the guidance of the Director of Forestry.

The proposed Natural Resources Management Project (696-0129), which is currently in the stage of PP design, will address soil conservation and agroforestry efforts in Ruhengeri Prefecture. These activities will build.

upon the experiences of the USAID-funded projects in the area, including this Communal Afforestation Project. USAID assistance through the NRM Project will be limited in terms of funding, but will help ensure the sustainability of the communal afforestation project, especially in terms of communal efforts in the area of agroforestry extension.

## II. STATUS OF COMPLETION OF PROJECT ELEMENTS

### 1. Technical Assistance

The project agreement called for a short-term (4 months) technical assistance in the area of agroforestry with a budget of \$50,500. However, the unexpected need for funds to cover the costs of nursery workers and casual laborers necessitated the elimination of several items from the budget, including the short-term technical assistance funds. This was of great concern to the midterm evaluation team. However, the project did receive occasional support and assistance from EIA and REDSO/Nairobi.

Between 1984 and October 1986, a total of 3 Peace Corps volunteers provided administration/management assistance to the Project Manager, as well as technical input on nursery extension and agroforestry. The GOR covered the local costs of the volunteers. Although the Subproject Paper called for long-term PCV assistance, the last PCV resigned in October 1986 for personal reasons. The USAID mission then decided against assigning another volunteer to the project.

### 2. Commodities:

According to the Project Agreement, the USAID contribution in this element was to provide 2 vehicles, 5 motorcycles with 2 replacements, and 37 bicycles with 25 replacements. The actual procurement for the project is listed below.

- 1 Toyota Hi Lux Pick-Up
- 4 Yamaha Motorcycles
- 24 bicycles

A Hi-Lux Pick-Up was selected by the Project Manager instead of two vehicles equivalent to Land Rover. This purchase used almost all the funds budgeted for the two vehicles because it was larger but provided better transportation. This pick-up truck was utilized fully throughout the life of the project.

Four motorcycles were purchased instead of five. After the PCV left the project, the fifth motorcycle was considered unnecessary. The purchase of the bicycles was limited to 24, as only 24 extension workers worked on the project.

### 3. Construction:

The project originally proposed to construct five houses and one office. This included 3 houses and 1 office in Cyeru, 1 house in Butaro, and 1 house in Nyamugali.

Construction of the house in Nyamugali was cancelled because an extension officer was never assigned to the commune. The decision not to build this house was supported by the midterm evaluation team.

The office and three houses were built in Cyeru. One house, originally for a Peace Corps volunteer, has been rented to FSRP since the PCV's departure from the project. This house will continue to be used by USAID for as long as there is a need. One house was occupied by the Project Manager, and the other by the extension officer in the commune.

Construction of one house in Butaro was delayed but finally completed at the end of September 1988. This house has been assigned to the extension officer of the Butaro commune. As already mentioned, the delays in the construction forced three extensions of the PACD.

4. Local Costs:

The original budget for local costs under the USAID contribution was \$273,000. This was increased significantly, as a result of the issuance of Project Implementation Letters No. 4 and No. 7, to \$338,288. A breakdown of expenditures by item is given below:

1. Personnel	RF 23,374,491
2. Training	253,000
3. Commodities	5,647,108
<u>4. Other Costs</u>	<u>1,866,803</u>
Total	RF 31,141,402 = US\$ 329,253.00

The Project Manager was responsible for project accounting. While he was capable of bookkeeping, USAID verification determined that financial papers and documents were not maintained properly.

As a result of the midterm evaluation report, which criticized the inadequacy of training for extension officers and extension agents, the project established a training curriculum which emphasized on-the-job training for all the project personnel. A soil scientist from FSRP assisted in organizing the training and instructing the extension agents. The extension workers assisted farmers with alley cropping of agroforestry trees on selected farms. The farmers were also instructed on intercropping techniques and nursery techniques.

III. SUMMARY CONTRIBUTIONS

1. USAID Contributions:

The USAID contribution of \$500,000 was used primarily to finance local costs and construction. Especially, the local costs took much more funding than anticipated. A breakdown of the total contributions by project element is given below:

1. Technical Assistance	\$ 0
2. Commodities	23,712
3. Construction	138,000
<u>4. Local Costs</u>	<u>338,288</u>
TOTAL	\$ 500,000

2. GOR Contributions:

The GOR contribution was for the payment of salaries, seed procurement and contingencies. The GOR recruited and employed the Project Manager, the two extension officers, 24 extension agents and a cartographer. Because of the budget constraints, the Nyanugali Commune did not receive an extension officer. In this Commune, the Project Manager fulfilled the extension responsibilities.

As a result of the departure of the PCV, the midterm evaluation team recommended that the project recruit an expatriate assistant project manager. However, the GOR opposed this recommendation, since it regarded such an assistance as questioning competence of the Rwandan participation to the project. Nevertheless, project management subsequently improved. In line with the management plan established by the Director of Forestry in response to the midterm evaluation, a weekly reporting system of project activities were established and the bookkeeping was improved.

After the midterm evaluation team criticized the overuse of casual labor, which increased local costs, the project reduced the use of the casual labor and each commune increased UMUGANDA (commune self-help) efforts for tree planting and tending activities.

#### IV. Problems Encountered/Lessons Learned

The Communal Afforestation Project has helped the participating communes and farmers to be aware of the importance of reforestation and to establish their own forestry extension services. As the President of the Republic has strongly supported a reforestation campaign, communal officials and MINAGRI authorities made serious efforts to ensure the success of the project. Although the GOR considers this project favorably, there existed several problems with project management.

1. A logical framework of the project was not clearly established at the time of the project development. The evaluation team explained in its report that the EIA project did not require detailed information for subproject documentation and criticized this noting that it led to difficulties in evaluating the project. The team proposed a logical framework and recommended that the USAID mission issue a Project Implementation Letter (PIL) to adopt the logframe proposal. A PIL for this purpose was never issued. The mission's twice yearly project implementation review focused only on the physical outputs/achievements of the project.

assistance.

However, during the second year of the project, the need for funds to cover nursery workers and casual labor necessitated the elimination of all short-term technical assistance funds. As a result, the project had to depend on TDY assistance from EIA and REDSO's regional forester. In addition, the project received technical collaboration from FSRP for training of extension workers and soil fertility management research activities.

Although the GOR/MINAGRI managed to implement this project without technical assistance, PCV participation or expatriate consultancy throughout the life of the project could have contributed positively to its the overall management.

3. The project depended heavily on casual field labor for tree planting and tending activities, which incurred a significant amount of expense from the local costs element of the USAID contribution. Casual labor was to be for occasional assistance for the nurseries, but not for communal plantings which were to be achieved by applying UMUGANDA. The project ceased to employ casual labor after the midterm evaluation and the three communes significantly increased UMUGANDA efforts for reforestation.

Another unexpected expense was for nursery workers. While the original plan was for the nursery workers to be self financed through the commercialization of the nurseries, they continued to be financed by the project until September 30, 1987 when MINAGRI took over the responsibility of paying the salaries.

4. A reforestation demonstration plot with a small nursery was established near the project office in Cyeru. While this was not planned in the project paper, it proved to be a very valuable addition to the project. The demonstration plot provided a center point for extension activities for Cyeru. It also permitted trials of forestry and groundcover species of proven qualities in a field setting without the risk of on-farm failure.

**Attachment 1: Goal and Purpose for a Logical Framework of the Subproject as proposed by the Midterm Evaluation Team**

**Subproject Goal:**

The goal is to address the problems being caused by the impending scarcity of wood in the communes of Cyeru, Butaro and Nyamugali by encouraging the improvement of soil quality, the provision of fuelwood and the augmentation of income.

**Subproject Purpose:**

The project purpose is to establish a forestry extension system in three communes, based upon the forestry extension system developed by the Swiss funded Projet Pilote Forestiere, and utilizing the agroforestry research and field trials of the German funded Nyabisindu Project, as well as the Farming Systems Research Project (FSRP).

**End of Subproject Status:**

1. Increased planting of trees in communal or GOR owned woodlots and roadside plantings;
2. Improved management and exploitation of existing and new woodlots and roadside plantings; and,
3. Planting of agroforestry species on farmers' fields and the planting of on-farm woodlots encouraged.

---

Note: The midterm evaluation's logframe proposal was never officially adopted for the project.

## Attachment 2: Types of Tree Seedlings produced in Nurseries

<u>Name</u>	<u>Uses</u>
Eucalyptus saligna	Woodlot
Eucalyptus maideni	Woodlot
Cupressus	Woodlot
Pinus patula	Woodlot
Callitris	Woodlot
Albizzia	Woodlot/agrofor.
Avocado	Agrofor./fruit
Guava	Agrofor./fruit
Maracouja	Agrofor./fruit
Aberia caffra	Agrofor./fruit-fence
Pruniers	Agrofor./fruit
Grevillia	Agrofor./timber
Cedrella	Agrofor./timber
Marsipposis	Agrofor./timber
Acacia melanoxylon	Agrofor./pasture imp.
Leuceana	Agrofor./soil-fodder
Filao	Agrofor./woodlot/soil conserv.
Sesbania	Agrofor./soil-fodder
Markhamia	Agrofor./soil conserv.

Attachment 3: References

1. "Limited Scope Grant Project Agreement between the United States of America, acting through the Agency for International Development, and the Republic of Rwanda," August 31, 1983.
2. "Energy Initiatives for Africa (698-0424), Sub-Project, Commune Afforestation and Farm Tree Planting in the Sub-Prefecture of Buberuka, Rubengeri Prefecture, Rwanda," approved by AID Representative on September 19, 1983.
3. "Mid-Term Evaluation for the Communal Afforestation Project (AID Project 698-0424.001), October - November 1986.
4. "Plan de Travail Annuel Revise du Projet de Reboisement: Cyeru-Nyamugali-Butaro," Pheneas Biroli (Director of Forestry, MINAGRI), MINAGRI, March 1987.
5. "Visit of K. Openshaw to the Farm Tree Planting Project (FTPP) Kirambo Rwanda," Keith Openshaw, April 20, 1987.
6. "Rapport Semestriel, Exercice 1987," Projet de Reboisement: Cyeru-Butaro-Nyamugali, submitted by Evariste Dusenge (Project Manager) on August 4, 1987.
7. "Rapport Annuel, Exercice 1987," Projet de Reboisement: Cyeru-Butaro-Nyamugali, submitted by Evariste Dusenge on January 15, 1988.