

CLASSIFICATION  
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Control  
Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE <b>Gituza Forestry Project</b>			2. PROJECT NUMBER <b>698-0502.96</b>	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE <b>USAID/Rwanda</b>
			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>n/a</u>	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES		6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>85</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>89</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>89</u>	A. Total \$ <u>N/A</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>5/86</u>
			B. U.S. \$ <u>2,500,000</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>6/88</u>
Date of Evaluation Review				

B. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR		
A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Finalize a detailed proposal for the second phase beginning October 1989 and secure the necessary funding for the phase.	PCC	To be determined by CARE
2. Establish a strategy to protect the existing forest plantations from fire.	PCC	
3. Assist the Rwandan government in developing a sound forestry management plan and financial strategy in order to maximize the benefits from the 2,391 hectares which have been planted to date.	PCC	
4. Encourage, through training and appropriate supervision, more active participation by extension staff in designing and evaluating household-tailored agroforestry interventions.	PCC	
5. Increase intensive extension input to female farmers and lesser advantaged and more remote farmers.	PCC	
6. Clearly define strategies for rural, as opposed to urban, stove strategies.	PCC	
(continued on Page 2)		

8. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	A. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change	
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T		B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or	
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P		C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project	

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)		12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
Paul R. Crawford, ADO, USAID/Rwanda Yasuyo Tadokoro, PO, USAID/Rwanda		Signature <i>James A. Graham</i>	
		Typed Name James A. Graham, USAID Director	
		Date <i>Mar 31, 89</i>	

CLASSIFICATION  
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) -- PART I

Report Control  
Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)		
<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION		
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY _____ B. Final Obligation Expected FY _____ C. Final Input Delivery FY _____	A. Total \$ _____ B. U.S. \$ _____	From (month/yr.) _____ To (month/yr.) _____ Date of Evaluation Review _____

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR		
A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
7. Finance a survey of cookstove sales and marketing in urban areas, namely Kigali, Butare and Gisenyi, prior to embarking further on privatization.	PCC	} To be determined by CARE
8. Related to Para 7 above, delay the relocation of ACERG (Atelier de Ceramique et d'Energie Renouvelable de Gituza - The Care Gituza stove production facility) until a thorough survey of the market for improved stoves has been conducted, and until the ACERG producer is fully committed to the relocation.	PCC	
9. Ensure that there is no undue duplication of efforts in the field of improved charcoal stoves and ensure that CARE's program is not overwhelmed by the UNDP/World Bank Project.	PCC	
<p>Note: The PCC (Project Coordination Committee) is composed of representatives of Gituza Commune, the Forestry Services of MINAGRI, CARE and USAID/Rwanda.</p>		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS <table style="width: 100%; font-size: small;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____											
11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval Signature _____ Typed Name _____ Date _____												

2

**13. Evaluation Abstract:**

The project shows an excellent record of target achievement, a high standard of quality of work and effective internal managerial organization. The achievements merit and require further inputs and new instruments to secure the sustainability and the multiplier effects of the invested resources.

The project's main focus should turn to improved information and communication, expanded agroforestry inputs and closer cooperation with the authorities and development partners. A proposal for the second project phase up to 1993 should be finalized. It should also address the high fire risk of the plantations and further silvicultural refinement of the established forests.

**14. Evaluation Methodology:**

The final evaluation of the CARE Gituza Forestry Project took place in Kigali and Gituza from July 24 through August 2, 1988. This evaluation was held 12 months before the project completion date of September 1989, as opposed to within six months of the project completion date as specified in the Grant Agreement. This was for several reasons. One consideration was that evaluation planning was already underway when CARE learned that the PACD had been extended by one year. CARE also wanted the timing of the evaluation to coincide with the end of the planting season, in order to use any lessons learned from the evaluation in the transition from USAID to the Royal Dutch Government financing for the second phase, which will begin in October 1989.

The evaluation began in Kigali with a discussion of the project components, economic development philosophy, and evaluation methodology. A collaborative approach was used. The team leader was able to foster a spirit of cooperation and respectful exchange among all participants, including the bourgemestre of Commune Gituza, the Government of Rwanda (GOR) officials and local residents. To gather data, the team reviewed project documents, interviewed project managers and staff, and conducted a survey of 40 farm families. Rwandan students were recruited to assist in the interview.

The six-member evaluation team was composed of the following members:

Andreas Speich (Team Leader)  
Conservator of Forests  
City of Zurich, Switzerland

Nyiaramatama Zaina  
Social Development Specialist  
UNICEF/Rwanda  
Kigali, Rwanda

Louise Buck  
Regional Technical Advisor  
CARE East Africa  
Nairobi, Kenya

Mike Bess  
Private Energy Consultant  
Nairobi, Kenya

Jeffrey Livingston  
Natural Resource Economist  
c/o Lous Berger  
Paris, France

Dan Rugabira  
Delegate  
Directorate General of Forestry  
MINAGRI, Rwanda

Renee Harris Yates, Economist and Development Specialist, from Washington, D.C., also participated in the evaluation as a USAID observer.

## 15. Findings and Recommendations:

### (1) Project Administration

The overall project expenditures from funds managed by CARE from November 1984 through June 1988 amounted to FRW 222.7 million or US\$ 2,558,750. In addition, the project received contributions in kind (CIKs) valued at FRW 4,095,000 or US\$ 43,179. The CIKs combined with the contributions from CARE and the Royal Dutch Government of FRW 22.3 million (US\$ 250,843) represent a share of about 11.5% of the total project costs to date.

Of the overall project expenditures managed by CARE, 24% was related to the expatriate inputs; 13% was for salaries for Rwandan project and support staff; 23% for local temporary labor; 9% for long term infrastructure, such as offices and staff housing; 16% for the purchase of production materials and equipment; and 13% for operation and other support costs.

The financial resources at hand can be considered quite adequate. The chosen mode of project management resulted in excellent operational effectiveness. The administrative support and follow-up to all the components was adequate and timely. The project coordination committee meetings have developed positively.

The project has been successful in developing manpower, leadership and managerial capacity of the project staff. It appears likely that certain activities can soon be effectively managed without expatriate supervision.

### (2) Beneficiaries

The major beneficiaries of the project are Gituza Commune residents. The short-term benefits to the residents of Gituza Commune have been substantial; about US\$ 450,000 were spent for local manual labor over the first four years of the project, benefitting about 35,000 people. The result has been an improved quality of life for the Gituza residents. The agroforestry extension activities and the research and trial schemes are of high standard.

The Project Agreement between CARE and the GOR and other project documents explicitly specify the importance of creating local, salaried job opportunities. The influx into the local economy from the project was unique in the history of Gituza Commune.

### (3) Project Achievements

The evaluation team's conclusion is that the two project components (Reforestation and Agroforestry) have been successful in achieving planting targets and in farmer acceptance of the techniques advocated by the project. About 2,500 hectares of trees are now growing where bald hills loomed only three years ago. A central nursery was established and 8 existing nurseries were upgraded under the agroforestry component by improving management and adding demonstration plots. They were guarded, well-maintained and organized with clearly marked plant species. The commune residents show real pride in the trees and nurseries. Their value to the commune is reflected in the special care given to protection and maintenance.

H

An important finding of the financial analysis is that the plantations will not attain a positive cash flow until the year 16. Until that time, the Commune of Gituza will be unable to finance tending, harvesting and replanting costs using solely locally generated revenues. The analysis emphasizes that recurrent costs will not be met without outside financial assistance until midway through the first 30 year rotation. Potential revenue from the sale of seeds from the commercialized nurseries will not significantly defray these costs.

The Energy Conservation Component is considered one of the best examples of conscientious flexible stove development in West Africa. The program has succeeded in selling over two thousand charcoal stoves in over a year and selling some 800 improved woodstoves and installing a further 500. The rural cookstoves program under this component has been successful in introducing improved household energy management to hundreds of housewives in Gituza and surrounding communes. Follow-up and monitoring of installed stoves are satisfactory.

#### (4) Summary of Recommendations

The team's recommendations center on maintenance, fire prevention and financial sustainability of the nurseries and 2,500 hectares of trees, and additional participation by women and other less advantaged persons. Options are recommended for financing future recurrent costs of the established plantations, in view of the negative cash flow projections over the first 15 years of the project life. The New Forestry Code of the Government of Rwanda should be taken into account. Upon adoption of the new code, a decision on the legal status of the plantations must be quickly reached to permit formulation of a long term financial plan.

#### (5) Lessons Learned

Although the project showed a remarkable success in reaching its targets in the reforestation and agroforestry components, rates of agroforestry adoption varies significantly by sector, from 20% in one sector to 60% in another. The evaluation team discovered the following constraints to adoption:

- 1) Some nurseries are too far away from the farmers' homes, and transportation of seedlings is a problem.
- 2) The increase in the price of plants resulting from the nursery commercialization strategy has made them too expensive for some farmers to purchase.
- 3) Farmers prefer not to plant trees in fields.
- 4) The attitude of some leaders among local farmers is not cooperative. They would like to be paid and are jealous of extension agents who receive much better salaries. They can negatively influence farmers.

Forestry projects, in general, currently face a number of difficulties in terms of the perception of their impact among the local population. In order to secure a long term positive impact, the projects have to be adapted and managed carefully, according to varied and complex local socio-ecological conditions. One of the main positive impacts of the Reforestation Component of the Gituza Forestry Project is the successful creation of an excellent opportunity to develop and improve the locally required silvicultural knowledge during the decades ahead. A more varied design of the plantations might further broaden the opportunities to draw useful lessons for the future, hence increasing the chances of finding silvicultural solutions that match the needs.

The original objective of the Energy Conservation Component was to improve household energy management. However, the component's priority was shifted to develop a model stove program for rural and urban Rwanda. At the early stage of program implementation, it was learned that improved cookstoves would reduce household energy consumption and thus reduce per capita demand for fuel. Since then, the project has been formally targeted towards energy conservation through improved stoves, rather than improved household energy management.

In terms of cookstove marketing, the urban charcoal stove market has proven much easier to penetrate than the rural woodstoves market. Strategies adopted to disseminate improved stoves in rural areas require much more intensive attention and follow-up than those adopted for urban areas.

6



Aide au Développement

CARE INTERNATIONAL AU RWANDA

B. P. 550, KIGALI, RWANDA • RUE DU LAC MPANGA

• Tél. : 72402/76012 • Cable: CARERWANDA KIGALI

No. RW/89/1136

January 13th, 1989

Mr. James A. Graham  
Director of USAID  
c/o American Embassy  
Kigali

Subject: Gituza Forestry Project Evaluation Comments

Dear Mr. Graham,

We would like to share with you the enclosed comments on the final evaluation of the Gituza Forestry Project as a follow-up to the evaluation report recently submitted for your perusal. They have been drawn up by project management in answer to what are felt to be a few apparently incorrect assumptions and to put some findings of the report into better perspective.

Sincerely yours,

  
Christof J. Scheiffele  
Director

Attachment: a/s

CARE INTERNATIONAL IN RWANDA

GITUZA FORESTRY PROJECT

COMMENTS ON THE FINAL FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION OF AUGUST 1988

The Project Management of the Gituza Forestry Project finds the final evaluation a thorough and highly professional piece of work that certainly highlights the state of project development and provides good coverage on the successes and the shortfalls of the project. There are, however, several inaccuracies and general comments that would have been more useful if the evaluation team had submitted a draft to the Directorate General of Forests, CARE and others prior to finalizing the evaluation report. The project management staff therefore feels obligated to respond to some factual errors in the report which in fact reduce the evaluation's overall validity.

A. General Remarks

The evaluation report is most often thorough but too long. The sections on Reforestation and Agroforestry (both 30 pages) should have been better synthesized. Also a summary listing of major findings and recommendations would have been helpful for quick review. Only the Energy section provides succinct and manageable levels of recommendations. In addition the level of human and financial effort required to address the exhaustive list of recommendations is unrealistic which suggests the team should have suggested more carefully prioritized followup actions. In view of the downscaling of personnel it will be very difficult for the project to commence with new initiatives, unless others will be reduced or eliminated. The report does not mention that about 25% of the originally programmed resources were removed from project management, i.e. over \$400,000 from World Food Program and \$500,000 from AID, and what impact that may have had on project performance (even though a fifth year at no extra cost was nevertheless achieved).

B. Remarks on Reforestation Section

1. The document puts forward on p. 9, section 2.2 that substantial modification of the reforestation objectives occurred during the life of the project. The reforestation target initially set at 3,600 ha dropped to 2,350 as mentioned in the Revised Action Plan in October 1986. However the mission did not take in consideration the 1,630 ha planting target mentioned in the Revised Action Plan in August 1987.

2. Also on p. 9 the report gives to understand the project did not try the introduction of indigenous species and other broadleaves. During the first two years of the project over 200,000 units of indigenous species local to Gituza were propagated. Survival rates, however, were low but these species were nevertheless tried repeatedly.

3. p. 10- The project's soil conservation activities like contouring of all reforestation sites, micro-terraces using slope-variable spacing and site-species indexing were fully compatible with Weber's suggestions and not ignored as indicated. At present there are few or no active gullies, the reforestation has significantly slowed run-off and

therefore the project felt it was not necessary to install the peak stage run-off gauges as suggested. In addition these are expensive and time consuming instruments which would have required further extension of staff.

C. Remarks on Agroforestry Section

1. The statement on p. 34 as "A second, related point of concern is the project's strong extension emphasis on project-promoted technologies, virtually at the exclusion of indigenous or "pre-project" agroforestry practices" is an inaccurate description of interventions promulgated by the project. The project built on existing practices and the Gibson-Müller report documented a 21% and 10% increase in boundary plantings and fruit trees (both indigenous activities) respectively. Farmers are free to choose their plants at the sector nursery and to adopt whatever configuration they want. Naturally woodlots logically decreased due to reduction of allowable space but those woodlots instituted under project support behaved much better using project-proposed species and planting techniques.

2. On the same page (para. a.) the report states the project should during the next year and beyond put priority on institutional strengthening and support at all levels within the agroforestry extension network. The project wants to emphasize that the Agroforestry Extension Director was the Commune's Agronome for the first two years and after this time has been fully attached to the project and also remained attached to MINAGRI (paid by MINAGRI) and thus is very aware and familiar with the objectives, programs and operating constraints of all departments within MINAGRI working in Gituza. The senior project staff is also regularly attending meetings at the communal level where these previous items are intensively discussed. In addition the 8 extension agents (MONIFORS) are also working for and paid by MINAGRI. Furthermore the notion that the Bourgemestre should actively be involved in agroforestry extension belittles his other time consuming and, to him, more important tasks. Support at Sector and Cellule level is much more important.

3. p. 34, para. c.- The project sought from the beginning a balance between men and women in extension, however the project's attempt to recruit fifty percent female extension workers failed because no sufficiently qualified candidates applied. Due to the generally low education level in the Commune it was extremely difficult to find qualified candidates for extension workers. The project has trained a total of 15 Monifors and not 8 (see p. 38) and chose the best for permanent assignment. From the original 12 Monifors hired 5 were woman; one of these was better suited for a leadership role in the Central Nursery, two were unsuccessfully used as Monifors in the sectors and two left the project on their own after starting families and so later on did the one who was responsible for the nursery.

4. Farmers chosen for intensive visits were selected by the project staff on a rotating basis. In four years, for each of the 8 Sectors, 4 pilot zones have been chosen for intensive extension contact with the farmers. There was never a predilection towards progressive farmers (see p. 48 para.3). During the 1986/87 seasons the intensive extension service was concentrating on families adjacent to the plantations and on

those far away from the sector nurseries. The objective was to bring compensation/indemnization for any perceived losses to the families living next to the plantation sites, and the project at the same time had the intention to reach the lesser advantaged households in the remoter cellules. Consequently this activity fully agreed with the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation .

5. In addition to comments already made in no.1 above, the statement "project grading system effectively negates the value of traditional or pre-project activities and opportunity for effective interaction with farmers" is very unclear because the project's follow-up forms and visits specifically dealt with these indigenous forms of tree management (woodlots and grevillea boundary plantings).

6. p. 45 section 3.4.1 - The report mentions the lack of collection of information periodically throughout the project by a social scientist for measuring social impact. At the time of the evaluation, however, data on Umuganda was available because during the first 18 months of the project Umuganda in sector nurseries was tracked very carefully. In fact the data was so pointed and depressing that the Bourgemestre suggested alternative forms of labor, one of which (a split: project/MINAGRI) was adopted. Differentiation of participation by sex began in 1986 and information on this was available to the evaluation team had they asked.

7. p 48, para. 3- The statement " considerably reduced emphasis on indigenous species " is misleading. Pre-project home nurseries were producing very limited quantities of Markhamia. In addition the project propagated this species as well Sesbania and Maesopsis in considerable quantities in sector and central nurseries. There was a taboo against either planting or cutting Erythrina and Ficus was not requested by the farmers during any of the surveys and appears to be disregarded due to its prevalence in the past by Tutsis for live corral fencing.

8. p. 50- " If Monifors are correct in their current estimated adoption rate of 30%, little progress has occurred during the past two years. " It would appear the team felt that the progress made on changing tree-planting practices was inadequate for a 3 year period although the statistics provided at the bottom of the page do not support this finding. The team is explaining here why things did not work instead of emphasizing what did. However, the team, considerably experienced in this area, failed to provide alternative methods for data collection for impact and performance.

9. Records do exist for progress toward cost-recovery on commercial seedlings (p.51, para. 3.4.4.1). Furthermore the report neglected to mention that this was the first time in Rwanda that seedlings were sold to the farmers and that this nursery commercialization was occurring in an area that was the least likely. In spite of this, the project has moved a long way with nearly 50% recovery now in hand. After 20 years of free seedlings this is a major but understated accomplishment.

Gituza, January 12, 1989

Jacques De Cuyper  
Project Manager Gituza Forestry Project

10

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 11, 1988

TO: Emerson J. Melaven, USAID Director  
Jim Graham, USAID Director (in-consulting)  
Barbara D. Howard, PRM

FROM: Renée H. Yates, PDO Consultant *RHY*

SUBJECT: Observations of CARE Gituza Forestry Project Evaluation

The final evaluation of the CARE Gituza Forestry Project took place in Kigali and Gituza from July 24 - August 2, 1988. This evaluation was held 12 months before the end of the project in September 1989, as opposed to within six months of the project completion date as specified in the grant agreement, for several reasons. One consideration was that evaluation planning was already well underway when CARE learned that AID had extended the PACD by one year. CARE also wanted the evaluation timing to coincide with the end of the planting season, in order to use any lessons learned from the evaluation in the transition from USAID to Dutch financing during a second phase. CARE is prepared to update the "final" report as necessary to take into account any significant developments during the last months of AID financing.

The six-member evaluation team was headed by Mr. Andreas Speich, a Forestry Specialist from Switzerland. The other team members were: Louise Buck, Agro-forestry Specialist from CARE's office in Nairobi; Zaina Nyiramatama, a Social Development Specialist now with UNICEF in Kigali; Ian Rugabira, a representative of the Rwandan Ministry of Agriculture; and Geoffrey Livingston, a Natural Resource Economist from Louis Berger, Paris. I participated as the USAID observer.

The evaluation began in Kigali with a discussion of the project components, the team leader's economic development philosophy, and evaluation methodology. ~~The energy conservation component will be evaluated separately in late August and was not discussed.~~ Each team member was competent, conscientious and serious about determining the activity's impact on Rwandan beneficiaries. ~~The team leader showed a particular interest in how the project affects Rwandan farm families.~~ A collaborative approach was used. The team leader was able to foster a spirit of cooperation and respectful exchange among all participants, including the "bourgemestre," Rwandan officers and local residents. To gather data, the team reviewed project documents, interviewed project managers and others, and conducted a survey of 40 farm families. Vacationing Rwandan students were recruited and trained to interview the farmers. The team proved very effective in gathering a maximum of data in the shortest possible time.

*Good. Instruct*

As participant observer, I discussed the project with each team member, the CARE Director, the project managers and the Rwandan staff at Kigali and Gituza. I participated in key meetings and travelled to the project site in Prefecture Byumba, Gituza, about 30-40 minutes from the Gabiro Lodge. Dan Rugabira, GOR representative from the Forestry Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, and Zaina Nyiramatama, Rwandan Social Scientist consultant were important sources of information. While in Gituza I visited plantation sites, two nurseries, and a farm family.

### Visible Progress

About 2,500 hectares of trees are now growing where bald hills loomed only three years ago. A central nursery was established and 8 existing nurseries were up-graded under the agroforestry component. The nurseries had been up-graded by improving management and adding demonstration plots; they were guarded, well-maintained and organized with clearly marked plant species. The Rwandans show real pride in the trees and nurseries. Their value to the Commune is reflected in the special care given to protection and maintenance.

### Management

Overall project management is very strong. The CARE/Rwanda organization runs smoothly and efficiently. Project documents were quickly and easily retrieved from files in both Kigali and Gituza. Vehicle maintenance records were kept up-to-date and administrative matters were handled expeditiously. Rwandan project staff were well informed of their responsibilities and seemed satisfied with their professional treatment as employees.

One cost-related concern was raised by the team in view of the fact that approximately 50% of the project budget went to indirect costs, i.e. overhead and Kigali office support. The expatriate project staff maintained two houses, in Kigali and Gituza, commuting between houses at least once a week. When asked why such frequent trips were necessary after adequate residential housing had been completed at Gituza, the need to use the computer in Kigali was given as the reason. (There is no electricity in Gituza.) Use of a short-wave radio was considered inadequate to meet the project's communication requirements. The evaluation team will make recommendations for future savings in this area.

### Relationships with GOR and USAID

CARE personnel generally enjoy good relationships with the GOR. On balance, the GOR representatives have seen the benefits of the activity and cooperated in the pursue of its goals. Relationships with USAID have not gone as smoothly. Communication on project implementation and other matters has been difficult over the last two years; processing of USAID-related implementation actions has been an on-going problem. CARE management attributes this situation in part to the fact that a USAID project manager has visited the project site only once during a 4-year period. As a consequence, USAID was unable to appreciate fully the project's accomplishments.

125

### Findings and Recommendations

The evaluation report will be ready in September. The team's preliminary conclusion is that the two (reforestation and agro-forestry) project components have been successful in achieving planting targets and in farmer acceptance of the techniques advocated by the project. The short-term benefits to the residents of Gituza Commune have been substantial; about 450,000 dollars were spent for local manual labor over the first four years of the project, benefiting about 35,000 people. The result has been an improved quality of life for the Gituza residents.

### Sustainability

An important finding of the financial analysis is that the plantations will not attain a positive cash flow until year 16. (This situation is average for LDC forestry investments that provide commercial timber.) Until that time, the Commune of Gituza will be unable to finance tending, harvesting and replanting costs using solely locally generated revenues. The analysis emphasizes that "recurrent costs will not be met without outside financial assistance until midway through the first 30 year rotation." Potential revenue from the sale of seeds from the commercialized nurseries will not defray significantly these costs.

The team's recommendations will center on maintenance, fire prevention and financial sustainability of the nurseries and 2,500 hectares of trees. Options will be recommended for financing recurrent costs, in view of the negative cash flow projections over the first 15 years of the project life. The new GOR Forestry Code will be taken into account.

A study of the future demand for forestry products in Rwanda and the long-term benefits of increased agricultural productivity and the value of wood products will also be recommended. Such a study would provide marketing details, defining thinning schedules and give a clearer idea of potential revenues.

### Future Role of USAID

USAID funding will end in September 1989. The Dutch have already committed to financing a 4-year second phase to facilitate the transfer of project management and financing to local control. Nonetheless, the GOR will face nine years of negative cash flow before the plantations begin to pay off. Conservative estimates of the yearly recurrent costs are about \$150,000. In order to ensure the sound plantation management necessary to derive maximum benefits from AID's original \$2.5 million investment, USAID may want to consider financing some of these recurrent costs. USAID financing could also be useful for the recommended forestry product demand study, perhaps as part of the Natural Resource Management Project.

13

Mr. Andreas Speich and Geoffrey Livingston would be excellent consultants for this work. Their addresses are:

- Andreas Speich  
Conservator of Forests  
City of Zurich  
Werdmuhle Platz 3  
CH 8023 ZURICH  
Office Tel: 012162775  
Telex: 813 077 ST ZH
- Geoffrey Livingston  
Louis Berger SARL  
71 Rue Fondary  
75015, Paris

I enjoyed working with the CARE evaluation team and consider AID's money to have been well spent.

cc: Christof J. Scheiffele  
Director, CARE/Rwanda