

# Governance, Human Rights and Reconciliation Program in Rwanda

## Key results:


















The governance, human rights and reconciliation program is designed to help the Government of Rwanda and CSOs to lay foundations for an evolving governance, human rights and reconciliation portfolio within the Danish partnership with Rwanda. Achievable results will evolve around: (i) Citizens and CSOs have actively and meaningfully participated in governance and accountability dialogue for climate-resilient local growth, (ii) Improvement of delivery and access to justice services in Rwanda and (iii) A cohesive, resilient, and inclusive society has been obtained through community-based and integrated approaches to healing, livelihoods, civic participation, and conflict resolution mechanisms.

## Justification for support:

- Response to challenges related to governance, human rights and reconciliation.
- Based on the long-term international engagement to enhance citizen participation in service delivery and supporting an active citizenry around local governance.
- Direct relation to poverty alleviation and particular enhancement of socio-economic rights.

## Major risks and challenges:

- Political will from the Government of Rwanda to allow Denmark's engagement in the sector of Human Rights and Governance changes.
- Political/Cross-border insecurities that can spark ethnic tensions with spillovers and similarities to the conflict that resulted in the Genocide, which can influence funding decisions and create changes in the choice of partners.
- Human rights violations increase, which can affect the security of partners and Danish Embassy staff.
- Changing requirements for NGOs or international actors in Rwanda.
- Denmark is associated with a legitimization of Rwanda's government's actions.
- Regional conflicts spurring ethnic cleansing and keeping the country at security risk impacting the program delivery
- Justice facing backlog and formal system being overburdened in several respects, the program might contribute to a little percentage

File No.	25/34722				
Country	Rwanda				
Responsible Unit	Embassy of Denmark				
Sector	15160 (Governance and Human rights)				
Partner	4 partner organisations				
	DKK million	2025	2026	2027	2028
Commitment		15,0	27,5		
Project disbursement		7,8	16,5	15,2	3,0
	2025 – 2028 (34 months)				
Finance Act code	06.32.01.28.				
Head of unit	Casper Stenger Jensen				
Desk officer	Peter Eilschow Olesen				
Reviewed by CFO	YES: Peter Sylvest Halkjær				
Relevant SDGs <i>[Maximum 5 – highlight with grey]</i>					
					
No Poverty	No Hunger	Good Health, Wellbeing	Quality Education	Gender Equality	Clean Water, Sanitation
					
Affordable Clean Energy	Decent Jobs, Econ. Growth	Industry, Innovation, Infrastructure	Reduced Inequalities	Sustainable Cities, Communities	Responsible Consumption & Production
					
Climate Action	Life below Water	Life on Land	Peace & Justice, strong Institutions	Partnerships for Goals	

## Objective:

The programme aims to promote and support the strengthening of good governance, human rights and citizen engagement with an emphasis on accountability and transparency. This will be achieved through a broader goal of the partnership which is “to ensure the overall objective of a *greener, more democratic and socially cohesive Rwanda*”.

## Environment and climate tagging - Principal objective (100%); Significant objective (50%)

	Climate adaptation	Climate mitigation	Biodiversity	Other green/environment
<b>Indicate 0, 50% or 100%</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Total green budget (DKK)</b>	0	0	0	0

## Justification for choice of partner:

The choice of the partners has been informed by consultations with sector stakeholders and based on the expertise and long-term experience of the partners in the specific focus area. All selected partners have more than 5 years of relevant experience in the field and their degree of internal capacity is assessed to be satisfactorily.

## Summary:

The programme engages in the areas of citizen participation in local development, access to justice services, monitoring of human rights and reconciliation efforts following the genocide against the Tutsi. The focus areas have been chosen where results can be anticipated and considering the strategic alignment between Danish and Rwandan priorities and while underscoring human rights as a basic principle for Denmark's development cooperation.

## Budget:

Outcome	Partner	DKK	%
Outcome 1: Citizens and CSOs have participated in governance, accountability dialogue for climate-resilient local growth.	Norwegian Peoples Aid / TI Rwanda	19,000,000	44.7
Outcome 2.a: Improvement in delivery and access to justice	Legal Aid Forum	6,500,000	15.3
Outcome 2.b: NHCR fulfils its mandate to promote and protect human rights in conjunction with state and non-state actors and regional and int. bodies.	Danish Institute for Human Rights	10,000,000	23.5
Outcome 3: Obtained a cohesive, resilient and inclusive society through community-based and integrated approaches to societal healing.	Interpeace	6,200,000	14.6
Reviews		800,000	1.9
<b>Grand total</b>		<b>42,500,000</b>	<b>100</b>

**Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
of Denmark**

**DANIDA**

**Programme Document  
Governance, Human Rights and Reconciliation  
in Rwanda  
2025-2028**

**1 October 2025**

**Ref no 25/34722**

## List of Abbreviations

CBO	Community based organisation
CSO	Civil society organisation
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
GANHRI	Global Alliance of National Human rights Institutions
ILPD	Institute of Legal Practice and Development
JAP	Justice and Accountability Programme (EU)
NST1	National Strategy for Transformation 1
NST2	National Strategy for Transformation 2
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission
RGB	Rwanda Governance Board
PPIMA	Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy
ToR	Terms of Reference
UPR	Universal Periodic Review

# TABLE OF CONTENT

<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. CONTEXT AND STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1. Governance, human rights and reconciliation context.....	2
2.2. Strategic alignment .....	4
<b>3. JUSTIFICATION AND RATIONALE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1. Justification for outcomes and partnerships.....	6
3.2. Other international support .....	9
3.3. Lessons from ongoing support and international experiences .....	10
3.4. Donor coordination and justification for bilateral programming.....	11
<b>4. PROGRAMME OBJECTIVE.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5. SUMMARY OF RESULTS FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6. INPUTS/BUDGET.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7. INSTITUTIONAL AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>8. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, PLANNING AND REPORTING .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>9. RISK MANAGEMENT.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>10. CLOSURE .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>11. SHORT SUMMARY OF PROJECTS.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: CONTEXT ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>SEE ATTACHED. ....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: PARTNER ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: RESULT FRAMEWORKS .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>PROGRAMME FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>NORWEGIAN PEOPLE’S AID.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>LEGAL AID FORUM.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>DIHR AND NCHR .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>INTERPEACE.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>ANNEX 4: RISK MATRIX.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT. ....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>ANNEX 5: BUDGET DETAILS.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT. ....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>ANNEX 6: LIST OF SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS .....</b>	<b>37</b>

<b>NOT INCLUDED.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>ANNEX 7: COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>NOT INCLUDED.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>ANNEX 8: PROCESS ACTION PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>ANNEX 9.1: QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECK .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>ANNEX 9.2: APPRAISAL RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT .....</b>	<b>37</b>

# 1. Introduction

The present programme document outlines the background, rationale and justification, objectives and management arrangements for development cooperation concerning the Governance, Human Rights and Reconciliation Programme in Rwanda, 2025-2028.

The programme document (PD) follows on from the identification (and scoping) report (March 2025), which has laid the ground, justification and rationale for the formulation of Danish support to governance, human rights and reconciliation in Rwanda.

Denmark is engaged in a targeted partnership with Rwanda and has upgraded its presence in Kigali from a Project Office to an Embassy on 1 August 2025. The partnership has taken the starting point in shared interests such as peace and security, climate change, poverty reduction, forced displacement, irregular migration, and adherence to rule-based international cooperation. In this light, Denmark and Rwanda work together on three themes: climate and environment; asylum and migration; and governance, human rights and reconciliation. The overall objective of the partnership is “to ensure the overall objective of a *greener, more democratic and socially cohesive Rwanda*”<sup>1</sup>.

In the partnership, governance and human rights have been described as complex and challenging, and it has taken some time to identify programmatic elements. An allocation of DKK 15 million is included on the Danish Finance Act for 2025, and a further DKK 27,5 million is planned for 2026. The programme covers a period of 34 months up to the mid-2028, noting that the engagements focusing on governance, human rights and reconciliation need longer time frames to deliver meaningful results. The original plan of the Danish Project Office in Kigali was to identify and formulate “*one or more project proposals*”. After some considerations it was decided that the formulation would include a programme framing. This PD therefore sets a programmatic foundation for an evolving governance, human rights and reconciliation portfolio within the Danish partnership with Rwanda.

Overall, the approach has been to formulate engagements based on realistic options, and identify entry points, which provide tangible benefits to the population, while also standing firm on engaging in areas of critical and foundational civil and political rights. The overall objective is to *Promote and support the strengthening of good governance, human rights and citizen engagement with an emphasis on accountability and transparency*<sup>1</sup>.

The programme envisages 3 outcomes:

- 1) More inclusive, effective, efficient and accountable local policy responses, service delivery and climate resilient local growth have benefitted citizens.
- 2) Improving access to justice services and monitoring of human rights under the Constitution.
- 3) Deepening healing, strengthening livelihoods and civic engagement for effective reintegration and social cohesion in resilient communities.

The identification mission and subsequent formulation mission has identified four partnerships with the following organisations: 1) The Norwegian People’s Aid (NPA) working with Transparency International Rwanda (TI-RW) (Outcome 1); 2) The Legal Aid Forum (LAF) (Outcome 2); 3) The National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR) in partnership with the Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) (Outcome 2), and 4) Interpeace (Outcome 3).

---

<sup>1</sup> MFA: Rwanda, Draft Framework Document (2023).

## 2. Context and strategic considerations

### 2.1. Governance, human rights and reconciliation context

Rwanda's human rights and governance landscape is characterized by a **juxtaposition of economic progress and stringent political control**. In July 2024, Rwanda conducted presidential and legislative elections. Incumbent President Paul Kagame was re-elected for a fourth term with 99.18% of the votes and a reported 98.2% voter turnout, facing little opposition and delivering largely expected results. The ruling party Rwanda Patriotic Front retained its parliamentary majority. The outcome mirrored the previous presidential and legislative elections of 2017 and 2018.

The country faces a complex landscape in terms of governance and human rights, deeply influenced by its historical context—particularly the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi—and the government's subsequent state-building initiatives. The Genocide remains a central reference point in Rwanda's discussions around governance and human rights, with strict political controls framed as essential for preventing a resurgence of ethnic divisions and conflict. Nonetheless, while the historical context is significant, reports from organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch indicate that concerns persist regarding issues like freedom of expression and association, fair trial rights, and allegations of torture and enforced disappearances of political opponents. Human rights violations cannot be justified, even when considered against this complex backdrop.

Rwanda's governance model prioritizes stability, economic development, and service delivery. This position comes at the expense of political freedoms and civil liberties, leading to a complex and often contentious human rights environment. The government prioritizes **socio-economic rights**, ensuring access to public services and promoting poverty reduction policies, using a performance driven approach. Public participation is encouraged in service delivery, but within government-defined frameworks rather than independent citizen-led initiatives. Corruption levels are low, and Rwanda has a strong reputation for good financial governance. Civil society organisations (CSO) working in service delivery (education, health, social welfare) face fewer restrictions than others in the civil society landscape.

There continue to be notable limitations on media freedom and the activities of opposition parties. Civil and political rights are subject to strict regulation, and while legal reforms affecting media and civil society organizations were introduced in 2013, 2015, and 2024, in practice, their ability to play a meaningful role in promoting and externally monitoring human rights and governance is often constrained. Investigative journalists—particularly those addressing sensitive topics—may encounter harassment, threats, and, in rare instances, suspicious deaths. As a result, organizations sometimes opt for self-censorship as a precaution against possible government reprisals. In addition to restrictive legislation, they also contend with bureaucratic obstacles and an environment that can feel intimidating.

Civil society organisations rely heavily on international funding, which is scarce, and their programmatic focus shifts frequently depending on donor priorities. This results in high staff turnover and weak institutional continuity. Community-based organizations (CBOs) seem to lack capacity and strong linkages with urban-based CSOs, and their relationships are often transactional. A few CSOs operate with a degree of government acceptance and their leadership conducts some political advocacy within boundaries that they seem to know well.

Despite Rwanda's global reputation for **gender equality** in governance, women-led civil society organizations appear to be relatively weak and have limited advocacy influence. **Youth led** civil society organisations and movements tend to focus on entrepreneurship, employment and the green agenda, and less on politics and rights.

Regarding **rule of law**, Rwanda's accession in 1962 to the United Nations implied the constitutionalisation of fundamental liberties, followed by further adhesion to core UN human rights treaties in the mid-seventies<sup>2</sup>. Nevertheless, implementation mechanisms lagged, and the promotion and protection of human rights was therefore at the heart of the 1993 Arusha Peace Agreement and its 1992 Protocol on Rule of Law<sup>3</sup>. Despite these normative steps taken, the 1994 Genocide became a stark witness to the shortcoming of upholding human rights and protection of the population. The governance and human rights institutional framework is on paper ensured by the National Commission for Human Rights, which again is ensured by the Judiciary.

Rwanda has made some strides in improving its judicial infrastructure; however, concerns persist regarding its independence. Critics will say that the legal system is an instrument for the executive branch, with political opponents and dissenters subjected to prosecutions with limited transparency and fairness.

The **National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR)** was established in 1999 to sensitize the public on human rights, investigate violations, and inform authorities for possible judicial action. It is one of 10 "Other State Organs" created by the 2003 Constitution. Over time, its mandate has expanded inter alia to include the National Preventive Mechanism. With quasi-judicial status, its commissioners act as judicial police officers, enabling on-site investigations and legal proceedings in human rights cases. Since 2002, the NCHR has held A-Status accreditation from the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI) for meeting Paris Principles standards, allowing participation in the UN Human Rights Council and other monitoring mechanisms.

The **court system** faces a huge backlog of cases. The backlog is recognised as one of the major challenges in access to justice, and the formal system is overburdened in several respects. Considering the backlogs in courts, and the steadily increasing cases received by the Rwanda Investigation Bureau, and the National Public Prosecution<sup>4</sup>, the authorities are now focusing on finding alternatives to the court system. The Criminal Justice Policy was adopted, among other objectives, to reduce the number of cases going to courts, and offer effective rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders back into the community.

Rwanda has developed **alternative dispute resolution (ADR)** as a national system to enhance access to justice. The system takes on civil cases, but there are currently plans to include criminal cases in ADR to take pressure off the delays in the courts. Such a jurisdiction for the ADR system may be questioned, because of the lack of legal expertise and safeguards of the ADR. Currently, there is a renewed focus on policy coordination to ensure that access to justice in future is well coordinated. This requires that the Legal Aid Policy (which has been dormant since it was passed in 2014), the ADR and the Criminal Justice Policy are complementary. An ADR center has been established in Kigali, which aims to bring the different actors together in one place and speed up implementation. These efforts have just started, and the roll-out is pending because of various steps, such as standard operating procedures, coordination mechanisms, and training still need to be developed and put in place.

With regard to **reconciliation**, the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, established in 1999, has played a central role in promoting unity, reconciliation, and healing. The focus has been on community dialogues, education, and policy implementation to foster national cohesion. As an illustration of the magnitude of the task after the genocide, the community-based justice system in force until 2012 tried over

---

<sup>2</sup> International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (adhesion in 1975) | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1975) | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1975) | Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1981) | Convention on the Rights of the Child (1991). Rwanda also adhered to the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol (1980). Information obtained in interview and documentation shared by the EU adviser in the Ministry of Justice.

<sup>3</sup> <https://ucdpged.uu.se/peaceagreements/fulltext/Rwa%2019930804.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Information from LAF: Since 2015-2016, the files received by NPPA has increased drastically, from 25,453 to 83,349 in the last year of 2021-2022, and the figures show that this year 2022-2023 may exceed 103,404.



1.9 million cases, emphasizing truth-telling, accountability, and reintegration. **Abunzi**<sup>5</sup> Committees were established in 2003 under the Constitution, and serve as a hybrid justice system combining traditional and modern conflict resolution methods. Their goal is to provide restorative justice at the lowest levels, and ease the burden on the formal judicial system, which often faces resource and capacity constraints. Abunzi committees are voluntary and the system seems to be weighed down by a degree of fatigue, and was reported to be losing many members, and becoming non-operational in many locations.

**Trauma counselling and psycho-social** support continues to be in high demand, recognising the enormous, multifaceted and lasting impact of the genocide. According to the Rwanda Mental Health Survey (2018), 20.49% of the population suffers from mental health disorders, a rate that is twice the global average. Moreover, 37% of genocide survivors experience post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), while others grapple with depression, anxiety, and unresolved grief<sup>6</sup>. Such support is in particular needed in communities which were heavily affected during the Genocide not least in light of the release and return of “genocidaires” (around 20,000), which has started. The majority of the “genocidaires” will be released in the next couple of years after having served their time in prison, and their return to communities will be a stark reminder and traumatic for survivors and their families. Despite state-led efforts in reconciliation, including Gacaca courts and the *Ndi Umunyarwanda* program, community-level social cohesion remains fragile, especially in areas where the genocidaires are returning. This reintegration process, if not properly managed and supported, risks retraumatisation among survivors, disrupting family dynamics, and undermining trust within communities<sup>7</sup>. The current culture of silence will be difficult to uphold, and counselling needs are seen to rise considerably. There is an intergenerational trauma and reconciliation gaps in the communities, as many young Rwandans born after 1994 struggle with trauma inheritance and understanding past events, while their parents struggle to break the silence. Some survivors feel justice remains incomplete; others argue that reconciliation was forced rather than organic. A major strategy for the Government is to enable healing and peaceful coexistence through socio-economic development and poverty reduction.

It should also be noted that for some communities, the Genocide horrors surface again when witnessing the conflict evolving in **the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)**. It is a reminder of the past, when ethnic differences between Hutu and Tutsi communities resurface through hate speech and violence and ethnic divisions going deep again. The United Nations and various human rights organizations note Rwanda’s support to the M23 rebel group, which is implicated in serious human rights violations. Meanwhile other groups in the conflict also commit serious human rights violations. With regard to Rwanda, the involvement has strained the country’s diplomatic relations and raised questions about its commitment to regional stability.

## 2.2. Strategic alignment

### *Denmark’s strategies*

Denmark has two strategic frameworks of key importance:

- **A Changing World – Partnerships in Development (2025)**<sup>8</sup> is Denmark’s new strategy for development cooperation. The strategy builds on equal partnerships based on local needs and Danish strengths. The core of equal partnerships is not agreeing on everything, but on finding common ground between our own interests and those of our partners. The strategy emphasises the following five prioritised focus areas: 1) Job creation, economic growth, trade and investments, 2)

---

<sup>5</sup> Abunzi is a traditional community-based mediation mechanism integrated into the formal justice system to provide accessible and restorative conflict resolution. The term “Abunzi” translates to “those who reconcile” or “those who bring together.”

<sup>6</sup> Data from Interpeace project document to MFA, Embassy Office in Kigali (April 2024).

<sup>7</sup> Prison Fellowship Rwanda, (2019).

<sup>8</sup> Scoping and formulation of the programme were done prior to the publishing of the new development strategy “A Changing World – Partnerships in Development” (2025). However, as in the previous development strategy “The World We Share” (2021) the defence of democracy and human rights is also a prioritised focus area in the new strategy.

Response to conflicts, forced displacement, and irregular migration, 3) A just, sustainable and green transition, 4) Democracy and Human rights, and 5) Education and health. Denmark will promote the development of modern, green, and digital economies with a strong private sector creating decent jobs and that become part of the global economy. With a human rights-based approach to development Denmark aims to bolster democratic institutions and processes by promoting participation and free expression and thereby advocating for the rights to participation, expression, association, assembly, free media, and access to information to support enabling environments for elections, moreover to enhance civil society engagement in advocacy and hold governments accountable. Gender equality and the rights of women, girls and LGBT+ people also stand out as a priority. With regard to socio-economic rights the strategy focuses on the access to quality education and basic health services as fundamental for development including productivity, innovation and sustainable growth. The strategy also emphasises Denmark's priority to foster peace and stability and engage in tackling the root causes of conflict, fragility and supporting new solutions to address irregular migration.

- In the **Africa Strategy (2024)** the main message is the emphasis on the promotion of equal partnerships with African countries, recognizing Africa's growing geopolitical significance. The strategy outlines a new and fairly broad direction for Danish engagement in Africa. The focus is on mutual interests and acknowledging Africa's role in international politics. The Africa Strategy maintains focus on initiatives that support the rights of women and girls, as well as education. There is also a focus on efforts to promote human rights through digital technologies and uphold gender equality, recognizing these as fundamental components of democratic governance.

### ***Denmark's Framework Document for Rwanda***

The objective of the Danish engagement in governance and human rights in Rwanda is to *promote and support the strengthening of good governance, human rights and citizen engagement with an emphasis on accountability and transparency*<sup>9</sup>. While recognising the achievements in Rwanda regarding state reconstruction, stability and socio-economic development over the last decades, it is also stated in the Framework Document that Rwanda has made limited progress towards a more pluralistic democracy, with open political space, and political and civil rights.

Meanwhile, the framework document emphasises areas where Rwanda is "likeminded" with Denmark's policies – for example gender equality and non-discrimination of consensual same-sex relations. The framework document also notes that Rwanda has become increasingly engaged in the UN Universal Periodic Review process, which has proved to be an effective mechanism for human rights advocacy, especially for local civil society organizations. Denmark is currently engaged in the human rights and governance area in one major project, which aligns with both Denmark's and Rwanda's focus on socio-economic rights and citizens participation and inclusion. The project is the *Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy (PPIMA IV)* supported with DKK 10 million. Denmark also engages in policy dialogue including on human rights with Rwanda as an EU member state.

While there might be less alignment between Rwanda and Denmark's emphasis on civil and political rights there is more common ground on the priority to socio economic rights, poverty reduction and gender equality. There is also good alignment between Denmark and Rwanda at policy level on gender and to some extent on diversity rights, as well as environmental protection and climate change.

### ***Rwanda's strategic framework***

Rwanda's governance and human rights framework is anchored in its **Constitution**, which emphasizes democracy, unity, and the protection of fundamental rights. Adopted in 2003 and amended in subsequent years, the Constitution dedicates forty-one articles to establishing and ensuring fundamental human rights and freedoms. The Constitution guarantees rights such as equality before the law, protection from

---

<sup>9</sup> Draft Strategic Framework Document (2023).

discrimination, and the right to life. Although the Constitution contains numerous provisions and that promote and guarantee human rights, the implementation and practical outcomes have yet to fully meet expectations of international monitors and observers.

Rwanda follows a long-term development strategy (Vision 2050) aiming to transform Rwanda into an upper-middle-income country by 2035 and a high-income country by 2050. This vision emphasizes good governance, rule of law, and respect for human rights as foundational pillars. The **National Strategy for Transformation (NST1)** (2017-2024) focused on economic growth, social development, and transformational governance, aiming to consolidate good governance and justice as building blocks for equitable and sustainable national development. The present five-year **NST2 (2025-2029)**, approved in August 2024, builds upon its predecessor and focuses on five key priority areas developed with specific targets: 1) Job Creation; 2) Export Promotion; 3) Quality of Education; 4) Reduction of Stunting and Malnutrition; and 5) Enhanced Public Service Delivery. Initiated in 2000, Rwanda's **decentralization policy** aims to promote good governance, reduce poverty, and enhance efficient service delivery by empowering local governments. This policy facilitates citizen participation in decision-making processes at various administrative levels. The focus on poverty reduction and economic transformation in Rwanda's strategies are in line with both **A Changing World – Partnerships in Development** (2025) and the **Africa Strategy** (2024).

The **Rwanda Governance Board (RGB)** is a key player in promoting and managing the Government's approach to governance, human rights and monitor service delivery across public and private sector institutions, as well as civil society organisations. The core mandate of the RGB is inter alia promotion of good governance; monitoring and evaluation of service delivery and compliance with governance standards across various institutions; registration and oversight of civil society; media sector promotion and access to information and co-ordination of development forums. The RGB operates independently, without receiving instructions from any other institution, and submits its annual report and action plan to the President of the Republic and the Parliament. The RGB also develops tools and is for example the counterpart for the NPAs' PPIMA Project, in the efforts to assess and enhance governance standards across various sectors (using a Community Score Card (CSC)).

## 3. Justification and rationale

### 3.1. Justification for outcomes and partnerships

The strategic options for development engagement point towards the Danish support balancing Government and civil society priorities. This implies focusing on areas where results can be anticipated and in engagements where there is strategic level alignment between Danish and Rwandan priorities. However, the programme should also underscore human rights as a basic principle for Denmark's development cooperation.

It is proposed to engage in 3 outcomes.

- i. **Promoting socio-economic rights and enhancing citizens engagement in quality of local development.**

Specific reference to Denmark's strategic framework with Rwanda:  
“promote and protect human rights; advocate for democratic development; support and work together with civil society on relevant human rights issues, such as active citizen participation in local governance,

civic space, inclusion of marginalized groups and access to justice; special attention to the inclusion of women and other marginalized groups”.

Socio-economic rights and quality services are key to poverty reduction, and central to both to Denmark’s and Rwanda’s strategic frameworks. Citizens in Rwanda can exercise their right to advocate for example for quality services, and the right to food. In line with Rwanda’s official performance approach, there is focus on developing and using tools to measure and improve performance and to build the capacities of communities and CBOs in this regard. The focus on socio-economic rights and participation is an area where there is close cooperation between the government in particular the Ministry of Local Government and the Ministry of Finance, and CSOs. Denmark has good ongoing experience with Norwegian People’s Aid (NPA) through the PPIMA IV related to this outcome.

**ii. Access to justice and monitoring of human rights under the Constitution.**

Specific reference to Denmark’s strategic framework with Rwanda:  
“promote and protect human rights; participate actively in the human rights and political dialogue between Rwanda and EU Member states; special attention to the inclusion of women and other marginalized groups.”

**Access to justice** in the broadest sense is a major obstacle for Rwandan citizens, both related to the aftermath of the Genocide and for other cases to be resolved. The formal court system is overburdened, and alternative dispute resolution is therefore an official policy. Meanwhile, there is a demand for citizens with few or no means to be able to access legal aid, so their access to justice can be fulfilled. Denmark can benefit from the ongoing EU Justice and Accountability Programme, which supports judiciary reforms and promotion of human rights and make meaningful complements to these efforts by supporting the coherence and coordination between legal aid, ADR and criminal justice. The Legal Aid Forum (LAF) is a civil society organisation, which has positioned itself in a coordination role and as a trusted actor with the Ministry of Justice.

Monitoring of human rights falls under the NHRC, which is one of the institutions with a specific human rights mandate under the constitution. Presently, the NHRC cannot fulfil its role, partly because it is not independent and therefore mostly engaged in non-sensitive rights cases, but also because it is not present outside Kigali. The commission also struggles with capacity shortcomings as pointed out by GANHRI and an ongoing capacity assessment undertaken by the Ministry of Justice. The commission is in danger of losing its A status. The EU programme in MoJ has supported an institutional and capacity assessment, which will be an entry point for engagement between the Commission and the international community. There is a relatively new appointed leadership of the NCHR, as there is a commitment to implement a reform agenda and raise the standard of operation. External support will be key to the reforms, as the Commission is not well resourced (it is one of the least resourced institutions in Africa). The Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) will be a partner to the Commission and will also work closely with the EU.

**iii. Enabling conflict prevention, reconciliation psycho-social well-being among communities**

Specific reference to Denmark's strategic framework with Rwanda:

“support peaceful reconciliation of the Genocide against the Tutsi as well as many decades of ethnic stereotyping, discrimination, inequality, and state-led violence and impunity including by the reintegration of prisoners and ex-perpetrators of genocide into society.”

The fragilities in Rwandan society cannot be ignored. The structural fragilities point back to the 1994 Genocide, and structures of discrimination and inequality leading up to the tragedy, and subsequently the aftermath of reconciliation, seeking justice and state and institutional building. However, the fragility of social cohesion and widespread psycho-social problems in communities are massive and both apparent as well suppressed. A third priority for Denmark is therefore to engage in conflict prevention and reconciliation at a time when about 20,000 genocidaires are released after serving their sentence and reintegrated into communities. The conflict in Eastern DRC is another factor which could jeopardise the stability of communities and erode gains in social-cohesion and public participation. The return of the genocidaires to society is predicted to increase levels of anxiety and other psychosocial problems, directly impacting social cohesion. Prisoner rehabilitation is therefore a high priority to ensure that the newly released prisoners can be assimilated back into society without stirring up the social fabric and set-off community conflicts. There are major efforts ongoing in the prisons since 2020, e.g., by Interpeace and its local partners, Dignity in Detention, Haguruka, and Prison Fellowship Rwanda, with financial support from the European Union and the Government of Sweden.

The emphasis on conflict prevention and reconciliation from a mental and psycho-social perspective is not covered by the traditional Abunzi system which is designed to promote restorative justice, social harmony, and access to justice. Abunzi handles disputes related to land, family matters, inheritance, debts, and minor civil or criminal cases. The system like other access to justice mechanisms does not include the psycho-social and mental elements, which are essential to prevent conflicts and promote reconciliation within communities, when the “lid” is opened, and the culture of silence is being tested by the genocidaires returning and the conflict in Eastern DRC also reignites perceptions of ethnic conflict. Both the government and civil society organisations are concerned with the situation and jointly priorities the peaceful reintegration.

#### *Justification against the OECD-DAC criteria*

Criterion	Justification
<b>Relevance</b>	The programme responds to challenges related to governance, human rights and reconciliation. The programme builds on an existing long term international engagement in enhancing citizen participation in service delivery and supporting an active citizenry around local governance. Such engagement is directly related to poverty alleviation and the enhancement particularly of socio-economic rights. Environmental protection and climate justice have by now become urgent issues. The combination of climate change and high population density constrain agricultural livelihoods, which is a mainstay for the poorest segments of the populations.
<b>Impact</b>	<p>The programme seeks to contribute to an impactful and systemic approach to addressing governance, human rights and reconciliation challenges, and in particular to make lasting changes to individuals and communities to becoming less poor through influencing service delivery, enhancing access to justice and respecting human rights.</p> <p>By including reconciliation and psycho-social aspects, the programme sees impact as strengthening resilience of individuals and communities, helping them overcome trauma and thereby becoming active citizens.</p>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Based on donors' experience of implementation of ongoing projects, it is anticipated that participation and service delivery related to socio-economic rights will be relatively effective.

	It is anticipated that support to the justice sector including the NCHR may be less effective noting the political nature and the institutional tardiness and complexity.
	The selection of partners has been based on consultations with a view to quality of work, <i>effectiveness</i> , legitimacy and track record.
<b>Efficiency</b>	The selection of partners has focused on organisations which have a good degree of internal capacity, however external institutional blockages may affect implementation.
<b>Coherence</b>	The programme presents an opportunity for Denmark to contribute to better coherence in the international community, by the close engagement with the EU engagements in the sector. Moreover, is the EU working within the Ministry of Justice which allows the Danish programme to conduct policy dialogue and strengthen the coherence with national policy development.
<b>Sustainability</b>	The programme will promote sustainability of results through its focus on longer-term approaches. While working with civil society organisation there is a close coordination with government actors, such as the Rwanda Governance Board, the Ministry of Local Government on the citizens participation; and the Ministry of Justice on legal aid and ADR and in the support to the NCHR. The reconciliation efforts by Interpeace are important in terms of communities sustaining peaceful coexistence at a time of grievances and remembrance of the genocide is flaring up. The programme's focus on strengthening policy frameworks (such as the government's intention to include the Community Score card as a government tool, and the policy coherence of the ADR, Legal aid and criminal justice policies also point towards sustainability, as these processes are already "owned" by the government. The capacity development by the partners in the programme will further strengthen the sustainability aspects of the programme.

### 3.2. Other international support

The EU and its member states engage in quiet diplomacy with the Rwandan government through various channels, including annual justice and human rights and political partnership dialogues, and regular ministerial-level engagements as needed. One key initiative is the annual **Justice, Reconciliation, Law, and Order Sector Peer Review**, a multi-day retreat that facilitates in-depth discussions on policy progress and challenges. This event brings together key stakeholders such as the Minister of Justice, Chief Justice, Chief Prosecutor, senior justice sector officials, practitioners, civil society organizations (CSOs), and international partners. While primarily focused on justice-related policies, the retreat also touches on the implementation of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) roadmap.

The EU and the member states also engage strategically with civil society organizations (CSOs) through various dialogue platforms and programs aimed at promoting human rights. A major EU initiative, the **Justice and Accountability Programme** (€20 million), focuses on enhancing justice delivery, inclusivity, and human rights protections. Additionally, member states continue bilateral judicial cooperation, including on prosecutions, trials, and extraditions, particularly in cases related to genocide. The Justice and Accountability Programme also supports the NCHR by providing training to police and correctional services on human rights issues, including the prevention of torture. Furthermore, several Member States fund CSOs to facilitate shadow reporting on human rights practices.

**Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) as Actors of Change Programme** is an EU challenge fund aimed at enhancing CSOs' contributions to governance, development, and human rights processes in Rwanda. The initiative has focused on areas such as reconciliation, accountability, environmental sustainability, art and culture, anti-discrimination, and durable solutions for forced displacement (€4.6 million).

Moreover, the UK/FCDO has been a major donor to decentralisation and public financial management directly to the government and support to CSOs to promote citizen engagement, accountability, human rights advancement, and progress in freedom of expression. Switzerland also has a human rights and governance programme and works closely with other European donors.

UNDP manages the **Strengthening Civil Society Organizations for Responsive and Accountable Governance**. This ongoing project, with an estimated budget of \$8.6 million, aims to enhance the capacities of local CSOs to advocate for human rights, gender equality, and social justice. It also seeks to bolster CSOs' roles in socio-economic development and facilitate effective citizen engagement.

Since late January 2025, the situation in the development partner support to Rwanda has changed drastically and more changes are currently unfolding. USAID first suspended and then terminated many of its projects in Rwanda due to the dismantling of the organization. The UK has suspended some of its development support to Rwanda due to Rwanda's role in the conflict in Eastern DRC and has also announced cuts in its global aid budget by 40% from 2027 which is likely also to affect Rwanda. Germany has presently suspended new commitments to Rwanda due to Rwanda's role in the conflict in Eastern DRC. Rwanda cut its aid and diplomatic ties with Belgium in early 2025 primarily because it accused Belgium of taking a partisan stance in the conflict in the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Other EU partners have also paused new commitments and are reviewing their development support to Rwanda due to the regional conflict. These changes are being felt in civil society organisations which must scale down their operations.

### **3.3. Lessons from ongoing support and international experiences**

Denmark does not have a lot of concrete experiences from Rwanda regarding achieving results in human rights and governance programming. Nevertheless, Denmark and other donors have considerable experience elsewhere in identifying entry points and working in flexible and adaptive ways to stay engaged in a meaningful way and to uphold the strategic level priorities of Danish development cooperation in an authoritarian context. Specifically for Rwanda, an understanding of the impact of the **1994 Genocide** is a foundational platform for explaining (without endorsing) the type of authoritarian state that has emerged. Some experiences from donors working on governance and human rights in authoritarian contexts which seem relevant to Rwanda are summarized below<sup>10</sup>.

Examples of relevant lessons for engaging in authoritarian contexts and their applicability in Rwanda:

**Empowering local civil society and independent actors:** This approach is taken by some donors in Rwanda. However, the international community has experienced that working only with civil society does not yield results. Working with and through the Government is more effective, however on sensitive rights issues Government is not open for cooperation, and a balanced approach with both civil society and Government is a main strategy pursued by donors.

**Engaging in quiet diplomacy and multi-stakeholder dialogue** without directly confronting on sensitive topics but instead engage in "issue-based cooperation" (e.g., environmental protection, education, health) that indirectly strengthens civic engagement and governance: Approach taken by the international community in Rwanda.

**Strengthening public sector institutions from within, i.e.** focus on administrative efficiency, anti-corruption mechanisms, service delivery, legal and regulatory reforms that may improve citizens' rights without directly challenging the regime: Approach in particular taken by FCDO, the EU and the World Bank in their major engagements in Rwanda.

**Leveraging economic incentives, human rights and good governance as cross-cutting themes:** An approach taken *inter alia* by Switzerland in Rwanda. This could be relevant for Denmark in areas such as climate and environmental justice, and in promotion of gender and minority rights.

---

<sup>10</sup> The section draws on various overview sources including the blogs by Nic Cheeseman, Carnegie Endowment and others.



**Supporting Education, Youth Engagement and culture:** Culture and arts activities support can be relevant for Denmark through the new Danish fund for culture and arts, which is a four year initiative under the auspices of the Africa Strategy.

Denmark's **Doing Development Differently** approach is appropriate to the Rwandan situation. Denmark also engages with likeminded donors, mainly under the auspices of the EU Delegation.

### 3.4. Donor coordination and justification for bilateral programming

In the Rwanda context and in accordance with the principles in the Danida: *How-to Note on Human Rights and Democracy* (2022), bilateral interventions are at the heart of the Danish approach. Donors work together at project level, where more donors often support the same partner. Earlier experience from a donor basket fund led by DFID/FCDO recognised that the Government of Rwanda did not find such a modality appropriate in Rwandan context, and the general approach is therefore specific project interventions where donors try to support a partner either as a sole contributor or together with others.

In line with the above How-To Note Denmark is coordinating closely with the EU, and their leadership role in dialogues with the Government. The EU has a broader palette of Human Rights and Good Governance interventions, and the Danish programme was identified on the basis of consultations on the EU portfolio, not least in the justice sector and in resilient communities (support to Interpeace). Likewise, the Danish programme is formulated on the basis of likeminded donor coordination and the identification of spaces for engagement.

## 4. Programme Objective

The development objective of the Danish engagement in governance and human rights in Rwanda is to:

- **Promote and support the strengthening of good governance, human rights and citizen engagement with an emphasis on accountability and transparency<sup>11</sup>.**

### ***Theory of Change and Key Assumptions***

**IF** citizens engage in service delivery and environmental protection in a participatory way, and “score the services” and promote their socio-economic rights, and

**IF** underserved populations have access to justice through legal aid and accessing ADR or other means and

**IF** the National Commission for Human Rights becomes accessible in the regions, has trained staff and is seen as an independent body and

**IF** the nexus between societal healing, collaborative livelihoods and citizens participation is realised in areas where traumas and consequences of the 1994 Genocide are severe;

**THEN** CSOs and citizens’ capacity to effectively engage and leverage the existing citizen participation spaces have strengthened citizens’ needs and priorities are better met and

---

<sup>11</sup> Draft Framework Document (2023).



**THEN** justice sector actors demonstrate improved capacity and standards and coordinate better, and the NCHR can be reached by the population and fulfils its mandate to promote and protect human rights and

**THEN** targeted individuals and families will demonstrate increased emotional resilience, intergenerational relationships and greater economic self-reliance,

**EVENTUALLY CONTRIBUTING TO** a society where **good governance, human rights and citizen engagement with an emphasis on accountability and transparency, and material and emotional quality of life is felt by the population.**

The theory of change is founded upon a **human rights-based approach** that combines **long-term consistent efforts** with **flexibility** and works across citizens and national level stakeholders on socio-economic rights and thorough improved governance, “checks and balances” and institutional resilience to improve human rights in accordance with the constitutions.

### Key Assumptions

- The conflict in Eastern DRC does not influence negatively the Danish and EU programmes in Rwanda,
- Social cohesion efforts at community and administrative levels and at policy level remain a priority,
- State and civil society actors can work together on the programme priorities allowing for a conducive environment for participation, environmental protection policies, citizens’ rights and addressing traumas and socio-psychological conditions,
- Civil society space permits organisations to implement the programme

*Assumptions at project level are found in the partner documentation.*

## 5. Summary of Results Framework

### Results framework for the Governance, Human Rights and reconciliation Programme in Rwanda, 2025-2028.

The results framework is developed on the basis of the overall objectives of Denmark’s partnership with Rwanda. The outcomes are formulated on the basis of the objectives, outcomes and indicators in the partner documentation through an iterative process with the partners.

Programme		Governance, Human Rights and Reconciliation Programme in Rwanda 2025-2028 (July)	
Development Objective		Promote and support the strengthening of good governance, human rights and citizen engagement with an emphasis on accountability and transparency <sup>12</sup> .	
Impact Indicator		Increase in Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and citizens’ engagement in enhancing inclusive, accountable planning, design, and implementation of government policies and practices.	
Baseline	2025	0	
Target (year)	Mid 2028	10 % increase	

<sup>12</sup> Draft Framework Document (2023).

<b>Outcome 1</b>		<b>Citizens and CSOs have actively and meaningfully participated in governance, accountability dialogue for climate-resilient local growth.</b>	
Outcome indicator		1. Increased number of policies where CSOs and citizens have played a critical role/contributed towards enhancing inclusive, effective and accountable planning, design and implementation of government policies and institutional practices. 2. Citizen's capacity strengthened to effectively utilise the existing citizen participation spaces to amplify public voices and better leverage government systems. 3. Climate resilience capacities of local communities have increased.	
Baseline (October)	2025	0	
Target	2028	10% increase	
<b>Output 1</b>		<b>CSOs and citizens capacity to effectively engage in governance and accountability processes have been strengthened</b>	
Output indicators		90% of CSOs and citizens have capacity to effectively engage in governance and accountability processes have been strengthened by 2028	
		40% of Citizen's capacity strengthened to effectively utilise the existing citizen participation spaces to amplify public voices and better leverage government systems by 2028	
		Climate resilience capacities of local communities have increased by 15% in 2028	
<b>Outcome 2 (A)</b>		<b>Justice sector actors deliver improved, accessible, and quality legal aid and dispute resolution services for vulnerable populations</b>	
Outcome indicator		% of increase among justice actors and legal aid providers who applied practices that enhance access to justice for vulnerable groups	
Baseline	2025	TBD	% of justice sector actors trained in policies and standards who demonstrate improved knowledge and skills (pre and post training assessments) Number of justice sector coordination meetings/dialogues held annually on ADR, CJ and legal aid policies, with at least 50% of agreed actions implemented within the reporting period % increase in the number of vulnerable and marginalised individuals accessing legal aid services with disaggregated data (data sets exist and will be inserted when the project starts)
Target (mid-year)	2028	-32 justice actors trained on ADR and CJ policy actions (disaggregated by gender, age and disability) by 2026 -70 participants attending the dialogue on court-annexed mediation procedure in 2027 -at least 1 Standard SOPs for ADR practices are developed	
<b>Outcome 2 (B)</b>		<b>The NCHR fulfils its mandate to promote and protect human rights in conjunction with state and non-state actors as well as with regional and international bodies</b>	
Outcome indicator		The National Commission for Human Rights, Rwanda has taken measures to enhance its capacity and expand its engagement in promotion and protection activities within its mandated functions.	
Baseline	2025	TBD at inception	1.1: Increase in number of rights holders engaging with NCHR. 1.2: Increased visibility to human rights issues raised by NCHR.
Target	2028	Numbers/way of measurement to be discussed at inception	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NCHR has increased its accessibility through establishing regional offices in select regions</li> <li>- NCHR's National Preventive Mechanism has been strengthened in select regions</li> <li>- NCHR's interaction with the international human rights system has increased</li> <li>-The capacities of the NCHR leadership have increased in select mandate areas</li> <li>- NCHR's research function has been strengthened</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome 3</b>		<b>A cohesive, resilient, and inclusive society has been obtained through community-based and integrated approaches to healing, livelihoods, civic participation, and conflict resolution mechanisms<sup>13</sup>.</b>
Outcome indicator		<p>Within two years, targeted individuals and families will demonstrate increased emotional resilience, improved intergenerational relationships, and greater economic self-reliance. By the end of the two-year period, communities engaged in the project show stronger civic participation and improved trust in governance.</p> <p>% of targeted communities adopting functional, community-led mechanisms for conflict prevention and resolution, and participation in local decision-making processes</p> <p>% of participants reporting increased trust in local governance</p>
Baseline	2025	<p>Overall resilience score: 51.3% (56% emotional awareness, 55% critical thinking, 51% self-management, 51% healing of trauma)</p> <p>Score of trust: 62.6% (61% on empathy, tolerance &amp; forgiveness)</p> <p>Livelihood score: 59.6% reported food insecurity</p> <p>Baseline for project participants to be determined by the pre-interventions assessment (pre-screening).</p> <p>National scores:</p> <p>30% reported active participation in decision making (RGS-2024)</p> <p>15% reported use of ADR mechanisms</p> <p>66.2% reported trust in local government (RGS-2024)</p> <p>Baseline for project participants to be determined by the pre-interventions assessment (pre-screening).</p>
Target	2028	<p>At least 70% report improved emotional resilience</p> <p>At least 80% report increased trust &amp; collaboration</p> <p>At least 65% report improved livelihoods conditions</p> <p>At least 50% of targeted communities adopting functional, community-led mechanisms for conflict prevention and resolution, and participation in local decision-making processes</p> <p>At least 65% reporting active participation in local decision making</p> <p>At least 80% of participants reporting increased trust in reintegration policy and local governance</p>

The implementing organisations are both international and national civil society organisations.

### Outcome 1

- The **Norwegian Peoples Aid (NPA)** works with a local organisation, Transparency International Rwanda (TI RW) and will gradually hand over responsibility for implementation in the course of the project, and in the last year act as adviser to TI RW. The project works with three several local organisations.

### Outcome 2

<sup>13</sup> Outcome 3 strengthens an ongoing project, and the Danish contribution will allow Interpeace to step up engagement in three districts. The progress monitoring reflected in the attached project proposal is therefore detailed and tangible.

- **The Legal Aid Forum (LAF)** is a local organisation with a specialisation in legal issues with a good track record on justice sector topics, policy coherence and human rights. LAF has good access to relevant government actors.
- The **National Commission for Human Rights** will be supported through a partnership with the **Danish Institute for Human Rights**, which will be the recipient of the funding. The capacity building of the Commission will be coordinated with the EU engagement to MoJ and the Commission. The EU has supported the MOJ with an institutional and capacity needs assessment, which will be the basis for the support. Other partners in the legal sector will be identified early on in the development of a project document.

### Outcome 3

- **Interpeace** is an international organization that prevents violence and builds lasting peace. In Rwanda, Interpeace works through partnerships with local organisations specialised in reconciliation and addressing trauma and other psycho-social effects in communities. Interpeace often works with the Ministry of Health. Denmark support to Interpeace's ongoing programme will be able to expand implementation to cover three additional districts.

The selection of partners has been done during the identification process followed by dialogues and assessments. See identification report in Annex 1, and partner assessments in Annex 2.

## 6. Inputs/budget

The below budget summarises the support from 2025-2028. **The detailed budget is included an Annex 5. The budget timeframe is from October 2025 to end of July 2028 (34 months). The total budget is 42.5 Mill DKK.** The total amount of the budget is subject to the approval of the Finance Act of 2026 in Denmark.

### Programme budget on outcomes

Rwanda programme - Periodized commitment and disbursement budget					
MFA Commitment budget	2025 (Q3)	2026 (Q1)	2027 (Q1)	2028	TOTAL
LAF (2025-2028)	1,500,000	5,000,000	-	-	6,500,000
NPA (2025-2028)	5,000,000	14,000,000	-	-	19,000,000
DIHR (2025-2027)	6,500,000	3,500,000	-	-	10,000,000
Interpeace (2025-2028)	1,700,000	4,500,000	-	-	6,200,000
Reviews*	300,000	500,000	-	-	800,000
	<b>15,000,000</b>	<b>27,500,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>42,500,000</b>
MFA Disbursement budget	2025 (Q4)	2026 (Q2)	2027 (Q2)	2028 (Q1)	TOTAL
LAF (2025-2028)	1,500,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	-	6,500,000
NPA (2025-2028)	2,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	3,000,000	19,000,000
DIHR (2025-2027)	2,500,000	4,000,000	3,500,000	-	10,000,000
Interpeace (2025-2028)	1,500,000	2,500,000	2,200,000	-	6,200,000
Reviews*	300,000	-	500,000	-	800,000
	<b>7,800,000</b>	<b>16,500,000</b>	<b>15,200,000</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	<b>42,500,000</b>

\* Programme support : Partner assessment in 2025 and review in Q1.2027

Unspent funds in one year can be carried forward to the next year within the programme period only. The budget only reflects inputs from this specific grant. If other funds are added, the budget and results matrix should be updated to include additional funding.

The Danish grant must be spent solely on activities leading to the expected outputs and outcomes as agreed between the parties. The partners are responsible for ensuring that the funds are spent in compliance with

the agreement and with due consideration given to economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in achieving the intended results. The programme has set aside 300,000 DKK for partners assessment and further detailing of the programme in the inception period in 2025. The programme will also conduct a review in Q1 2027, as a way to gauge progress, achievements and future options, the budget includes 500,000 for this purpose.

## 7. Institutional and Management arrangements

The Danish Project Office in Kigali, which became a full embassy on 1 August 2025, will manage the programme. The embassy will have employed more staff and one staff member will oversee the programme and liaise closely with the partners on progress monitoring and all issues as relevant.

The Embassy will also participate in coordination and information sharing with Government, civil society and other international partners. Three of the projects are closely coordinated with the EU Delegation (legal aid, support to NCHR and the reconciliation through Interpeace).

As noted above, there should be a financial assessment of the partners as well as further detailing of the programme (as deemed necessary) in October/November 2025, when the new embassy team is in place. The financial assessment is considered important in light of the exodus of USAID and the cut-back by other donors, which are likely to have a bearing on the capacity of organisations. The partner assessments shared by the organisations and conducted by other donors have been useful as a guidance in the identification and formulation process, but assessments of compliance with the Danish Government standards need to be conducted. A review is planned for the last quarter of 2026 and first quarter of 2027 (see above).

The DIHR has agreed to have an inception phase of their intervention where they, in a consultative process, will develop a work programme with the NCHR. DIHR may also identify a second partner. The workplan between DIHR and NCHR will be presented and approved by the Danish Embassy in Kigali.

A workshop with partners will be hosted by the Danish Embassy within the first six months of programme implementation. In the workshop the ToC at programme level will be reviewed, and the causal pathways between the partner projects and the overall ToC will be mapped. This may lead to adjustments, including identification of indicators at different levels which strengthen the overall programme logic.

The above workshop will be followed by annual stock-taking meetings with partners to promote cross-learning, identify contextual changes, possible synergies and overlaps, and updating of risks at programme and project levels.

## 8. Financial Management, planning and reporting

All partners will adhere to the MFA's Financial Management Guidelines (2019). Detailed arrangements pertaining to partners are outlined in the project documents and will also be specified in grant agreements for the organisations. The guidelines encompass disbursements, partner procedures related to financial management, procurement processes, work planning, narrative progress reports, financial reports, accounting standards, and auditing practices (also see previous section on management arrangements and reporting schedule). Denmark maintains a zero-tolerance policy towards corruption.

Disbursements will occur in accordance with agreed schedules, which are based on approved budgets, taking into consideration any previously disbursed but unspent funds. Conditions for funds transfers generally include a formal request for disbursement from the partner, satisfactory utilisation of prior transfers, and technical and financial reporting submitted on time.

Financial reports must be submitted bi-annually following agreed formats as set out in the partner agreements and detailed project documents. Individual grant agreements with IPs will stipulate reporting requirements, including annual audits for each partner, conducted in accordance with their respective procedures, with results available within six months of each year's end. Additionally, Denmark retains the right to; a) conduct any necessary audits or inspections concerning the use of Danish funds and b) inspect the accounts and records of suppliers and contractors involved in contract performance, with the authority to conduct comprehensive audits.

MFA anti-corruption clauses relating to the management of the funds will be included in the grant agreements. Project documents are presented in annex for each implementing partner. The project documents include procedures for how partners will adhere to Danida policies on; i) anti- corruption, ii) child labour, iii) prevention of sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment, and iv) counter-terrorism.

## 9. Risk Management

With regard to contextual risks, the programme will be implemented in a stable yet volatile environment in a region ripe with conflicts and a politicised regional and international environment. This could influence funding decisions and choice of partners over time. The programme design therefore includes a focus on peacebuilding and reconciliation, noting the risk that post Genocide grievances remain unsolved or flare up. It is already seen that the conflicts in Eastern DRC spark ethnic tensions with spillovers and similarities to the Genocide. *While the risk is likely with significant impact, it is mitigated by close monitoring of the situation and application of Doing Development Differently tools*

Observance of human rights violations is also a risk, noting Rwanda's track record of political and civil rights. Consequently, the partners must demonstrate the capability to undertake on-going risk management and to update the risk management framework as necessary, adapting to the evolving context. This includes the preparation of safe-guards for their staff when "thinking and working politically", but also includes measures to manage fiduciary risks. Partners must inform the embassy of any major risks that arise. *The contextual risks are likely with significant impact and will be mitigated by close monitoring and dialogue between the embassy and partners and within the EU and other likeminded international actors.* The contextual changes may influence the project level, for example through obstacles of different kinds, which lead to lack of progress. Such alerts could mean further restrictions on the space of operation for civil society organisations and calls for rethinking of implementation strategies and plans.

The partners have prepared project level risk frameworks. There is a need to review these risks prior to programme start, given the political situation in the region. With regard to Rwanda's operating environment, the national leadership is results-oriented and there is adherence to implementation of the country policies and strategies. The Danish support is aligned with these strategic frameworks, however with a different view on civil and political freedom and rights.

There could also be institutional and reputational risks for Denmark noting the regional conflict patterns in Eastern DRC and Rwanda's position, as well as the closed political space for opposition parties and the limited civil and political rights. A peace agreement was signed on 27 June 2025 and there is a slight optimism, although earlier peace agreements have not been sustained.

## 10. Closure

At the end of the programme the organisations must submit final narrative and audited financial reports to the Embassy.



## 11. Short summary of projects

**Outcome 1: Project 1:** Support to citizen participation and environmental justice in line with NPA's Strategy for Rwanda / Citizen Action for Climate Resilience (CACR)

**Timeline:** October 2025-July 2028.

Current Danish funding of total 10 mill DKK covers the period until end of 2025. The CACR project will start in October 2025 with a budget of 19 mill DKK.

The project seeks to sustain and continue NPA, TI-Rw and their partners' well-regarded work with the greatest potential to make lasting contributions around **citizens' environmental protection and justice and climate change action awareness, as well as citizen participation through the existing non-state led spaces, primarily the Community Score Card (CSC) process**. Specifically, the focus will be put on sustaining the project results with respect to strengthening citizens, CSOs and local leaders' policy literacy, environment and climate change resilience, and contribution to the institutionalisation of some of the practical gains of NPA and partners' extensive efforts in Rwanda. This focus also forms the basis to accelerate the localisation process and, in coordination with the Project Office of Denmark (POD), transition support and key roles in the project to national partners. Hence, this initiative is a collaborative project led by Norwegian People's Aid (NPA), as overall Grant Manager, in consortium with Transparency International Rwanda (TI-Rw), and three additional Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) – as project partners.

The Danish contribution will specifically focus on **strengthening locally-led climate resilience actions in support of more inclusive climate resilient and accountable local growth. At the same time, it will support citizen-led independent monitoring and reporting on duty bearers' compliance with environmental and social management safeguards during the planning and implementation of public and community-led infrastructure projects across the country and in project intervention districts in particular.**

In terms of practical approaches for this thematic area, the project will work to: i) *enhance the capacity* of CSOs, CBOs, citizens and local leaders' policy literacy on specific rights, environment and climate change policy topics, and ii) tangibly contribute to catalysing and accelerating individual and collective responsibility and commitments to adopting environment-friendly habits, behaviours and practices, while *contributing to a framework for wider environmental and related social justice issues and specific climate resilient community-based actions*.

Over the period from October 2025 to July 2028, the CACR project will work to address the following mutually reinforcing and multi-faceted issues which hinder the meaningful engagement of CSOs and citizens in governance and accountability processes in Rwanda, as well as in envisioning solutions to issues faced:

- i. Weak knowledge and understanding of government policy choices by citizens, CSOs and CBOs;
- ii. Insufficient uptake of successful non-state models of citizen participation;
- iii. Weak climate change resilience and adaptive capacity of local communities along with a limited culture around environmental and social justice safeguarding and accountability.

Other relevant funds and work by NPA and TI-Rw will be aligned to contribute to the same strategic goals (of both NPA and TI-Rw in areas where applicable), to strengthen the overall sustainability efforts and chances for success.

**Outcome 2, Project 2:** Strengthening the Rule of Law in Rwanda: Supporting the Justice Sector to implement key Access to Justice Policies and Human Rights Mechanisms

Mini-project document received with Annexes and related studies.

This project aims to support the Government of Rwanda in implementing policies through targeted interventions that enhance access to legal aid, strengthen ADR mechanisms, and improve justice sector capacity. By translating policy commitments into practical actions, this project will ensure that Rwanda's justice sector reforms are not only well-intended but also effectively implemented, ultimately advancing equal access to justice for all. The main components of the project include capacity building of justice actors to implement policy actions and human rights mechanisms; Direct delivery of legal aid services; Operationalization of the ADR centre to support coordination and implementation of the policies; Dialogues aimed at supporting policy implementation; and Development of tools such as legal aid guidelines, sentencing guidelines and paralegal curriculum to support standardization. LAF has adequate human resources to successfully deliver on all planned activities in this project. However, some of the trainings will be conducted by hired independent consultants.

In September 2022, the government of Rwanda adopted the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) and Criminal Justice Policies to promote people-centered justice, reduce over reliance on litigation, address conflicts, reduce court case backlogs, promote alternatives to imprisonment, as well improve, coordinate and expand ADR mechanisms in Rwanda, among others. Despite the notable progress made in rebuilding and modernizing the justice system following the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi, significant disparities persist—particularly between urban and rural communities. People living in remote areas often encounter multiple obstacles, including limited physical access to courts, low levels of legal awareness, and financial challenges, all of which restrict their ability to seek and obtain justice. Recognizing these challenges, the Government of Rwanda has prioritized reforms in criminal justice, the promotion of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), and the expansion of legal aid services.

### **Outcome 2, Project 3: Capacity Enhancement of the National Commission for Human Rights, Rwanda**

DIHR has submitted a concept note/mini project document. DIHR has held discussions with EU and NCHR. Other legal partners in Rwanda are likely to be included, DIHR specifically mentions the legal training institute The Institute of Legal Practice and Development (ILPD). The project will start in 2025 with a preparatory process with the partners and then define concrete activities.

The proposed project intends to support the reform efforts initiated by the current leadership of the NCHR. These efforts are accentuated by the observations of GANHRI's Sub-Committee on Accreditation, highlighting that NHRC does not fully live up to the principles for NHRIs because it is not independent and therefore mostly engaged in non-sensitive rights cases, but also because it is not present outside Kigali and is under-funded. The Commission also struggles with capacity shortcomings. As part of the EU's Justice and Accountability Programme, a capacity needs assessment is currently being finalized, which outlines recommendations for how to ensure that the NHRC can retain its A-Status; and thereby raise the standard of the Commission's operation. This project will support the efforts to implement NCHR's strategic plan 2024-2029 and the recommendations outlined in the institutional assessment, in close collaboration with development partners supporting the NCHR, particularly the EU and GIZ.

Key to the success of the project is joint identification and planning of areas of support, which match NCHR needs and DIHR expertise. It is therefore proposed that the project incorporates a three-month inception phase focusing inter alia on: Identification of areas of collaboration and detailed activities, followed by an updated results framework and budget. This process will involve close collaboration with ongoing NCHR support programmes, particularly the EU's Justice and Accountability Programme. The identification of areas of support will take point of departure in the EU capacity needs assessment and NCHR's strategic plan 2024-2029, and it is foreseen that two to three areas will be identified in the current phase of the project.

This project will complement ongoing programmes of the EU in particular and BMZ/GIZ aimed at enhancing the capacity of the NCHR and its engagement with civil society.



**Outcome 3, Project 4:** Resilient communities: deepening healing, strengthening livelihoods and civic engagement for effective reintegration and social cohesion in Rwanda

Interpeace has submitted a Mini-project document and related materials on the ongoing project, which the Danish support expands with an additional three districts.

This project represents a strategic continuation and enhancement of Interpeace's efforts, aiming to further expand the scope of interventional packages, and maximize impact and inclusivity across Rwandan communities. Simultaneously addressing psychological wounds, entrepreneurship/livelihood and enabling civic participation of project participants will significantly strengthen overall societal well-being. This approach not only addresses immediate psychological needs, but also nurtures sustainable community development, empowering individuals to actively participate in shaping their collective future. The project is also embedded in a wider institutional relationship between Denmark and Interpeace. Between 2022 and 2024, Interpeace and the Department for Migration, Peace, and Stabilization of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs implemented the first phase of their strategic partnership, aimed at reinforcing sustaining peace efforts through enabling local leadership and capacity to manage conflict in a non-violent manner, supporting a peace responsive international system, and shaping the international peace and security infrastructure of the 21st century. The partnership is currently being renewed for a second phase, with an enhanced focus on policy influencing, including at the United Nations and European Union levels. The proposed project in Rwanda can generate important lessons learned and recommendations for this policy engagement and the political dialogue at the leadership level.

With Danish funding, two more districts: Karongi (Western Province) and Gasabo (City of Kigali) will be added, in addition to scaling up initiatives in existing districts under SIDA, especially Nyagatare (Eastern Province) as well as complementing policy work with MINUBUMWE and Rwanda Correctional Service (RCS).

## ANNEX 1: CONTEXT ANALYSIS

See attached.

## ANNEX 2: PARTNER ASSESSMENT

Brief partner assessment.

### **Norwegian People's Aid**

Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) is an international, politically independent, membership-based organisation working in more than 30 countries around the world. Founded in Norway in 1939 as the labour movement's humanitarian solidarity organisation, NPA aims to improve living conditions and to create a democratic, just, and safe society. NPA's international work covers three core areas: mine action and disarmament, development aid, and humanitarian relief aid. NPA has been implementing activities in Rwanda since the end of the Genocide against the Tutsis in 1994. NPA has been implementing the PPIMA programme in Rwanda since 2009. The programme is ending with Phase IV. The organisation has over time delivered good results including documentation of achievements. NPA has a wide and strong network of more than 20 local CSOs, some of which are part of the current phase of the project, and others of which have been part of earlier phases but are still providing advice. Based on good results and good implementation capacity, Denmark first committed 3 Mill DKK to Phase IV (in 2024) and has subsequently committed a supplementary contribution of DKK 6,500,000 specifically for the period 1 January 2025 to 31 December 2025." During this last year NPA is working on a successor project and the concept note for this project is attached to this document, as Denmark intends to continue financing NPA. Based on the good and strong network with partners, NPA will in the new phase "localize" implementation. Transparency International Rwanda is the local partner, which increasingly will be responsible for implementation, with NPA in the facilitating role. NPA has established good working relations with both local and national government. NPA has a solid track record with managing donor funds from like-minded donors in Rwanda, including Sida, NORAD, Swiss Development Cooperation, EU and FCDO (formerly DFID).

Denmark conducted a "light" partner assessment in December 2023, which concluded the following: From what NPA's CD explained, the organisation overall and the Country Office (CO) is assessed to have robust procedures and tools for tracking progress and following up with each partner. NPA has many important tools to ensure that these partners live up to the standards of donors. This includes the Performance and Financial Assessment Tool (PFAT), which tracks progress and improvements for each partner on a regular basis, as well as continuous dialogue assessments to periodically follow up. Furthermore, NPA performed a comprehensive HR review of its partners in 2022. Based on these follow-up tools and procedures, NPA continuously provides training in HR, audit, compliance, etc., where this is considered critical.

The financial management at NPA's Rwanda CO also is assessed to be appropriate and robust. Grants (as commitments) are issued on an annual basis, while NPA has a "rule-of-thumb" to disburse when approx. 70% of previous disbursements is consumed, with up to 3 disbursements per year, per partner. NPA also has audits performed for all their partners, which are consolidated and made specific for each donor. NPA's auditor was changed recently, after 3 years, which is in accordance with 'best practice'. This auditor audits the whole PPIMA programme, as well as specific projects. Globally, NPA also has thorough and detailed guidelines and procedures for procurement and other aspects of financial management, which has been shared with the Project Office in Kigali and is assessed to meet the standards of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark and like-minded donors.

## Legal Aid Forum

The Legal Aid Forum (LAF) is a leading non-governmental network in Rwanda dedicated to ensuring access to justice for vulnerable people. It was established in 2006 to create a collaborative space for organizations providing legal aid to indigent and vulnerable groups. From its inception, LAF's purpose has been to share best practices, build capacity, conduct research, and engage in evidence-based advocacy to expand legal assistance for those in need. Today, LAF has grown into a membership-based umbrella of 38 national and international NGOs, professional bodies, university legal clinics, and faith-based initiatives, all working together to empower Rwandans – especially the poor and marginalized – to understand and assert their legal rights. LAF's vision is “*a Rwanda where indigent and vulnerable groups have equitable access to justice*,” and its mission is to promote and support accessible, quality legal aid services nationwide. Over the past five years, LAF has been very active in strengthening Rwanda's legal aid system and promoting justice reforms. In 2022, LAF launched a major Pro Bono Legal Aid Project to expand free legal services to the poorest communities in Kigali. The initiative is run in collaboration with the Ministry of Justice, the Rwanda Bar Association and university law clinics. LAF has been a vocal advocate for sustainable legal aid funding and supportive laws. In public forums and media, LAF experts have debated legal aid legislation – noting that the government's withdrawal of a draft legal aid law in 2018 (due to budget constraints) left a gap in meeting citizens' need for counsel. LAF has focused on improving the capacity of justice sector actors and embracing innovation and promoted Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms in Rwanda's justice system (for instance, publicizing progress in integrating ADR as a complement to formal courts) to make resolving conflicts more efficient and accessible. LAF frequently coordinates national events and campaigns to raise awareness on rights. LAF implements a wide range of projects and services aimed at improving access to justice. LAF's organizational structure is that of a network with a central secretariat. The General Assembly of member organizations constitutes the forum's highest body, and a Board of Directors elected from member representatives provides governance oversight. The day-to-day operations are run by a Secretariat based in Kigali, headed by an Executive Director and a team of program directors and officers. LAF's 38 member organizations include prominent Rwandan NGOs like *Haguruka* (women's rights), *AJPRODHO* (youth rights), *Rwanda Women's Network*, and others, as well as the Rwanda Bar Association and law school clinics. This broad membership enables LAF to tap into diverse expertise and extend its reach nationwide through local partners. Key partners of LAF include the Ministry of Justice of Rwanda, the Judiciary, the Rwanda Bar Association (RBA), local government authorities, and academic institutions. LAF also works in civil society coalitions on human rights and legal advocacy. To fulfil its mission, LAF relies on a diverse base of support and funding. The Rwandan government provides an enabling environment and sometimes logistical support (though government funding for legal aid is limited), while the bulk of LAF's financial support comes from international donors and development partners. Major funding sources in recent years have included bilateral and multilateral agencies as well as private foundations. The FCDO's due diligence assessment of Rwanda's Legal Aid Forum (LAF) found an overall moderate risk level for partnering with LAF. While LAF has established policies and considerable experience, however the review also noted some gaps and areas for improvement. LAF demonstrates sound financial controls, regular audits, and generally prudent financial management.

## Danish Institute for Human Rights

The Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) will work in a partnership with Rwanda's National Commission for Human Rights. A very recent institutional capacity assessment of the NCHR conducted by the MoJ is the foundation for the capacity development and the cooperation between the two institutions. DIHR serves as Denmark's national human rights institution, dedicated to promoting and protecting human rights both domestically and internationally. While DIHR does not have the mandate to monitor or report on human rights situations in other countries—a responsibility that lies with each nation's own human rights institution—it leverages its experience to collaborate with various international actors. These collaborations aim to strengthen human rights systems globally by supporting the development of robust and coherent frameworks where every actor fulfils their mandate effectively. Capacity Building for National Human

Rights Institutions (NHRIs): DIHR plays a pivotal role in enhancing the capacity and influence of NHRIs worldwide, assisting them in becoming more effective mechanisms for the protection and promotion of human rights and the rule of law.

DIHR is a major partner for the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and a partner assessment is done at HQ level. With regard to Rwanda the DIHR has been present until 2011, and now sees an opportunity to reengage.

## Interpeace Rwanda

**Interpeace** is an international peacebuilding organization that has been actively engaged in Rwanda for over two decades, focusing on fostering societal healing, social cohesion, and sustainable development. The work in Rwanda centres around three main pillars: 1. Mental Health and Psychosocial Support: Implementing interventions like Resilience-Oriented Therapy and Sociotherapy to address trauma and enhance psychological resilience among community members. 2. Social Cohesion and Reconciliation: Facilitating Multifamily Healing Spaces to mend intergenerational trauma and improve family dynamics, thereby strengthening community bonds. 3. Collaborative Livelihoods: Promoting joint income-generating projects through the Collaborative Livelihoods (COLIVE) protocol, encouraging cooperative economic activities among individuals from diverse backgrounds.

Interpeace and its local partners work on: Prisoner Rehabilitation and Reintegration: Developing curricula to support the psychological rehabilitation of prisoners, particularly those convicted of genocide-related crimes, facilitating their reintegration into society: Positive Masculinity and Parenting: Implementing programs aimed at promoting healthy gender norms and improving parenting skills to prevent gender-based violence and foster family harmony.

Interpeace collaborates with various Rwandan governmental bodies, including the Ministry of Health and the Rwanda Biomedical Centre, as well as local organizations like Prison Fellowship Rwanda, to implement its programs effectively. EU is a major donor and until recently Sweden has supported the work of Interpeace.

Interpeace has been assessed by the EU recently and found to be a partner with sufficiently sound systems to receive and manage donor funding. Although the assessment is not available, it was communicated to the Project Office in Kigali that Interpeace had gone through a very thorough assessment.

## Summary of key partner features

Name of Partner	Core business <i>What is the main business, interest and goal of the partner?</i>	Importance <i>How important is the project for the partner's activity-level (Low, medium, high)?</i>	Influence <i>How much influence does the partner have over the programme (low, medium, high)?</i>	Contribution <i>What will be the partner's main contribution?</i>	Capacity <i>What are the main issues emerging from the assessment of the partner's capacity?</i>	Exit strategy <i>What is the strategy for exiting the partnership?</i>
<b>NPA – planning to work with Transparency International Rwanda</b>	NPA began working in Rwanda after the genocide. From 2007 NPA adopted a partnership model, with the aim of supporting and developing the capacity of civil society and enhance the growth of positive values in areas like anti-	High	Medium	Citizen participation, socio-economic rights and environmental awareness (Objective 1)	Sufficient capacity as a project implementer. Plans to transfer more responsibility to local partners. A	There is no exit strategy

	corruption, gender equity, poverty eradication, tolerance and promoting democracy. In 2009, the PPIMA (Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy) project was born which accounted for about 70% of the Country Programme				capacity assessment was conducted by MFA at the end of 2023. The effect of major changes in the donor support, as well as NPA's "localisation plan" should be assessed.	
<b>LAF</b>	The Legal Aid Forum (LAF) is a leading non-governmental network in Rwanda dedicated to ensuring access to justice for vulnerable people. It was established in 2006 to create a collaborative space for organizations providing legal aid to indigent and vulnerable groups. From its inception, LAF's purpose has been to share best practices, build capacity, conduct research, and engage in evidence-based advocacy to expand legal assistance for those in need.	High	Medium	Improving access to justice services and monitoring of human rights under the Constitution. (Objective 2)	A thorough assessment of the capacity has been carried out by FCDO. This found some minor to moderate risks but not in the financial management. Denmark should conduct a partner assessment. Also to assess the effect of major changes in the donor support landscape	There is no exit strategy
<b>DIHR</b>	The Danish Institute for Human Rights (DIHR) will work in a partnership with Rwanda's National Commission for Human Rights. A very recent institutional capacity assessment of the NCHR conducted by the MoJ is the foundation for the capacity development and the cooperation between the two institutions. DIHR serves as Denmark's national human rights institution, dedicated to promoting and protecting human rights both	Low in general but High in Rwanda, as DIHR plans to reengage with this opportunity.	Medium	Improving access to justice services and monitoring of human rights under the Constitution. (objective 2)	Done at MFA-DIHR level. DIHR will manage the budget in the partnership between DIHR and NCHR.	There is no exit strategy

	domestically and internationally.					
<b>Interpeace</b>	Interpeace has been engaged in Rwanda for over two decades. Focus is on societal healing, social cohesion, and sustainable development. The work centres around: Mental Health and Psychosocial Support and interventions like Resilience-Oriented Therapy and Sociotherapy to address trauma and enhance psychological resilience among community members and Social Cohesion and Reconciliation.	Medium	Medium	Enabling conflict prevention, reconciliation psycho-social well-being among communities (objective 3)	A partner assessment has been conducted by the EU. It found that systems are average and sufficient for EU compliance. Denmark should undertake a partner assessment.	There is no exit strategy

## ANNEX 3: RESULT FRAMEWORKS

### Programme framework

Programme		<b>Governance, Human Rights and Reconciliation Programme in Rwanda 2025-2028 (July)</b>	
Development Objective		<b>Promote and support the strengthening of good governance, human rights and citizen engagement with an emphasis on accountability and transparency<sup>14</sup>.</b>	
Impact Indicator		Increase in Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and citizens' engagement in enhancing inclusive, accountable planning, design, and implementation of government policies and practices.	
Baseline	2025	0	
Target (Mid year)	2028	10 % increase	
<b>Outcome 1</b>		<b>Citizens and CSOs have actively and meaningfully participated in governance, accountability dialogue for climate-resilient local growth.</b>	
Outcome indicator		4. Increased number of policies where CSOs and citizens have played a critical role/contributed towards enhancing inclusive, effective and accountable planning, design and implementation of government policies and institutional practices. 5. Citizen's capacity strengthened to effectively utilise the existing citizen participation spaces to amplify public voices and better leverage government systems. 6. Climate resilience capacities of local communities have increased.	
Baseline (October)	2025	0	
Target	2028	10% increase	
Output 1		<b>CSOs and citizens capacity to effectively engage in governance and accountability processes have been strengthened</b>	
Output indicators		90% of CSOs and citizens have capacity to effectively engage in governance and accountability processes have been strengthened by 2028	

<sup>14</sup> Draft Framework Document (2023).

		40% of Citizen's capacity strengthened to effectively utilise the existing citizen participation spaces to amplify public voices and better leverage government systems by 2028	
		Climate resilience capacities of local communities have increased by 15% in 2028	
<b>Outcome 2 (A)</b>		<b>Justice sector actors deliver improved, accessible, and quality legal aid and dispute resolution services for vulnerable populations</b>	
Outcome indicator		% of increase among justice actors and legal aid providers who applied practices that enhance access to justice for vulnerable groups	
Baseline	2025	TBD	% of justice sector actors trained in policies and standards who demonstrate improved knowledge and skills (pre and post training assessments) Number of justice sector coordination meetings/dialogues held annually on ADR, CJ and legal aid policies, with at least 50% of agreed actions implemented within the reporting period % increase in the number of vulnerable and marginalised individuals accessing legal aid services with disaggregated data (data sets exist and will be inserted when the project starts)
Target (mid-year)	2028	-32 justice actors trained on ADR and CJ policy actions (disaggregated by gender, age and disability) by 2026 -70 participants attending the dialogue on court-annexed mediation procedure in 2027 -at least 1 Standard SOPs for ADR practices are developed	
<b>Outcome 2 (B)</b>		<b>The NCHR fulfils its mandate to promote and protect human rights in conjunction with state and non-state actors as well as with regional and international bodies</b>	
Outcome indicator		The National Commission for Human Rights, Rwanda has taken measures to enhance its capacity and expand its engagement in promotion and protection activities within its mandated functions.	
Baseline	2025	TBD at inception	1.1: Increase in number of rights holders engaging with NCHR. 1.2: Increased visibility to human rights issues raised by NCHR.
Target	2028	Numbers/way of measurement to be discussed at inception  - NCHR has increased its accessibility through establishing regional offices in select regions - NCHR's National Preventive Mechanism has been strengthened in select regions - NCHR's interaction with the international human rights system has increased -The capacities of the NCHR leadership have increased in select mandate areas - NCHR's research function has been strengthened	
<b>Outcome 3</b>		<b>A cohesive, resilient, and inclusive society has been obtained through community-based and integrated approaches to healing, livelihoods, civic participation, and conflict resolution mechanisms<sup>15</sup>.</b>	
Outcome indicator		Within two years, targeted individuals and families will demonstrate increased emotional resilience, improved intergenerational relationships, and greater economic self-reliance. By the end of the two-year period, communities engaged in the project show stronger civic participation and improved trust in governance.	

<sup>15</sup> Outcome 3 strengthens an ongoing project, and the Danish contribution will allow Interpeace to step up engagement in three districts. The progress monitoring reflected in the attached project proposal is therefore detailed and tangible.

		% of targeted communities adopting functional, community-led mechanisms for conflict prevention and resolution, and participation in local decision-making processes % of participants reporting increased trust in local governance	
Baseline	2025		<p>Overall resilience score: 51.3% (56% emotional awareness, 55% critical thinking, 51% self-management, 51% healing of trauma)          Score of trust: 62.6% (61% on empathy, tolerance &amp; forgiveness)          Livelihood score: 59.6% reported food insecurity          Baseline for project participants to be determined by the pre-interventions assessment (pre-screening).</p> <p>National scores:          30% reported active participation in decision making (RGS-2024)          15% reported use of ADR mechanisms          66.2% reported trust in local government (RGS-2024)          Baseline for project participants to be determined by the pre-interventions assessment (pre-screening).</p>
Target	2028		<p>At least 70% report improved emotional resilience          At least 80% report increased trust &amp; collaboration          At least 65% report improved livelihoods conditions</p> <p>At least 50% of targeted communities adopting functional, community-led mechanisms for conflict prevention and resolution, and participation in local decision-making processes          At least 65% reporting active participation in local decision making          At least 80% of participants reporting increased trust in reintegration policy and local governance</p>



## Norwegian People's Aid

Project		<b>Citizen Action for Climate Resilience (CACR)</b>	
Project Objective		More inclusive local policy responses fostered climate resilience and accountable local growth	
Impact Indicator		% increase in Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and citizens' engagement in enhancing inclusive, accountable planning, design, and implementation of government policies and practices leading to climate resilient local growth	
Outcome		Citizens and CSOs have actively and meaningfully participated in governance, accountability dialogue for climate-resilient local growth.	
Outcome indicator 1		Increased number of policies where CSOs and citizens have played a critical role/contribution towards enhancing inclusive, effective and accountable planning, design and implementation of government policies and institutional practices.	
Baseline	Year	2025	TBD
Target	Year	2028	10% increase
<b>Output 1</b>		<b>CSOs and citizens capacity to effectively engage in governance and accountability processes have been strengthened</b>	
Output indicator 1.1		# of CSO staff trained in governance, policy advocacy, and accountability tools (gender disaggregated)	
Output indicator 1.2		# of citizens who are aware and understand rights, public policy choices, governance and accountability process (gender disaggregated)	
Output indicator 1.3		% of engaged CSO staff and other non-state actors (including GFPs) reporting increased knowledge and confidence to participate in governance and accountability dialogues (gender disaggregated)	
Baseline	Year	2025	
Target	Year 1	2026	60%
Target	Year 2	2027	80%
Target	Year 3	2028	90%
<b>Output 2</b>		<b>Output 2: Citizen's capacity strengthened to effectively utilise the existing citizen participation spaces to amplify public voices and better leverage government systems</b>	
Output indicator 2.1		# of CSOs and citizens participating in public forums and consultations to hold policy makers accountable (i.e. planning, budgeting, and performance monitoring) (gender disaggregated)	
Output indicator 2.2		# of government and CSO-led accountability initiatives conducted (e.g. public hearings, scorecards, budget dialogues)	
Output indicator 2.3		# of citizen issues/priorities documented and presented to the duty bearers for solutions	
Output indicator 2.4		% of priorities/issues for which citizens have requested/received feedback (from any powerholder) on how the budget/resources were allocated for community priorities/development programmes/projects in last year	
Baseline	Year	2025	<b>% increase</b> of priorities/issues for which citizens have requested/received feedback (from any powerholder) on how the budget/resources were allocated for community priorities/development programmes/projects in last year
Target	Year 1	2026	20%
Target	Year 2	2027	30%
Target	Year 3	2028	40%

Output 3:		Output 3: Climate resilience capacities of local communities have increased	
Output indicator 3.1		# of citizens who are aware of the environmental and social safeguarding measures and practices and are ready to embrace them and hold local leaders to account	
Output indicator 3.2		# of CSO evidence-based policy proposals/alternatives/recommendations presented to government/policy makers for reforms /policy improvements	
Output indicator 3.3		% of policies/government programmes/laws/strategies adopted, reviewed or amended by relevant government agencies responding to CSOs evidence-based recommendations/inputs and or citizens needs related to inclusive climate resilient and accountable local growth	
Baseline	Year	2025	% <b>increase</b> of policies/government programmes/laws/strategies adopted, reviewed or amended by relevant government agencies responding to CSOs evidence-based recommendations/inputs and or citizens needs related to inclusive climate resilient and accountable local growth
Target	Year 1	2026	5%
Target	Year 2	2027	10%
Target	Year 3	2028	15%

## Legal Aid Forum

Project title		STRENGTHENING THE RULE OF LAW IN RWANDA: <i>Supporting the Justice Sector of Rwanda to implement key Access to Justice Policies and Human Rights Mechanisms</i>	
Project objective		Strengthen the capacity of justice sector institutions to deliver quality legal aid and dispute resolution services for vulnerable populations in Rwanda	
Outcome 1		Justice sector actors deliver improved, accessible, and quality legal aid and dispute resolution services for vulnerable populations	
Outcome indicator		% of increase among <b>Justice actors and legal aid providers who applied practices that enhance access to justice for vulnerable groups</b>	
Baseline	Year	TBD	
Target	Year	TBD	
Output 1.1		JRLOS actors trained on ADR and criminal justice policy actions	
Output indicator		Number of justice actors trained on ADR and CJ policy actions (disaggregated by gender, age and disability)	
Baseline	Year	0 <sup>16</sup>	
Annual target	Year 1	32	
Annual target	Year 2	0	
Annual target	Year 3	0	
Output 1.2.		Judges and registrars trained on small claims procedure	
Output indicator		Number of judges and registrars trained on small claims procedure (disaggregated by gender, age and disability)	
Baseline	Year	TBD	
Annual target	Year 1	0	
Annual target	Year 2	82	
Annual target	Year 3	0	
Output 1.3		Judges, lawyers and prosecutors trained on plea-bargaining procedure	

<sup>16</sup> As far as LAF is concerned, no specific trainings have been conducted on policy actions, except for awareness sessions for the general public

Output indicator		Number of judges, lawyers and prosecutors trained on plea-bargaining procedure (disaggregated by gender, age and disability)
Baseline	Year	40 <sup>17</sup>
Annual target	Year 1	0
Annual target	Year 2	36
Annual target	Year 3	0
Output 1.4		ADR service providers trained on various forms of ADR
Output indicator		Number of ADR service providers trained on various forms of ADR (disaggregated by gender, age and disability)
Baseline	year	TBD
Annual target	Year 1	0
Annual target	Year 2	120
Annual target	Year 3	0
Output 1.5		Law enforcement officers are trained on the promotion and protection of human rights.
Output indicator		Number of Law enforcement officers trained on the promotion and protection of human rights (disaggregated by gender, age and disability)
Baseline	year	0
Annual target	Year 1	0
Annual target	Year 2	70
Annual target	Year 3	0
Output 1.6		Members of treaty body reporting task force are trained on how to report on concluding observations of treaty bodies
Output indicator		Number of people trained on reporting on concluding observations of treaty bodies, disaggregated by age, gender and disability
Baseline	year	
Annual target	Year 1	0
Annual target	Year 2	0
Annual target	Year 3	40
Output 1.7		Annual national dialogues on the human rights situation organized.
Output indicator		Number of participants attending national dialogues on the human rights situation organized.
Baseline	Year	104 <sup>18</sup>
Annual target	Year 1	80
Annual target	Year 2	0
Annual target	Year 3	80
Outcome 2		Institutional coordination and policy frameworks within the justice sector are strengthened to support effective delivery of legal aid services
Outcome indicator		% of institutions demonstrating improved performance in coordination, policy implementation and delivery of legal aid services (means of verification: Justice Sector Performance assessment , Baseline , annual assessments)
Baseline	Year	TBD
Target	Year	TBD
Output 2.1		A national dialogue on court-annexed mediation procedures conducted and documented
Output indicator		Number of participants attending the dialogue on court-annexed mediation procedure (disaggregated by gender, age and disability)
Baseline	Year	0
Annual target	Year 1	0

<sup>17</sup> LAF 2022 Annual Report

<sup>18</sup> On 9<sup>th</sup> December 2024, in celebration of International Human Rights Day, LAF organized a national dialogue that was attended by 104 people.

Annual target	Year 2	70
Annual target	Year 3	0
Output 2.2		Dialogue on effective implementation of small claims procedure is conducted and documented
Output indicator		Number of participants who attended the dialogue on effective implementation of small claims procedure (disaggregated by gender, age and disability)
Baseline	Year	0
Annual target	Year 1	0
Annual target	Year 2	100
Annual target	Year 3	0
Output 2.3		Standard SOPs for ADR practices are developed
Output indicator		SOPs for ADR practices are validated by relevant justice sector stakeholders and used.
Baseline	Year	0
Annual target	Year 1	0
Annual target	Year 2	1
Annual target	Year 3	0
Output 2.4		ADR Center is staffed and operating under a formal co-management framework signed and implemented between LAF and MINIJUST
Output indicator		Total project investment towards operationalization of the ADR Centre
Baseline	Year	0 <sup>19</sup>
Annual target	Year 1	1,051,625 RWF
Annual target	Year 2	1,167,698 RWF
Annual target	Year 3	758,215 RWF
Output 2.5		Standardized legal aid guidelines developed and disseminated
Output indicator		Number of copies of standardized legal aid guidelines distributed for use
Baseline	Year	0
Annual target	Year 1	0
Annual target	Year 2	50
Annual target	Year 3	0
Output 2.6		Sentencing guidelines are developed for adoption
Output indicator		Number of stakeholders who attended consultative gatherings aimed at developing and validating sentencing guidelines
Baseline	Year	0
Annual target	Year 1	0
Annual target	Year 2	20
Annual target	Year 3	0
Output 2.7		Legal and policy briefs are drafted and submitted
Output indicator		Number consultations (internal & External) aiming at gathering technical inputs and drafting assistance on legal instruments
Baseline	Year	0
Annual target	Year 1	2
Annual target	Year 2	2
Annual target	Year 3	2

<sup>19</sup> Even though LAF is currently co-managing the ADR Centre with MINIJUST, there is no formal co-management framework signed.

Output 2.8		A paralegal curriculum is developed, validated and disseminated for use
Output indicator		Number of copies of national paralegal curriculum distributed for use
Baseline	Year	0
Annual target	Year 1	0
Annual target	Year 2	500
Annual target	Year 3	0
Output 2.9		Benchmarking visit conducted, with a report produced and key recommendations identified to inform national context
Output indicator		1 Benchmarking visit report with key lessons with actionable recommendations is shared
Baseline	Year	0
Annual target	Year 1	1
Annual target	Year 2	0
Annual target	Year 3	0
Outcome 3		Vulnerable and marginalized populations have increased access to legal aid services
Outcome indicator		% of increase of vulnerable and marginalized individuals accessing legal aid services, disaggregated by gender, disability, age, geographical location and nature of case
Baseline	Year 1	61% <sup>20</sup>
Target	Year 3	15%
Output 3.1		Vulnerable and marginalized populations have received quality Legal aid services
Output indicator		Number of vulnerable and marginalized individuals who received quality legal aid services disaggregated by age, gender, disability and legal empowerment approach (walk-ins, MLACS, and call center)
Baseline	Year	3,860 <sup>21</sup>
Annual target	Year 1	4,360
Annual target	Year 2	4,860
Annual target	Year 3	5,360

## DIHR and NCHR

Project title		Promoting Justice and Human Rights in Rwanda
Project objective		To enhance duty bearer accountability and access to justice for persons in vulnerable situations in Rwanda through strong institutions with a mandate to promote and protect human rights
Outcome 1		The National Commission for Human Rights, Rwanda has taken measures to strengthen its capacity and expand its engagement in promotion and protection activities within its mandated functions
Outcome indicator		1.1: Increase in number of rights holders engaging with NCHR. 1.2: Increased visibility to human rights issues raised by NCHR.
Baseline	2025	- # TBD. - # of NCHR public events/reports/media coverage (number to be determined in inception phase).
Target	By mid-2028	- NCHR is able to document how it has successfully addressed the concerns of GANHRNP's Sub-Committee on Accreditation. - # of NCHR public events/reports/media coverage (number to be determined in inception phase).

<sup>20</sup> LAF Annual reports 2022, 2023

<sup>21</sup> LAF Annual report 2024

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 NCHR capacity and needs assessment in relation to the identified outputs carried out.</li> <li>- 1 context analysis produced.</li> </ul>
Output 1		NCHR has increased its accessibility through establishing regional offices in select regions
Output indicator		1.1: 2 regional offices are operational. 1.2: # of staff of regional offices trained (number to be determined in inception phase).
Baseline	2025	Due to budget cuts, NCHR had to close the offices it had in the 5 provinces since 2001. NCHR is currently negotiating for funding for 4 provincial offices with 3 staff in each office in the finance law FY 2025/26.
Annual target	2025	- A comprehensive plan for an expansion in line with NCHR's mandate initiated.
Annual target	2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A comprehensive plan for an expansion in line with NCHR's mandate completed.</li> <li>- Basic furniture and equipment for two of the four planned regional offices for 3 staff per office provided.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2027	- Staff of regional offices trained in select areas identified in the expansion plan.
Annual target	2028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff of regional offices trained in select areas identified in the expansion plan.</li> <li>- Assessment of the impact of staff trainings carried out.</li> </ul>
Output 2		NCHR's National Preventive Mechanism has been strengthened in select regions
Output indicator		2.1: # of staff trained (number to be determined in inception phase). 2.2: # of monitoring visits carried out and reports/recommendations shared with duty bearers (number to be determined in inception phase). 2.3: # of engagement with duty bearers on human rights issues in places of detention (number to be determined in inception phase).
Baseline	2025	TBD
Annual target	2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A methodology for visiting detention facilities, including mental health facilities, developed.</li> <li>- Baseline initiated.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Baseline completed.</li> <li>- Monitoring tools reviewed and updated.</li> <li>- At least 12 staff members trained, with a particular focus on staff in the provincial offices.</li> <li>- At least 5 monitoring visits to detention facilities carried out and findings documented and shared.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 6 monitoring visits to detention facilities carried out and findings documented and shared.</li> <li>- Dialogue with Justice, Reconciliation, Law &amp; Order Sector actors and decision-makers carried out.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 5 monitoring visits to detention facilities carried out and findings documented and shared.</li> <li>- Dialogue with Justice, Reconciliation, Law &amp; Order Sector actors and decision-makers carried out.</li> <li>- Study on the situation in places of detention and the impact of NCHR's NPM work.</li> </ul>
Output 3		NCHR's interaction with the international human rights system has increased
Output indicator		3.1: # of parallel reports initiated/produced (number to be determined in inception phase). 3.2: # of UN and AU mechanisms engaged with (number to be determined in inception phase).
Baseline	2025	The NCHR has submitted a limited number of parallel reports (number TBD) to UN Treaty Bodies. The Commission engages in preparation of State periodic reports as a member of the taskforce on national treaty reporting and follow-up on recommendations and does not issue parallel reports when its advice is incorporated into the State's reports.
Annual target	2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A plan for strengthening NCHR's engagement in the international human rights system initiated.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>
Annual target	2026	- A plan for strengthening NCHR's engagement in the international human rights system developed.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concrete steps taken to implement the plan.</li> <li>- NCHR's direct engagement with select UN and AU human rights mechanisms facilitated.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concrete steps taken to implement the plan.</li> <li>- NCHR's direct engagement with select UN and AU human rights mechanisms facilitated.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concrete steps taken to implement the plan.</li> <li>- NCHR's direct engagement with select UN and AU human rights mechanisms facilitated.</li> </ul>
Output 4		The capacities of the NCHR leadership have increased in select mandate areas
Output indicator		4.1: # of commissioners and directors trained (number to be determined in inception phase). 4.2: A measurable increase in knowledge, skills and attitude of NCHR personnel trained based on pre- and post-training assessments
Baseline	2025	TBD
Annual target	2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A comprehensive capacity development plan has been initiated, following the identified needs in the EU assessment.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A comprehensive capacity development plan has been designed, following the identified needs in the EU assessment.</li> <li>- A leadership seminar for NCHR commissioners and key staff facilitated by the former head of the Ethiopian Human Rights Commission has been organised.</li> <li>- Training programmes identified in the capacity development plan have been facilitated.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training programmes identified in the capacity development plan have been facilitated.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment of the impact of leadership trainings carried out.</li> </ul>
Output 5		NCHR's research function has been strengthened
Output indicator		5.1: NCHR has a research plan 5.2: NCHR has a mechanism for assessing implementation of recommendations issued. 5.2: # of research reports produced
Baseline	2025	TBD
Annual target	2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Research needs identified.</li> <li>- Sharing of experiences from DIHR's research department.</li> <li>- A research plan and mechanism for assessing implementation of recommendations developed.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sharing of experiences from DIHR's research department.</li> <li>- A research plan and mechanism for assessing implementation of recommendations developed.</li> <li>- 1 research report prepared and disseminated.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 research report prepared and disseminated.</li> <li>- Implementation of recommendations outlined in research reports monitored.</li> </ul>
Annual target	2028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 research report prepared and disseminated.</li> <li>- Implementation of recommendations outlined in research reports monitored.</li> </ul>

## Interpeace

Project title	<b><i>"Resilient communities: deepening healing, strengthening livelihoods and civic engagement for effective reintegration and social cohesion in Rwanda"</i></b>
Project objective	<b>7</b>
Outcome 1:	Within two years, targeted individuals and families will demonstrate increased emotional resilience, improved intergenerational relationships, and greater economic self-reliance.
Outcome indicators	% of participants reporting improvement in: a) their personal emotional resilience



		b) trust and collaboration within their communities (social cohesion scale) c) their livelihood conditions (food security scale)	
Baseline	Year 0	2024	<b>At national level:</b> Overall resilience score: 51.3% (56% emotional awareness, 55% critical thinking, 51% self-management, 51% healing of trauma) Score of trust: 62.6% (61% on empathy, tolerance & forgiveness) Livelihood score: 59.6% reported food insecurity <b>Baseline for project participants to be determined by the pre-interventions assessment (pre-screening).</b>
Target	Year 3	2028	At least 70% report improved emotional resilience At least 80% report increased trust & collaboration At least 65% report improved livelihoods conditions
Output 1.1.:		Community-based dialogue spaces for healing and social cohesion operationalized	
Output indicator		# of individuals & families graduated from healing & community cohesion spaces	
Baseline	Year 0	2024	0
Annual target	Year 1	2025-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24 new dialogue and healing facilitators trained</li> <li>At least 12 multifamily dialogue and healing spaces facilitated</li> <li>At least 48 families (300 individuals) supported</li> </ul>
Annual target	Year 2	2026-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 24 multifamily dialogue and healing spaces facilitated</li> <li>At least 150 families (600 individuals) supported</li> </ul>
Annual target	Year 3	2027-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 12 multifamily dialogue and healing spaces facilitated</li> <li>At least 48 families (300 individuals) supported</li> </ul>
Output 1.2:		Households and community groups trained in livelihood and financial literacy, and provided with seed funding to run collaborative livelihoods initiatives	
Output indicator		# of CBEs incubated and operating	
Baseline	Year 0	2024	0
Annual target	Year 1	2025-26	
Target	Year 2	2026-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 1,125 graduates from healing are trained on CO-LIVE</li> <li>At least 90 individuals provided advanced training in entrepreneurship, business development &amp; management</li> <li>12 (intergenerational) Community-Based Enterprise (CBE) incubated &amp; supported</li> </ul>
Target	Year 3	2027-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 375 graduates from healing are trained on CO-LIVE</li> <li>At least 30 individuals provided advanced training in entrepreneurship, business development &amp; management</li> <li>3 (youth-specific) Community-Based Enterprise (CBE) incubated &amp; supported</li> </ul>
Outcome 2:		By the end of the two-year period, communities engaged in the project show stronger civic participation and improved trust in governance.	
Outcome indicators		% of targeted communities adopting functional, community-led mechanisms for conflict prevention and resolution, and participation in local decision-making processes % of participants reporting increased trust in local governance	
Baseline	Year 0	2024	<b>National scores:</b> 30% reported active participation in decision making (RGS-2024) 15% reported use of ADR mechanisms 66.2% reported trust in local government (RGS-2024) <b>Baseline for project participants to be determined by the pre-interventions assessment (pre-screening).</b>
Target	Year 2	2026-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 50% of targeted communities adopting functional, community-led mechanisms for conflict prevention and resolution, and participation in local decision-making processes</li> <li>At least 65% reporting active participation in local decision making</li> </ul>
Target	Year 3	2027-28	



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 80% of participants reporting increased trust in reintegration policy and local governance</li> </ul>
Output 2.1.		Strengthened community-based ADR mechanisms through training of ADR facilitators	
Output indicator		# of community conflict mediators trained, and % of disputes resolved using community-based ADR mechanisms.	
Baseline	Year 0	2025	0
Annual target	Year 1	2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 24 community-based ADR facilitators trained</li> <li>At least 24 ADR platforms facilitated by trained mediators</li> </ul>
Target	Year 2	2027	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 24 72 ADR platforms facilitated by trained mediators</li> </ul>
Target	Year 3	2028	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 24 ADR platforms facilitated by trained mediators</li> </ul>
Output 2.2.		Civic engagement platforms established/revitalized and facilitated by trained community dialogue facilitators.	
Output indicator		# of citizen forums facilitated (including a # of functioning youth and women forums)	
Baseline	Year 0	2024	0
Annual target	Year 1	2025-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 24 citizen forms facilitators trained</li> <li>2 events linking inmates closing their release and their respective families and community leaders organized, bringing together at least 200 people.</li> <li>At least 1 district coordination meeting organized, attended by 15 local officials, local actors, and representatives of citizen fora.</li> <li>1 national stakeholders dialogue conference, bringing together 60 representative of government institutions, civil society, researchers and local practitioners (actors)</li> </ul>
Target	Year 2	2026-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 180 citizen forums facilitated</li> <li>At least 3600 people empowered to actively participate in local decision-making</li> <li>At least 45 local officials and opinion leaders trained on trauma &amp; conflict-informed transformative leadership</li> <li>2 events linking inmates closing their release and their respective families and community leaders organized, bringing together at least 200 people.</li> <li>At least 2 district coordination meeting organized, attended by 30 local officials, local actors, and representatives of citizen fora.</li> <li>1 national stakeholders dialogue conference, bringing together 60 representative of government institutions, civil society, researchers and local practitioners (actors)</li> <li>45 correctional officers trained</li> </ul>
Target	Year 3	2027-28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 60 citizen forums facilitated</li> <li>At least 1200 people empowered to actively participate in local decision-making</li> <li>2 events linking inmates closing their release and their respective families and community leaders organized, bringing together at least 200 people.</li> <li>At least 1 district coordination meeting organized, attended by 15 local officials, local actors, and representatives of citizen fora.</li> <li>1 national stakeholders dialogue conference, bringing together 60 representative of government institutions, civil society, researchers and local practitioners (actors)</li> </ul>

## ANNEX 4: RISK MATRIX

See attached document.

## ANNEX 5: BUDGET DETAILS

See attached document.

## ANNEX 6: LIST OF SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Not included.

## ANNEX 7: COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS

Not included.

## ANNEX 8: PROCESS ACTION PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION

See attached document

## ANNEX 9.1: QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECK

See attached document

## Annex 9.2: APPRAISAL RECOMMENDATIONS

See attached document

**Identification of Good Governance and Human Rights support to Rwanda  
2025-2028**

*April 2025*

*Updated July 2025*

INTRODUCTION	3
1. BACKGROUND	4
2. CONTEXT ANALYSIS	4
3. STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS	8
3.1. Danish strategic framework	8
3.2. Rwanda's strategic framework	9
3.3. Denmark's Framework Document for Rwanda	9
4. DEVELOPMENT PARTNER ENGAGEMENT	10
5. LESSONS LEARNED ON GOVERNANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS PROGRAMMING IN AUTHORITARIAN CONTEXTS	11
6. OPTIONS FOR ENGAGEMENT	13
4. CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSED WAY FORWARD	16
ANNEX 1 ASSESSMENT GRID	19
ANNEX 2: OVERVIEW OF EU AND MEMBER STATE SUPPORT TO GOVERNANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS	27

#### List of Abbreviations

CBO	Community based organisation
CSO	Civil society organisation
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
GANHRI	Global Alliance of National Human rights Institutions
ILPD	Institute of Legal Practice and Development
JAP	Justice and Accountability Programme (EU)
NST1	National Strategy for Transformation 1
NST2	National Strategy for Transformation 2
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission
RGB	Rwanda Governance Board
ToR	Terms of Reference
UPR	Universal Periodic Review

## Introduction

This identification report lays the ground for the formulation of Danish support to governance and human rights in Rwanda. The ToR requests a scoping of possible support options in the governance, reconciliation and human rights sectors in Rwanda with a view to identifying and formulating *one or more project proposals* to be part of Denmark's sector engagement in the coming 2-3 years.

The approach to the assignment was to identify and assess realistic options based on an initial analysis of the governance situation and perspectives and then identify entry points. The report has been drafted based on an analysis, which draws heavily on accessible sources, reports and interviews within the time allocated to the assignment. On this basis the identification takes the approach of assessing *relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable engagement opportunities* for partnerships in governance, human rights and reconciliation.

The identification and formulation mission were in Kigali from 17<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2025 and worked closely with the Danish Embassy Office in the identification and formulation of a programme.

## 1. Background

Denmark has engaged in a **targeted partnership with Rwanda (2023-2025)** and plans to open an Embassy in Kigali in the third quarter of 2025. The partnership has taken the starting point in shared interests such as peace and security, climate change, poverty reduction, forced displacement, irregular migration, and adherence to rule-based international cooperation. In this light, Denmark and Rwanda work together on climate and environment, asylum and migration, governance, human rights and reconciliation, “to ensure the overall objective of **a greener, more democratic and socially cohesive Rwanda**”<sup>1</sup>. In the partnership, governance and human rights have been described as complex and challenging, and it has taken some time to start identifying programmatic elements, which is the purpose of this report.

Human rights are at the heart of Denmark’s development cooperation strategy, and the aim is therefore to actively work with Rwanda to protect and promote all human rights including political and civil freedoms (**The World We Share (2021)**). Denmark’s recent Africa Strategy, **Strategy for strengthened Danish engagement with African countries (August 2024)** (*hereafter the Africa Strategy*) provides new directions with focus on equal partnerships. Meanwhile, Denmark has started to prepare a new overall strategy for its development cooperation, which in late 2025 will replace the current strategy (*The World We Share*).

DKK 15 million has been allocated to the area of governance and human rights on the Danish Finance Act for 2025, and a further DKK 15 million is planned for 2026.

## 2. Context analysis

### Summary points for chapter 2:

*There are entry points for civil society to promote citizens participation in service delivery, but also in climate justice and reconciliation. Rwanda’s statebuilding model prioritises stability, economic development and service delivery and thereby the promotion of socio-economic rights and citizens participation to promote check and balances in these areas.*

*Civil and political rights are restricted with the consequences that civil society does not play a major role in the statebuilding efforts.*

*Currently there are openings to engage with the National Commission for Human Rights (NCHR), as it may lose its A status, unless NCHR “steps-up” in several critical areas of its mandate. Rwanda is signatory to major international treaties, and rule of law institutions are well established, but institutions function with a degree of dependence on the executive, this includes the NHRC.*

*The ongoing efforts to strengthen access to justice takes place at different levels and with focus on policy coherence and implementation, judging the most effective entry points is not straightforward. Access to justice a major obstacle for citizens, and not least in the perspective of crimes committed during the genocide, and the aftermaths. The court system faces increasing backlogs of cases, and alternative dispute resolution is promoted as a way to help citizens seek justice without long delays and costs in the formal system. Meanwhile reconciliation – for example through the Abunzi system is important at the grassroots level but experiencing fatigue.*

Rwanda's human rights and governance landscape is characterized by a **juxtaposition of economic progress and stringent political control**. In July 2024, Rwanda conducted Presidential and Legislative elections. Incumbent President Paul Kagame was re-elected for a fourth term with 99.18% of the votes and a reported 98.2% voter turnout, facing little opposition and delivering largely expected results. The ruling Rwanda Patriotic Front retained its parliamentary majority with 68.83%, ensuring continuity over any expectations for even a slight expansion of democratic space. The outcome mirrored the previous Presidential and Legislative elections of 2017 and 2018.

The country presents a complex governance and human rights situation, shaped by its historical context, the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi, and the government's post-genocide state-building efforts. The Genocide continues to be a defining backdrop in Rwanda's governance and human rights discourse, and the tight political control is narrated as a necessity for the prevention of a return to ethnic divisions and a major conflict. However, even considering the historical context, human rights violations such as torture and forced disappearances of political opponents cannot be justified. Reports from organizations like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch highlight concerns regarding freedom of expression, association, torture, and fair trial rights.

Rwanda's governance model prioritizes stability, economic development, and service delivery. This position comes at the expense of political freedoms and civil liberties, leading to a complex and often contentious human rights environment. The government prioritizes **socio-economic rights**, ensuring access to public services and promoting poverty reduction policies, using a performance driven approach. Public participation is encouraged in service delivery but within government-defined frameworks rather than independent citizen-led initiatives. Corruption levels are low and there is a strong reputation for good financial governance. Civil society organisations (CSO) working in service delivery (education, health, social welfare) face fewer restrictions than others in the civil society landscape.

Controls on **civil and political rights** are strict, and it can be argued that it is mainly in theory that media and civil society organizations, whose legal framework has been revised respectively in 2013, 2015 and 2024<sup>1</sup>, play a critical role regarding promotion and external oversight of human rights and governance. There are restrictions on media freedoms and opposition parties. Investigative journalists, especially those reporting on sensitive issues, face harassment, threats, and, in some cases, suspicious deaths. Organizations focusing on governance, human rights, and democracy often choose self-censorship to avoid government retaliation. Besides the restrictive laws they also face bureaucratic hurdles, and a climate of intimidation.

Rwanda ranks in the lower quintiles of international indices assessing political rights. Freedom House classifies the country as “not free,” assigning it a low score of 23/100.

Similarly, Civicus rates Rwanda at 25/100, placing it in the “Repressed countries” category, while the Bertelsmann Transformation Index categorizes it as a “Hard-line autocracy.”

Regarding freedom of speech and media, Reporters Without Borders ranked Rwanda 144th out of 180 countries in its 2024 index, a decline from 131st place in 2023. This drop is attributed to a

---

<sup>1</sup> Law governing NGOs L 58-2024 /20-06-2024, revising L 04-2012 on national NGOs and L. 05-2012 on international NGOs



“limited media landscape” and instances of violence against journalists. Rwanda remains among the lowest-ranking African countries in the index, positioned in the lowest quintile <sup>2</sup>.

Civil society organisations rely heavily on international funding, which is scarce, and their programmatic focus shifts frequently depending on donor priorities. This results in high staff turnover and weak institutional continuity. Community-based organizations (CBOs) seem to lack capacity and strong linkages with urban-based CSOs, and their relationships are often transactional. A few CSOs operate with a degree of government acceptance and their leadership conducts some political advocacy within boundaries that they seem to know well.

Despite Rwanda’s global reputation for **gender equality** in governance, women-led civil society organizations appear to be weak and have limited advocacy influence. **Youth led** civil society organisations and movements tend to focus on entrepreneurship, employment and the green agenda, and less on politics and rights.

The complexity and double-sidedness of the governance situation in Rwanda is summed up in the *2024 Mo Ibrahim Foundation Index on Overall Governance*<sup>3</sup>. Rwanda scores is ranked 14th out of 54 countries in Africa. The country’s overall rating is “pulled down” by its 35<sup>th</sup> position out of 54<sup>4</sup> for “Participation, Rights & Inclusion”, due to low scores in Media Freedom (50<sup>th</sup>), Freedom of Expression & Belief (45<sup>th</sup>), Freedom of Association & Assembly (44<sup>th</sup>), Digital Freedom (43<sup>rd</sup>), Political Pluralism (41<sup>st</sup>), Civil Society Space (40<sup>th</sup>)<sup>5</sup>.

Regarding **rule of law**, Rwanda’s accession in 1962 to the United Nations implied the constitutionalising of fundamental liberties, followed by further adhesion to some core UN human rights treaties in the mid-seventies<sup>6</sup>. Nevertheless, implementation mechanisms lagged, and the promotion and protection of human rights was therefore at the heart of the 1993 Arusha Peace Agreement and its 1992 Protocol on Rule of Law <sup>7</sup>. Despite these normative steps taken the 1994 Genocide became a stark witness to the shortcoming of upholding human rights and protection the population, and in spite of the peace agreement. The governance and human rights institutional framework are seen to be ensured by the National Commission for Human Rights, while the latter is ensured by the Judiciary.

Rwanda has made some strides in improving its judicial infrastructure, concerns persist regarding its independence. Critics will say that the legal system is an instrument for the executive branch, with political opponents and dissenters subjected to prosecutions with limited transparency and fairness.

The **National Commission for Human Rights** was established in 1999 to sensitize the public on human rights, investigate violations, and inform authorities for possible judicial action. It is an “Other State Organs” created by the 2003 Constitution (Art.140), with its independence enshrined in Article 42. Over time, the NCHR mandate has expanded inter alia to include the National Preventive Mechanism (L.61/2018). With quasi-judicial status, its commissioners act as judicial police officers, enabling on-site

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.icnl.org/resources/civic-freedom-monitor/rwanda>

<sup>3</sup> [https://assets.iiaonline/2024-IIAG-country-scorecards\\_EN.pdf](https://assets.iiaonline/2024-IIAG-country-scorecards_EN.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> <https://iiaonline/data.html?meas=PRI&loc=RW&view=overview&subview=absoluteTrends>

<sup>5</sup> IIAG 2024 index, page 61

<sup>6</sup> International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (adhesion in 1975) | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1975) | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1975) | Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1981) | Convention on the Rights of the Child (1991). Rwanda also adhered to the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol (1980). Information obtained in interview and documentation shared by the EU adviser in the Ministry of Justice.

<sup>7</sup> <https://ucdpged.uu.se/peaceagreements/fulltext/Rwa%2019930804.pdf>

investigations and legal proceedings in human rights cases. Since 2002, the NCHR has held A-Status accreditation from the Global Alliance of National Human rights Institutions (GANHRI) for meeting Paris Principles standards, allowing participation in the UN Human Rights Council and other monitoring mechanisms.

The **court system** faces a huge and increasing backlog of cases. The backlog is recognised as one of the major challenges in access to justice, but the formal system is overburdened in several respects. Considering the backlogs in courts, and the steadily increasing cases received by the Rwanda Investigation Bureau, and the National Public Prosecution<sup>8</sup>, there is focus on finding alternatives to the court system. The Criminal Justice Policy was adopted, among other objectives, to reduce the number of cases going to courts, and offer effective rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders back into the community.

Rwanda has developed **alternative dispute resolution (ADR)** as a national system to enhance access to justice. The system takes on civil cases but there are currently plans to include criminal cases in ADR to take pressure off the delays in the courts. Such a jurisdiction for the ADR system can be questioned, because of the lack of legal expertise and safeguards of the ADR. Currently there is a renewed focus on policy coordination to ensure that access to justice is stepped up by a coordination of the Legal Aid Policy (which apparently has been dormant since it was passed in 2014), the ADR, and the Criminal Justice policy. An ADR centre has been established, which aims to bring the different actors together and speed up implementation. These efforts have just started and the roll-out is pending because of various steps standard operating procedures, coordination mechanisms, and training not yet being developed.

With regard to **reconciliation**, the National Unity and Reconciliation Commission, established in 1999, has played a central role in promoting unity, reconciliation, and healing. The focus has been on community dialogues, education, and policy implementation to foster national cohesion. As an illustration of the magnitude of the task after the genocide, the community based justice system in force until 2012 tried over 1.9 million cases, emphasizing truth-telling, accountability, and reintegration. **Abunzi** Committees were established in 2003 under the constitution, and serve as a hybrid justice system combining traditional and modern conflict resolution methods. Their goal is to provide restorative justice at the lowest levels, and ease the burden on the formal judicial system, which often faces resource and capacity constraints. Abunzi committees are voluntary and the system seems to be weighed down by a degree of fatigue, and was reported to be losing many members, and become non-operational.

Some organisations also work with **trauma counselling and psycho-social** support recognising the enormous, multifaceted and lasting impact of the genocide. These systems mechanisms continue to be of huge importance in the communities, and the release and return of “genocidaires” which has started and will continue in considerable number in the coming years will be a stark reminder for survivors and their families. The current culture of silence will be difficult to uphold, and counselling needs are seen to rise considerably. Another issue is the intergenerational trauma and reconciliation gaps as many young Rwandans born after 1994 struggle with trauma inheritance and understanding past events, while their parents struggle to break the silence. Some survivors feel justice remains incomplete others argue reconciliation was forced rather than organic. A major strategy for the Government is to enable healing and peaceful coexistence through socio-economic development and poverty reduction; and strengthen citizens joining together and participating in local accountability mechanisms for service delivery.

---

<sup>8</sup> Information from LAF: Since 2015-2016, the files received by NPPA has increased drastically, from 25,453 to 83,349 in the last year of 2021-2022, and the figures show that this year 2022-2023 may exceed 103,404.

Rwanda ranking as number 41 out of 142 countries in the **2023 World Bank Rule of Law Index**<sup>9</sup> which is a composite index in which the country is “penalised” by its low 76<sup>th</sup> place for Fundamental Rights observance.

Rwanda’s involvement in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) has drawn international scrutiny. The United Nations and various human rights organizations have accused Rwanda of providing support to the M23 rebel group, implicated in serious human rights violations in eastern DRC. These allegations have strained Rwanda’s diplomatic relations and raised questions about its commitment to regional stability.

### 3. Strategic considerations

#### Summary points for chapter 3.

While the Government of Rwanda’s priorities on human rights meet international standards on paper, the dismal track record and actions in the area of **civil and political rights** cannot be said to align with the objectives of Denmark’s development cooperation strategy (*The World We Share*).

Meanwhile Denmark and Rwanda can find **common ground** at the strategic level on the priority to **socio-economic rights, poverty reduction and gender equality**, as well as other policy areas such as climate change mitigation, green energy, and refugees and migration. Rwanda has relatively low levels of corruption and there is a strategic level focus on transparency and accountability, and improvement of service delivery (NST 2).

#### 3.1. Danish strategic framework

Denmark has primarily two strategic frameworks of key importance for alignment and guiding in the identification process.

**The World We Share (2021)** is Denmark’s strategy for development cooperation until its successor is in place in late 2025. The strategy emphasises human rights and democratic governance as foundational elements. Denmark aims to bolster democratic institutions and processes by promoting participation and free expression and thereby advocating for the rights to participation, expression, association, assembly, free media, and access to information to support enabling environments for elections, and moreover to enhance civil society engagement in advocacy and hold governments accountable. Gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls stand out as a priority. With regard to socio-economic rights the strategy focuses on combating poverty and inequality through inclusive economic growth that promotes sustainable development that benefits all societal segments and social progress initiatives (i.e. education, health, and social protection to uplift disadvantaged communities). The strategy also emphasises Denmark’s priority to conflict prevention and fragility response, i.e. to foster global peace and stability and engage in initiatives that tackle the root causes of conflict and fragility and supporting displacement and migration solutions.

In the **Africa Strategy (2024)** the main message is the emphasis on the promotion of equal partnerships with African countries, recognizing Africa’s growing geopolitical significance. The strategy outlines a new and fairly broad direction for Danish engagement in Africa. The focus is on mutual interests and

<sup>9</sup> <https://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/country/2023/Rwanda/>

acknowledging Africa's role in international politics. The Africa Strategy maintains focus on initiatives that support the rights of women and girls, as well as education. There is also a focus on efforts to promote human rights through digital technologies and uphold gender equality, recognizing these as fundamental components of democratic governance.

### 3.2. Rwanda's strategic framework

Rwanda's governance and human rights framework is anchored in its **Constitution**, which emphasizes democracy, unity, and the protection of fundamental rights. Adopted in 2003 and amended in subsequent years, the Constitution dedicates forty-one articles to establishing and ensuring fundamental human rights and freedoms. The Constitution guarantees rights such as equality before the law, protection from discrimination, and the right to life. Governance is institutionalised in a presidential system with a bicameral parliament.

Rwanda follows a long-term development strategy (**Vision 2050**) aiming to transform Rwanda into an upper-middle-income country by 2035 and a high-income country by 2050. This vision emphasizes good governance, rule of law, and respect for human rights as foundational pillars. The **National Strategy for Transformation (NST1)** covered the period from 2017 to 2024, and focused on economic growth, social development, and transformational governance, aiming to consolidate good governance and justice as building blocks for equitable and sustainable national development. The **NST2** was approved in August 2024 and outlining the country's development agenda for 2025–2029. NST2 builds upon the achievements of NST1 and focuses on five key priority areas developed with specific targets: 1. Job Creation; 2. Export Promotion; 3. Quality of Education; 4. Reduction of Stunting and Malnutrition; and 5. Enhanced Public Service Delivery.

Initiated in 2000, Rwanda's **decentralization policy** aims to promote good governance, reduce poverty, and enhance efficient service delivery by empowering local governments. This policy facilitates citizen participation in decision-making processes at various administrative levels. However, there is a move towards recentralisation and fiscal decentralisation is limited.

**The Rwanda Governance Board (RGB)** promotes good governance principles as well as it can be considered to be a controlling mechanism. The RGB also develops tools and is for example the counterpart for the CSO (like NPAs' PPIMA Project) in the efforts to assess and enhance governance standards across various sectors (using a community score card).

### 3.3. Denmark's Framework Document for Rwanda

The objective of the Danish engagement in governance and human rights in Rwanda is to **Promote and support the strengthening of good governance, human rights and citizen engagement with an emphasis on accountability and transparency**<sup>10</sup>.

While recognising the achievements in Rwanda regarding state reconstruction, stability and socio-economic development over the last decades, it is noted in the document that Rwanda has made little progress towards a more pluralistic democracy, with open political space and competing views.

Meanwhile it is emphasised that there are areas where Rwanda is "likeminded" with Denmark's policies. These are gender equality and non-discrimination of consensual same-sex relations. The framework document also notes that Rwanda has become increasingly engaged in the UN Universal Periodic Review

---

<sup>10</sup> Draft Framework Document (2023).

process, which has proved to be an effective mechanism for human rights advocacy, especially for local civil society organizations. Denmark is currently engaged in human rights and governance in one major project, which aligns with both Denmark's and Rwanda's focus on socio-economic rights and citizens participation and inclusion. The project is the **Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy (PPIMA IV)** supported with DKK 10 million. PPIMA is a civil society support project aimed at strengthening CSOs and citizens to participate and influence the formulation and implementation of national and local policymaking, planning and governance. The project has worked in 19 different districts through local CSOs and supported better service delivery and advocacy of issues raised in districts for policy change at the national level. Denmark also engages in **policy dialogue** as a EU member state.

There is no alignment between Denmark's strategic emphasis on civil and political rights at strategic level and the dismal track record and actions in this area in Rwanda, even if Rwanda at policy and strategy level show such commitments on paper.

Meanwhile Denmark and Rwanda can find **common ground** at the strategic level on the priority to socio economic rights, poverty reduction, gender equality and reconciliation.

#### 4. Development partner engagement

##### Summary points for chapter 4:

The EU's Justice and Accountability Programme is a major pillar of human rights and governance support, and complementarity coordination with this programme is an advantage for Denmark in engagement in justice and human rights. The Ministry of Justice is considered by development partners to be an interested partner, and Ministry which is in need for additional resources to engage in reforms and delivery of services to the population.

The development partners work with the government on transparency and accountability and supports a range of rights initiatives through NGOs. This includes sexual and reproductive health rights, inclusion including for LGBTI, reconciliation, and not least socio economic rights and public participation where there are good relations with sector ministries.

The information in this chapter derives from an EU mapping of engagements. There are currently major shifts in the development partner landscape, due to USAID pull out, and reduction in the FCDO support, which are underway. The multilateral support could also be affected. Germany has suspended its assistance to Rwanda because of the situation in Eastern DRC. Meanwhile Rwanda has cut development cooperation ties with Belgium. The operations by NGOs in Rwanda are highly affected by the current shifts in support mechanisms.

The EU and its member states engage in quiet diplomacy with the Rwandan government through various channels, including the justice and human rights dialogue, political partnership discussions, and regular ministerial-level engagements as needed. One key initiative is the annual **Justice, Reconciliation, Law, and Order Sector Peer Review**, a multi-day retreat that facilitates in-depth discussions on policy progress and challenges. This event brings together key stakeholders such as the Minister of Justice, Chief Justice, Chief Prosecutor, senior justice sector officials, practitioners, civil society organizations, and international partners. While primarily focused on justice-related policies, the retreat also touches on the implementation of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) roadmap.

The EU and its member states also engage strategically with civil society organizations through various dialogue platforms and programs aimed at promoting human rights. A major EU initiative, the **Justice and Accountability Programme** (€20 million) focuses on enhancing justice delivery, inclusivity, and human rights protections. Additionally, member states continue bilateral judicial cooperation, including on prosecutions, trials, and extraditions, particularly in cases related to genocide. The Justice and Accountability Programme also supports the National Human Rights Commission by providing training for police and correctional services on human rights issues, including the prevention of torture. Furthermore, several Member States fund CSOs to facilitate shadow reporting on human rights practices.

**Civil Society Organizations as Actors of Change Programme** is an EU challenge fund aimed at enhancing CSOs' contributions to governance, development, and human rights processes in Rwanda. The initiative has focused on areas such as reconciliation, accountability, environmental sustainability, art and culture, anti-discrimination, and durable solutions for forced displacement (€4.6 million).

In 2024, various international donors and organizations continued to support human rights initiatives and citizen engagement in Rwanda through multiple programs and collaborations. An overview of the EU member states programmes is found in Annex 2.

Moreover, is the United Kingdom a major donor to decentralisation and public financial management directly to the government and support to CSOs to promote citizen engagement, accountability, human rights advancement, and progress in freedom of expression. Switzerland also has a human rights and governance programme and works closely with other European donors.

UNDP manages the **Strengthening Civil Society Organizations for Responsive and Accountable Governance**. This ongoing project, with an estimated budget of \$8.6 million, aims to enhance the capacities of local CSOs to advocate for human rights, gender equality, and social justice. It also seeks to bolster CSOs' roles in socio-economic development and facilitate effective citizen engagement.

Since late January the situation in the development partner support to Rwanda has changed drastically and more changes are currently unfolding. USAID has first suspended and most recently terminated its support altogether (January/February 2025), the FCDO will cut its total aid budget by 40% which is likely to affect Rwanda, Germany has suspended its assistance to Rwanda, and Rwanda has cut its aid ties with Belgium. These changes are already being felt in the Government and in civil society organisations which must scale down their operations. The multilateral organisations and programmes are also affected.

## 5. Lessons learned on Governance and Human rights programming in authoritarian contexts

### Summary points for chapter 5:

Lessons learned from human rights and governance programming in authoritarian contexts are relevant for the Danish engagement. Development partner experience from engagement in Rwanda point to the importance – and opportunities- of working directly with the Government as well as civil society.

Meanwhile programming with civil society, at local and national levels and in this regard assess their relationship and entry points with the Government is an important approach (re the point above).



Working together with likeminded donors, and not least under the auspices of the EU will offer Denmark possibilities for participation in policy dialogue (quiet diplomacy), which must be part of the engagement, noting the authoritarian context and the dismal situation on political and human rights.

There are opportunities to develop an approach (over time) where governance and human rights are very visible cross cutting issues in the support to migration and refugees and climate change in particular in climate justice.

Denmark's flexibility in planning and implementation, and Doing Development Differently, is highly appropriate in Rwanda.

Denmark has only few experiences from Rwanda for how to achieve results in human rights and governance programming in authoritarian contexts, but from other contexts Denmark has considerable experience in identifying entry points and working in flexible and adaptive ways in order to stay engaged in a meaningful way and to uphold the strategic level priorities of Danish development cooperation. General experiences from donors, including Denmark is summarised below (the points below are not exhaustive)<sup>11</sup>.

**Supporting Local Civil Society and Independent Actors**, which includes: Empower local NGOs, activists, and independent media to promote human rights and accountability; flexible and indirect funding to grassroots organizations, ensuring they can operate without direct government control; Use digital platforms to support freedom of expression while mitigating state censorship and surveillance. All of such actions need to be analysed carefully from a Do No Harm perspective.

- This approach is taken by some donors in Rwanda, but it seems piecemeal and limited, due to the potential of Doing Harm to local actors.
- In Rwanda, the international community has experienced that working only with civil society does not yield results. Working with and through the Government is both effective and holds potential for sustainability. The issue is though that on sensitive rights issues Government is not open for cooperation.

**Engaging in Quiet Diplomacy and Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue**, which includes: Development cooperation actors can maintain dialogue with authoritarian governments on governance and human rights without directly confronting them; Engage in “issue-based cooperation” (e.g., environmental protection, education, health) that indirectly strengthens civic engagement and governance; Promote peer learning and exchanges with institutions from democratic states.

- Approach taken by the international community in Rwanda.

**Strengthening Public Sector Institutions from within**, which includes: Focus on administrative efficiency, anti-corruption mechanisms, and service delivery, which indirectly enhance accountability.; Support legal and regulatory reforms that may improve citizens' rights without directly challenging the regime.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Consultant has prepared the summary based on literature and own evaluation work on governance in authoritarian contexts.



- Approach taken in particular by FCDO and the EU in their major engagements.

**Leveraging Economic Incentives and HR and Good Governance as cross-cutting themes**, which includes: Use “governance-linked aid”, where funding for infrastructure, education, or health are “mixed” governance reforms and human rights; transparency and accountability; Partner with business communities to promote responsible investment, labor rights, and anti-corruption measures.

- An approach taken inter alia by Switzerland in Rwanda. This could be relevant for Denmark in areas such as climate and environmental justice; and in promotion of gender and minority rights.

**Using Digital and Technology-Based Approaches**, which includes: Develop e-governance projects that improve transparency in service delivery (e.g., digital tax collection, online legal aid); Leverage big data and satellite technology to monitor human rights violations and governance failures.

- Approaches increasingly promoted by CSOs and the Government in Rwanda (for example NPA following on from PPIMA and other of their projects).

**Supporting Education and Youth Engagement**, which includes: Invest in education programs that encourage critical thinking, civic participation, and knowledge of human rights; Work with universities and student groups to create networks of future reformers; Develop cultural and artistic initiatives that promote governance themes without overt political confrontation.

- Culture and arts activities support can be relevant for Denmark through the new Danish Fund for culture and arts, which is a four year initiative under the auspices of the Africa Strategy.

With regard to approaches Denmark’s **Doing Development Differently** approach is appropriate to the Rwandan situation. Denmark also engages with likeminded donors, mainly under the auspices of the EU Delegation.

## 6. Options for engagement

Taking note and lessons from the above chapters, the strategic options for engagement point the following: position the Danish support where there is balance between Government and civil society priorities; where results can be anticipated; in engagements where there is strategic level alignment between Danish and Rwandese priorities; and finally, to underscore human rights as a basic principle for Denmark’s development cooperation. The identification mission consulted a number of organisations, donors and individuals, and based on other engagements and assessments in the area of human rights and good governance in Rwanda, the organisations selected are transparently presented and justified in this section.

It is proposed to engage in **three priorities** (outcome areas) in the Danish support to human rights, governance and reconciliation. The summary below provides the justification for the identification of engagements. Annex 1 goes a step deeper and seeks to substantiate the proposed selection, by applying the OECD/DAC criteria.

1. **Promoting socio-economic rights and enhancing citizens engagement in quality of local development.**

Specific reference to Denmark's strategic framework with Rwanda:

“promote and protect human rights; advocate for democratic development; support and work together with civil society on relevant human rights issues, such as active citizen participation in local governance, civic space, inclusion of marginalized groups and access to justice; special attention to the inclusion of women and other marginalized groups”.

Socio-economic rights and quality services are key to poverty reduction, and central both to Denmark's and Rwanda's strategic frameworks. Citizens in Rwanda can exercise their right to advocate for example for quality services, and the right to food. In line with Rwanda's official performance approach, there is focus on developing and using tools to measure and improve performance and to build the capacities of communities and CBOs in this regard. The focus on socio-economic rights and participation is an area where there is close cooperation between the government in particular the Ministry of Local Government and the Ministry of Finance, and CSOs. There are several CSOs with expertise and experience in the area. These include Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) and Never Again Rwanda (NAR). Denmark has good ongoing experience with NPA through the PPIMA IV. PPIMA IV is currently being evaluated, and the evaluation report will be of importance for Denmark to take the decision regarding the continuation of the cooperation (see the assessment grid below). NAR on the other hand, is positioning itself as a think tank, with less hands on engagement in project implementation and thereby concrete results.

The assessment of partner selection included NPA and NAR as these are the two main actors in this area among civil society organisations. As stated above NAR is currently changing its focus to become more of a think tank. Meetings with the SDC and FCDO discussed the options of working through the Ministry of Local Government, as they have embarked on in their programming. In order to avoid overcrowding and over engagement with the Ministry's own programmes it was decided to build on the ongoing satisfactory partnership with NPA in light of their expertise, effectiveness and focus on localisation.

## 2. Access to justice and monitoring of human rights under the Constitution.

Specific reference to Denmark's strategic framework with Rwanda:

“promote and protect human rights; participate actively in the human rights and political dialogue between Rwanda and EU Member states; special attention to the inclusion of women and other marginalized groups. “

- 2.1. **Access to justice** in the broadest sense is a major obstacle for Rwandan citizens, both related to the aftermath of the Genocide and for other cases to be resolved. The formal court system is overloaded, and alternative dispute resolution is therefore an official policy. Meanwhile there is a demand for citizens with few or no means to be able to access legal aid, so their access to justice can be fulfilled. Denmark can benefit from the ongoing EU Justice and Accountability Programme,

which supports judiciary reforms and promotion of human rights and make meaningful complements to these efforts by supporting the coherence and coordination between legal aid, ADR and criminal justice. The Legal Aid Forum (LAF) is a civil society organisation, which has positioned itself in a coordination role and as a trusted actor with the Ministry of Justice. Danish support through LAF will emphasise capacity building, coordination, implementation and awareness raising and training of justice and law actors. The EU leads the policy dialogue and notes the importance and its ability to conduct dialogue on reforms “from the inside”. This is a further opportunity for Denmark to work in complementarity with the EU. The EU has two advisers posted in the MoJ, which helps to understand the progress on reforms and the role played by organisations such as LAF.

- 2.2. Monitoring of human rights under the Constitution falls under the NCHR, which is one of the institutions with a specific mandate for **monitoring human rights** under the constitution. The NCHR cannot fulfil its role, partly because it is not independent and therefore mostly engaged in non-sensitive rights cases, but also because it is not present outside Kigali, and the commission also struggles with capacity shortcomings as pointed out by GANHRI and an ongoing capacity assessment undertaken by the Ministry of Justice. The commission is in danger of losing its A status.

The EU programme supports the NCHR, and currently conducts a capacity assessment, which will be an entry point for the commission and the international community to engage in a strategic process to help the commission to retain its A status, which implies the improvement of quality of conducting the mandate and increase coverage. There is also an opportunity to support the new leadership of the NCHR, as there is a commitment to implement a reform agenda and raise the standard of operation. External support will be key to the reforms, as the commission is not well resourced (it is one of the least resourced institutions in Africa). The Danish Institute for Human Rights could be positioned as a partner to the commission and work closely with the EU and the Commission as a way to augment the ongoing partnership between the EU and the Commission bringing in expertise as requested. An important aspect of such engagement is that the technical level dialogue on the resources needed by the commission can be framed and articulated from an international perspective and empower the commission vis-a-vis and support its funding and resource needs.

In the assessment of potential partners as also stated above the NHCR is an institution mandated in the constitution and a coordinated effort with the EU and supported by the Danish expert institution was judged to be effective, coherent and ensuring the highest quality. The Legal Aid Forum works closely with the Government, is seen as a legitimate partner by the Government at the same time as they are among the few advocates for human rights, which have a voice in Rwanda.

### 3. Conflict prevention and reconciliation

Specific reference to Denmark’s strategic framework with Rwanda:

“support peaceful reconciliation of the Genocide against the Tutsi as well as many decades of ethnic stereotyping, discrimination, inequality, and state-led violence and impunity including by the reintegration of prisoners and ex-perpetrators of genocide into society.”

The fragilities in Rwandan society cannot be ignored. The structural fragilities point back to the 1994 Genocide, and the structure of inequality leading up to the tragedy, and subsequently the aftermath of reconciliation, seeking justice and statebuilding and institutional building. The two Danish priorities (above) are of strategic importance, but impact and sustainability are questionable, because of the fragility of social cohesion and widespread psycho-social problems in communities, which often have been suppressed. A third priority for Denmark is therefore to engage in conflict prevention and reconciliation at a time where the release of about 20,000 genocidaires and reintegrating into communities, and the conflict in Eastern DRC, could jeopardise the stability of communities and erode gains in social-cohesion and public participation. The return of the genocidaires to society is predicted to increase levels of anxiety and other psychosocial problems, directly impacting social cohesion. Prisoner rehabilitation is therefore a high priority to ensure that the newly released prisoners can assimilate back into society without stirring up the social fabric and set -off community conflicts. There are major efforts ongoing in the prisons Since 2020, Interpeace and its local partners, Dignity in Detention, Haguruka, and Prison Fellowship Rwanda, with financial support from the European Union and the Government of Sweden.

The emphasis on conflict prevention and reconciliation from a mental and psycho-social perspective is not covered by the Abunzi system. The system is designed to promote restorative justice, social harmony, and access to justice, Abunzi handle disputes related to land, family matters, inheritance, debts, and minor civil or criminal cases. The system like other access to justice mechanisms do not include the psycho-social and mental elements, which are essential to prevent conflicts and reconciliation within communities, when the “lid” is opened and the culture of silence is being tested by the genocidaires returning and the conflict in Eastern DRC also reignite perceptions of ethnic conflict. Both the government and the civil society organisations are concerned with the situation and jointly prioritise the peaceful reintegration.

Interpeace works with smaller civil society organisations, and as an international organisation with tested and proven approaches they are the only organisation in Rwanda currently that effectively can operate at the standards required. Their work with local organisations ensures localisation and capacity building.

## 4. Conclusions and proposed way forward

A brief conclusion of the identification process is that there could be three *outcome areas* for Danish engagement. The outcomes are priorities both for Rwanda and for Denmark. Moreover, it is important

for Denmark to signal the foundational importance of civil and political rights, which is also reflected in the outcomes.

These are

- **Promoting socio-economic rights and enhancing citizens engagement in quality of local development.** This priority is proposed to be implemented by NPA under the continuation of PPIMA IV, where Denmark is already contributing to a transitional phase. This partnership is through NPA, a civil society organisation working in cooperation with national civil society organisations, national and local governments. In this priority there is also focus on environmental rights and climate justice, and thereby a link to other priorities in the Danish programme. PPIMA has delivered tangible results and has a very good track record in implementation. Alternatives were assessed, but NPA is the strongest partner.
- **Access to justice and monitoring of human rights under the Constitution.** This priority is proposed to be implemented by the Legal Aid Forum and the NCHR. LAF will work on relevant policy coordination and the promotion of ADR and legal aid and thereby enhance access to justice for vulnerable groups. LAF is a member based organisation, which sub-grants to its members. The proposal prepared for the mission is not convincing and need to be further clarified and detailed to get a full grasp of the tangible results anticipated. The strength of LAF is the status it has with the Ministry of Justice and other actors in the legal sector.
- **There is a real opportunity to strengthen the role of the NCHR, which currently appears weak, inefficient and ineffective with limited impact.** A strategic plan, a capacity assessment by the EU, and new leadership combined with a threat of the commission losing its A status are all key ingredients for changes and possible reforms. The DIHR has expressed interest in engaging with the commission, and a proposal prepared by DIHR and the Commission in close coordination with the EU's technical experts in the Ministry of Justice is expected to be a strong component and important element of the Danish support. This engagement also strengthens Denmark's participation in political dialogue (under the auspices of the EU) on human rights.
- **Conflict prevention and reconciliation.** This priority underscores the need to support the Rwandese population to cope with a wave of unresolved psycho-social consequences of the Genocide and the flaring up of tragedies and atrocities committed, when genocidaires are released. It has been pointed out that there is a real gap in support to the mental aspects of the unresolved issues, the lack of justice, and the culture of silence. It is proposed to explore support to Interpeace's country programme in line with Sweden and the EU.
- Next steps are the development of concept notes by the organisations and the drafting of a Programme document including a budget on the basis of this identification report and input from the partners.



## Annex 1 Assessment Grid

**Promoting socio-economic rights and enhancing citizens engagement in quality of local development.**

### **NPA and PPIMA IV and future programming**

Status	Description	Comment as relevant
Objective	<p>Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) is an international, politically independent, membership-based organisation working in more than 30 countries around the world. NPA's international work covers three core areas: mine action and disarmament, development aid, and humanitarian relief aid. NPA has been implementing activities in Rwanda since the end of the genocide against the Tutsis in 1994. NPA has been implementing the</p> <p>NPA writes in the concept note prepared for the ongoing Danish support that: "Beyond transparent service delivery as a basis for promoting human rights, there is still huge room for improvement on a range of political and civil rights, including freedoms of opinions. The ongoing work on the independent monitoring and reporting on the human rights Universal Periodical Review (UPR) recommendations implementation progress by Rwanda needs to be amplified and eventually extended to adequately engage citizens on human rights topic". The quote is important as it signals that the work on socio- economic rights and public participation is important but ahead lie the need to address political and civil rights.</p> <p>The Public Policy Information, Monitoring and Advocacy (<b>PPIMA</b>) programme, initiated as a pilot in 2009, constitutes the backbone of NPAs work in Rwanda. PPIMA aims to reduce inequalities by ensuring equal distribution of voice, power, and resources among the diverse population. The programme covers 19 districts. The programme focuses on enhancing citizen interest in public policy, ensuring policy and service delivery reflect citizens' needs and aspirations, including those of women, youth, people with disabilities, and the elderly. A core component of PPIMA is the Community Score Card (CSC), a participatory tool integrated into government-led home-grown citizen participation initiatives.</p>	
Strategic plan		To be shared by NPA



Current situation	<p>Denmark is currently the main supporter of NPAs work with a 10 million DKK contribution (3,5 million DKK, and 6,5 million DKK in 2025), the support aims to follow up on the results of PPIMA and lay the ground for a more holistic approach to community level participation and including a focus on the climate change awareness, environment protection and actions by communities. Looking back PPIMA supported the justice sector to include ADR, which was then taken out of PPIMA when Gov had the strategy in place. As mentioned above is social and environmental justice now a priority and should be seen to address food security concerns in the future.</p> <p>PPIMA's flagship is the community score card (CSC), which the government has formulated a strategic intervention to adopt, and work is ongoing to develop the guidelines in cooperation with NPA.</p>	
Annual Budget	N/A 2021-2022 around 4 mill USD	
Partnerships	NPA works with MINALOC, RGB, Ministry of Finance. Cooperates with several local CSOs and build their capacity, Emphasis on alliances and coalitions. NPA aims to withdraw as an international organisation when local capacities are in place (localisation strategy). Works with a range of development partners: Denmark, FCDO, Switzerland, EU, Belgium, Sweden and Norway.	
Relevance	The relevance of PPIMA is underscored by the programme's 15 years of work at community level, and with adaption of its main tool the CSC by central government. The relevance is underscored by its capacity to change and adapt when its work for example on ADR become government policy. Most recently is the shift towards environmental protection and rights underlining relevance as food security in the limited physical space could become a new arena for conflict and affect the efforts to reduce poverty.	
Coherence	<p>The organisation has a wide and strong network of more than 20 local CSOs; some of which are part of the current phase of the Programme, and others of which have been part of earlier phases but are still providing advice. In addition, NPA has established good working relations with both local and national government.</p> <p>NPA's work aligns with Rwanda's Vision 2050, emphasizing accountable governance and citizen-centric priorities.</p>	
Effectiveness	<p>The evaluation in 2022 concluded that PPIMA is an effective programme, but monitoring and evaluation should be strengthened.</p> <p>The Impact Study (December 2024) found that, when compared with those districts where the CSC has not been implemented, the CSC has significantly contributed to these areas by fostering a strong culture of accountability and continuous improvement among service providers.</p>	
Efficiency	NPA has a solid track record with managing donor funds from like-minded donors. NPA is assessed to have robust procedures and tools for tracking progress and following up with each partner. NPA has performed a comprehensive HR review of its partners last year. Based on these follow-up tools and procedures, NPA continuously provides training in HR, audit, compliance, etc.,	

	<p>where this is considered critical. The financial management at NPA's Rwanda CO also is assessed to be appropriate and robust (according to partner assessment by the Danish MFA (December 2023)).</p> <p>The impact study (December 2024) found: The CSC mechanism has empowered citizens to take an active role in overseeing project execution, ensuring that resources are utilized efficiently, and objectives are met. This was significantly stronger in CSC districts compared with non-CSC districts.</p>	
Impact	<p>The impact of community score card put in place by PPIMA is documented in the Impact Study (December 2024) using rigorous data collection and analysis. The score card has been "greened" and simplified. The process of participation has been extended to include planning – not only implementation – the aim is for communities to influence priorities of local government. However, only limited resources are controlled by local authorities.</p>	
Sustain-ability	<p>Gov accepted formally and adopted the community score card. Support the establishment of VSLA among the volunteer staff in communities, has enhanced their functioning. Their work had to be supported for them to continue working.</p> <p>However, decentralisation is the least funded sector by the gov, and the government will not be able to take over responsibility for staff.</p>	
Opportunity	<p><b>Denmark is supporting a transition phase to the PPIMA successor programme. There is a real opportunity based on the quality achievements of PPIMA for Denmark to be the enabler for setting a new direction for promotion of socio-economic rights and citizens participation. NPA is currently preparing a concept note and a full proposal will follow by July 2025. Some elements could be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue to support the sustainability if the community scorecard (refine it for the gov to take up)</li> <li>▪ Scale up to the remaining 11 districts (scenarios for scaling it up)</li> <li>▪ Responding to emerging challenges (urbanization, 78% in urban communities by 2050). Pressure on land. Environmental challenges.</li> <li>▪ Remind the gov to address social and environmental safeguards.</li> <li>▪ Local level leadership. Co-creation of solutions.</li> <li>▪ Decentralisation, reduce inequalities, conduct advocacy on structural barriers (87-88% of the budget is decentralised)</li> </ul> <p>The real challenge is according to NPA that people produce less food, land is smaller and smaller, urbanization, and people do not produce food in a different way. If this does not change, we can expect more and more conflicts.</p>	

Relevance	Coherence	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Impact	Sustainability	Opportunity
-----------	-----------	---------------	------------	--------	----------------	-------------

### Access to Justice support through Legal Aid Forum (Partly completed)

Status	Description	Comment as relevant
Mandate/objective	<p>To promote and support access to justice for all vulnerable groups in Rwanda and a Rwanda with equal justice for all</p> <p>The Legal Aid Forum (LAF) was founded in 2006 with the support of the Danish Institute for Human Rights, to serve as a platform for organizations committed to advancing legal empowerment for indigent and vulnerable groups, by offering them high quality legal aid services. LAF is the leading non-state legal aid provider in Rwanda, composed of 38 national and international NGOs, professional bodies, University Legal Aid Clinics and faith-based initiatives.</p>	
Strategic plan		To be requested
Current situation	<p>While the adoption of progressive policies is a significant step toward achieving people-centered justice in Rwanda, their effective implementation is key to delivering tangible results.</p> <p>This project aims to support the Government of Rwanda in implementing these policies through targeted interventions that enhance access to legal aid, strengthen ADR mechanisms, and improve justice sector capacity. By translating policy commitments into practical actions, this project will ensure that Rwanda's justice sector reforms are not only well-intended but also effectively implemented, ultimately advancing equal access to justice for all.</p> <p>Generally, the project seeks to support JRLOS to effectively implement ADR, Criminal Justice and Legal Aid Policies to ensure equitable access to justice for all. The project also seeks to support the promotion and protection of human rights:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support the effective coordination and implementation of ADR, Criminal Justice, and Legal Aid policies.</li> <li>2. Enhance Access to Legal Aid Services for Vulnerable Populations</li> <li>3. Build the capacity Justice Sector Actors to provide legal aid services in line with the policies</li> <li>4. Support the implementation of Human rights mechanisms.</li> </ol>	
Annual Budget	n/a	To be requested
Partnerships	Ministry of Justice, the Judiciary and training providers and partner organisations. LAF subgrants to it member organizations to <b>expand access</b> to legal aid services for vulnerable individuals and support institutional sustainability.	
Relevance	Many vulnerable groups in Rwanda, particularly those in rural areas and economically disadvantaged communities, face significant barriers to accessing justice due to low levels of legal literacy and financial constraints. These groups often lack basic knowledge about their legal rights and available legal mechanisms, making it difficult for them to seek justice effectively. Economic challenges, including the high costs of legal representation, court fees, and	

	transportation, further compound these difficulties. Despite efforts to improve legal aid services, gaps remain, with a shortage of lawyers providing pro bono services and limited government resources, leaving many vulnerable individuals without adequate representation.	
Coherence	<p>In its National Strategy for Transformation (NST2)<sup>12</sup>, the Government of Rwanda (GoR) has prioritized the promotion of universal access to quality justice and strengthening the justice sector's capacity. Notably, in 2022, the government adopted the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) and Criminal Justice Policies, and aims to promote alternatives to imprisonment, as well improve, coordinate and expand ADR mechanisms.</p> <p>The Legal Aid policy that was adopted in 2014 but remains largely unimplemented due to the lack of resources. Although, the GoR is considering to revise this policy, it is worth noting that a lot needs to be done to implement it.</p>	
Effectiveness		No information
Efficiency		No Information
Impact		No information
Sustainability		No information
Opportunity	In principle LAF provides an opportunity for policy coordination and implementation of access to justice and legal aid initiatives. However, it is not clear at this point what tangible results will look like, and it is difficult to judge the relative importance of this engagement. LAF is, on the other hand, and important umbrella organisation, which has access and entry points to facilitate change.	

Relevance	Coherence	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Impact	Sustainability	Opportunity
-----------	-----------	---------------	------------	--------	----------------	-------------

### National Human Rights Commission

Status	Description	Comment as relevant
Mandate/objective	The NCHR is among the 10 "Other State Organs" established by the 2003 Constitution (Art.140) and its independence is constitutionalized (art 42). Its initial mandate was extended to State legal advising (L.37/2002) and National Preventive mechanism (L.61/2018). The NCHR is empowered to file legal proceedings in all HR matters. NHRC promotes, protects, and monitors human rights in Rwanda. It operates independently as per Article 42 of the Rwandan Constitution and the Law No. 19/2013 of 25/03/2013 governing its functions. Most important is the Promotion of Human Rights; Protection of Human Rights (Investigates human rights violations and ensures appropriate legal action); Monitoring and Evaluation; and Advising the Government.	

<sup>12</sup> NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR TRANSFORMATION (NST2) 2024 - 2029

Strategic plan	The NCHR Strategic Plan 2025-2029, implementing outcome 5 “Promotion and Protection of Human Rights” of JRLOS work was published in January 2025. However not yet shared outside Government. The Plan promotes a comprehensive approach combining clarification of the mandate, improved functional specialization, deconcentration, and capacity building of top and intermediate staff especially in HR policy analysis.	The strategic plan, and the ongoing EU Capacity assessment serve as important underpinning for the formulation of Danish assistance
Current situation	There is a lack of guarantees of the independence of the institution, need for decentralization and to address the insufficient capacities for effective investigation and reporting on cases of human rights violations (GANHRI <sup>13</sup> recommendations, UPR 3 recommendations)). The NCHR is since 2002 accredited A-Status by GANHRI, the Commission remains among the 88 NHRIs granted with this status <sup>14</sup> . It can be anticipated that confirmation of the A status will strengthen the Commission's weight in the Rwandan institutional landscape of human rights, thus improving the overall HR protection in the country.	A credible planning and budgeting will be a critical factor for the extension of the A status by GANHRI, whose decision is expected in early 2026.
Annual Budget	Law of finance for FY 2023-2024 provided NCHR with 1 Billion FRW (equivalent to 0,7M USD) with the following breakdown: salary wage 500 M.FRW, HR promotion 351 M.FRW, HR protection 135 M.FRW.  Budget constraints caused the closure of NCHR regional branches from 2006 to now.	The budget ranks NCHR among the low-funded NHRIs (0,2 M USD to 1 M) such as Chad and Central Africa Republic.
Partnerships	The processes of consultations with concerned CSOs are not institutionalized in the NCHR law.	
Relevance	The NHRC, foreseen by the Arusha Agreement's Protocol was established in 1999, as an institution tasked to sensitize the population about human rights, investigate on human rights violations and inform authorities to eventually initiate judicial proceedings.	Relevant, but without a realistic budget, strategic plan implementation cannot happen.
Coherence	Weak Coordination with International Treaty Bodies	Strengthening by submission of parallel reports
Effectiveness	The effectiveness is challenged by several key challenges including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited Regional Presence:</li> <li>Gaps in Investigative Independence</li> <li>Human Resource and Training Gaps</li> </ul>	Effectiveness is hampered by the inability to investigate HR violations - i.e. extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, and torture.
Efficiency	The October 2024 report of the Sub-Committee on Accreditation recommended the following improvements to NCHR internal organization (also relate to continued <u>A status</u> ): *improved guarantees of independence,	Despite Rwanda's strong legal framework and human rights

<sup>13</sup> Global Alliance of National HR Institutions <https://ganhri.org/accreditation/>

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.ohchr.org/en/countries/nhri/global-alliance-national-human-rights-institutions-ganhri>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*enhanced functional immunity for NCHR members,</li> <li>*broad/transparent process for selection/appointment of commissioners,</li> <li>*improved relevance of NCHR's statements on torture and harassment of journalists,</li> <li>*decentralization and adequate funding for the establishment of regional offices.</li> </ul>	commitments, operational gaps hinder the NCHR's effectiveness and efficiency.
Impact	NCHR does not report on and publicly comment on the human rights situation in the country. NCHR does not take demonstrable actions to address all allegations of human rights violations by government authorities including issuing public statements that condemn human rights abuses.	Since designation as NPM in 2018, the NCHR has never published its report on Torture as required by NPM guidelines.
Sustainability	The sustainability to be judged on its impact regarding performance of its mandate.	Currently, impact is limited on the upholding of HR, and does not contribute to a sustainable situation where HR are respected and upheld.
Opportunity	The ongoing capacity assessment and subsequent planning of reforms is a high priority for the Commission's Chairperson, contributing to the planning and budgeting of reforms provided in the strategic plan. The exercise is leading to the development of a comprehensive training plan together with the Institute of Legal Practice and Development (ILPD) trainings and trainings to be provided by JAP short-term experts. The capacity development plan should finally contribute to the attraction and harmonization of additional EU or non-EU funding to the HR sub-sector	

Relevance	Coherence	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Impact	Sustainability	Opportunity
-----------	-----------	---------------	------------	--------	----------------	-------------

### Conflict prevention and reconciliation through Interpeace

Status	Description	Comment as relevant
Mandate/objective	<p>Interpeace's programme aims to foster a peaceful, resilient, and inclusive society by addressing the enduring impacts of the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi. The programme focuses on mental health support, social cohesion, prisoner rehabilitation, and collaborative livelihoods.</p> <p><b>1. Mental Health and Psychosocial Support:</b> Establishes community-based healing spaces facilitated by trained professionals to enhance individual and collective resilience.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develops structured psychosocial interventions, such as resilience-oriented therapy and sociotherapy, to address trauma and promote healing.</li> </ul> <p>2. <b>Social Cohesion:</b> Implements community-based sociotherapy groups to rebuild trust and relationships among genocide survivors and perpetrators. Introduces multifamily therapy sessions to improve family communication, address intergenerational trauma, and strengthen family bonds.</p> <p>3. <b>Prisoner Rehabilitation and Reintegration:</b> Collaborates with the Rwanda Correctional Service to provide psychosocial support and vocational training to inmates nearing release, facilitating their reintegration into society. Develops standardized curricula to harmonize rehabilitation efforts across correctional facilities.</p> <p>4. <b>Collaborative Livelihoods:</b> Supports participants who have completed healing programs to engage in joint income-generating activities, fostering economic independence and sustained social cohesion.</p>	
Strategic plan	Interpeace in Rwanda operates under a well-defined strategic framework that aligns with its global 2021–2025 strategy, “ <b>A Resilient Peace.</b> ” While this is a global strategy, Rwanda’s work is fully integrated within it and guided by a country-specific plan and implementation roadmap.	
Current situation	Genocidaires, up to 20,000 are being released including high profile offenders. The war in Eastern DRC seems to flare up ethnic conflicts. Hate speech is an example in this regard	
Annual Budget	N/A due to changes in donor funding	
Partnerships	Interpeace works closely with local organizations, including Prison Fellowship Rwanda, Haguruka, and Dignity in Detention, to deliver these initiatives. Financial support from the Government of Sweden and the European Union.	
Relevance	Interpeace’s work is relevant due to the country’s post-genocide context, its national priorities for peace and reconciliation, and the evolving challenges around mental health, social cohesion, and youth resilience and returning genocidaires.	
Coherence	Coherence with Government policies	
Effectiveness	Tbd in partner assessment	
Efficiency	Tbd in partner assessment	
Impact	The issues to be addressed are huge and also partly unknown because mental health, PTSD are not commonly communicated. The projects are few together with government institutions’ own coverage	
Sustainability	As above	



Opportunity	Based on the potential escalation of community level conflicts and the gap in addressing psycho-social needs which could be flaring up, the support will be important in in a conflict prevention perspective. Sweden works with Interpeace and the EU recommends action in this area.	
-------------	--	--

Relevance	Coherence	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Impact	Sustainability	Opportunity
-----------	-----------	---------------	------------	--------	----------------	-------------

## Annex 2: Overview of EU and member state support to governance and human rights

Germany	<p>The project “Strengthening the human rights-based approach in civil society organisations” supports five CSOs and the National Commission for Human Rights, with a focus on advocacy for the rights of marginalised groups (people with disabilities, people living with HIV, refugees, LGBTIQ+, and rural populations).</p> <p>GIZ project “Preventing Sexual and Gender-based Violence” (2021 – 2024, new phase from October 2024) supported MIGEPROF in enhanced coordination of services and stakeholders and two CSO in enhanced service delivery to survivors of GBV (especially teen mothers) and implementation of major outreach campaigns and information tools. Prevention activities also implemented in refugee camp settings</p> <p>GIZ rights-based programme supporting five local CSOs (iPEACE, RRP+, RUB, Amahoro Human Respect, Feminist Action Development Ambition) on legal aid, advocacy, media coverage, capacity development and organizational development.</p> <p>The project “Strengthening the human rights-based approach in civil society organisations” supports the human resources and technical capacities of selected civil society organisations (CSOs). It aims at improving the individual skills and knowledge of employees to implement the human rights-based approach. Further, CSOs are supported in their institutional capacities through financial agreements.</p>
Netherlands	<p>Support to several LGBT organizations through COC Amsterdam and Hivos funding, aiming to strengthen the LGBT community and its socio-economic integration in society.</p> <p>Support to OHCHR to support the Rwandan government in the implementation of the recommendations received during the review under CEDAW (Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women)</p> <p>Make Way Program: to mobilise a critical mass of CSOs, increasingly engaging with and comprising of marginalised youth with compounded vulnerabilities, and for them to claim and exercise their sexual and reproductive health and rights.</p> <p>Rutgers / Generation G: The programme strives towards the creation of gender-just and violence-free societies with and for young men and women.</p> <p>CREA / Women Gaining Ground: working with women and girls, ensuring opportunities for young women to become political actors and paying particular attention to the meaningful inclusion and leadership of women with disabilities</p> <p>Support to Institute Panos Grand Lacs to host weekly radio debates and community dialogues to promote citizen debate and access to information.</p>

	<p>- Support to the 2024 Development Journalism Awards organized by the Rwanda Journalists Association (ARJ).</p> <p>Regular Human Rights Defenders meetings were organized at the NL Embassy to facilitate information sharing and discussion on human rights related topics.</p> <p>A seminar was organized on strengthening citizen participation in decision-making processes in Rwanda, bringing together high-level decisionmakers, civil society and journalists to reflect on democratic processes in Rwanda.</p> <p>Support to the Rwanda CSO Coalition on UPR to produce a mid-term report on the implementation of UPR recommendations.</p>
Sweden	<p>Partnership with Health Development Initiative (HDI) upholding sexual reproductive health and rights for marginalised communities, through advocacy, policy influencing and provision of stigma free services.</p> <p>Kvinna till Kvinna, strengthening the capacity of 12 women's rights CSOs and programme support in the area of GBV prevention, SRHR, women's political participation and women's economic empowerment, sexual minority and key population rights.</p> <p>UN Joint Programme on Gender Equality, including support to the government gender machinery, GBV response and prevention, and women's economic empowerment.</p> <p>Communication campaign on 16 Days Against Gender Based Violence with partner Kvinna till Kvinna and their partner organisations.</p> <p>Fojo Media Institute, Rwanda Media Programme 2020-24: Capacity building of 36 private and non-profit media houses on public interest journalism, management and financial sustainability and gender equality; strengthening Rwanda Broadcasting Agency as public service media provider; and strengthening of journalism education at four universities.</p> <p>The Public Policy Information Monitoring and Advocacy (PPIMA) project: support to citizen participation in 19 districts through the Community Score Card (CSC) mechanism and institutionalization of the CSC; capacity strengthening of 15 CSOs and CSO-led policy advocacy.</p> <p>Core funding to Never Again Rwanda for the implementation of its Strategic Plan.</p>
Belgium	<p>5-year program (2022-2026) of Humanity &amp; Inclusion (HI) on "Promoting Integrated Child Development and Inclusive Services for All" and Light for the World (LftW) on among other inclusive and specialized education for blind and visually impaired children.</p> <p>(1) focus on SRHR in the bilateral health program through Enabel (health facilities, One Stop Centres, GBV prevention, etc.) – transversal attention to gender across other Enabel interventions</p> <p>(2) Project by AEGIS-TRUST to engage men and boys as allies to women and girls in fighting gender-based violence and discrimination and promoting attitudes and practices that build gender equality in homes, schools, workplaces, places of worship and other community spaces; and to transform popular gender norms to support more positive masculinities and greater tolerance for gender diversity</p> <p>(3) Support to Team Europe theatre caravan 16 days of activism against GBV</p> <p>(4) Transversal attention in supported interventions by civil society actors</p> <p>Support via Belgian NGO 11.be to PaxPress</p> <p>Civic Space Advancement Project (2024-2025) – support to consortium of 1 INGO and 3 RWA NGOs to work on the promotion of civic space, in the fields of political rights, socio-economics rights and health patients' rights.</p>

	Support to RCN Justice & Democratie and their RWA partners (2022-2026) to share information on universal competency trials through RWA media & affected communities
Luxemburg	<p>1) 4-year program (2023 – 2027) of Humanity &amp; Inclusion (HI) on inclusive education for children and facilitating access to health care for people with disabilities; 2) 4-year program (2022-2026) with Fondation Partage Luxembourg to promote access to education and socio-economic development of refugees; 3) 3-year program of Christian Solidarity International to facilitate access to education and psycho-social support for refugees in Rwanda.</p> <p>4-year program (2024 – 2028) with UNFPA to strengthen access to SRHR services across the TVET sector in Rwanda, including comprehensive sexuality education and referral mechanisms.</p> <p>Support to the OHCHR office in Rwanda to strengthen capacity building of national human rights institutions and civil society organizations.</p>
France	<p>Tinyuka II programme : in 2024, funding for eleven Rwandan feminist civil society organisations to promote the status of women and combat GBV;</p> <p>Financing of a study in collaboration with InterPeace NGO to examine the correlation between the consequences of the genocide perpetrated against the Tutsi in Rwanda and the prevalence of early and unplanned pregnancies among teenagers and young single mothers;</p> <p>Forensic Science programme (launches in 2024): combating GBV and preventing teenage pregnancy by supporting Rwandan civil society (NGO Haguruka) and developing forensic science for the benefit of Rwandan justice (Rwanda Forensic Institute).</p> <p>Financing of a one-week stay in France for a journalist from Rwanda's national television, with the Media &amp; Democracy association, to contribute to the emergence, safeguarding or consolidation of democratic processes in Africa.</p>
Denmark	The Norwegian People's Aid lead project Public Policy Information Monitoring and Advocacy Project (PPIMA). The project focuses on citizens' participation in local governance processes by strengthening citizens, CSOs and local leaders' policy literacy on human rights, environment and climate change and gender and equality considerations to accelerate commitments and establish framework for wider social justice. This includes laying the foundation for citizen-led independent monitoring and reporting on duty bearers' compliance with the environmental and social management safeguards in planning implementing of e.g. public infrastructure projects.
EU (2024)	<p>Nine new projects were signed in late 2023 with approximately €3.4m dedicated to disability, primarily focusing on youth with mental and intellectual disabilities.</p> <p>Two new projects for a total of €1,2m are contracted in 2024 from the EIDHR, focusing on: promoting equal opportunities and non-discrimination for minority and marginalised groups including sexual minorities; Building the capacity of local organisations to defend the rights of minority and groups; Facilitating access to legal assistance for victims of discrimination.</p> <p>Two EU projects fighting SGBV were contracted during COVID: Action Aid and the Spanish Red Cross, with outreach efforts, including community and school-based awareness campaigns. Action Aid 's 24 month project which ended in the first trimester of 2024 enhanced the capacity of CSOs including youth networks to work with young people a) to engage in advocacy work with health services and local authorities to increase access to and uptake of Sexual Reproductive Health (SRH) information and services and combat teenage pregnancies and b) to undertake awareness raising and campaigns with communities, local authorities including law enforcement to strengthen measures to understand and prevent SGBV. The project was implemented in Gasabo and Karongi districts. Several civil society projects in the agriculture sector had a focus on enhancing the voice of women farmers in decision making.</p>

	<p>Two projects (signed in 2023) totaling €1 million, aiming to protect and promote responsible freedom of expression, enhance access to information and improve digital media literacy. Projects aim at Community sensitisation and empowerment on critical thinking and analysis of digital media, and promotion of media and information literacy among citizens to increase capacity to assess credibility and quality of digital media messaging; Legal assistance to media practitioners to protect and promote freedom of expression in Rwanda, particularly with regard to digital media.</p> <p>One civil society project continued to build the capacity of trade unions in Rwanda and to promote the right to social dialogue among workers.</p> <p>Two regional FPI projects include activities in Rwanda to build capacity of young people in active citizenship</p> <p>A civil society project on human rights in the justice system continued in 2023, which includes legal rights awareness campaigns inside prisons as well as free legal aid and psycho-social support to vulnerable detainees.</p> <p>Under the Justice and Accountability programme, a contract was signed with the National Commission for Human Rights (€0,4m) to bolster its mandate as the National Preventative Mechanism against Torture, as well as to work on the UPR process.</p> <p>In addition, contracts signed with the Ministry of Justice, National Public Prosecution Authority, Rwanda Correctional Services collectively totaling €10.4 million aim at improving access to quality and timely justice, as well the successful reintegration of ex-prisoners.</p>
--	--

## PROGRAMME RISK MATRIX

Risk Factor (Risk Description)	Risk category	Impact (1-5)	Likelihood (1-5)	Risk level	Risk response	Responsible
Natural disasters or global pandemics affect the ability to implement the programme.	Contextual	3	2	6	Ensure implementing partners have flexible work plans and budget contingencies to adjust activities.	Danish Embassy
Political will from the Government of Rwanda to allow Denmark's engagement in the sector of Human Rights and Governance changes.	Contextual	5	2	10	Close monitoring of the situation. Use of a non-threatening approach. Ensure maintenance of good diplomatic relations.	Danish Embassy
Political/Cross-border insecurities that can spark ethnic tensions with spillovers and similarities to the conflict that resulted in the Genocide, which can influence funding decisions and create changes in the choice of partners.	Contextual	5	3	15	Close monitoring of the situation and application of Doing Development Differently tools.	Danish Embassy
Human rights violations increase, which can affect the security of partners and Danish Embassy staff.	Contextual	5	3	15	Close monitoring and dialogue between the embassy and partners and within the EU and other like-minded international actors. Preparation of safe-guards for their staff when "thinking and working politically". Adopt measures to manage fiduciary risks. Partners must demonstrate the capability to undertake on-going risk management and to update the risk management framework as necessary, as well as regularly inform the embassy of any major risks that arise.	Danish Embassy/ Implementing partners
Changing requirements for NGOs or international actors.	Contextual	4	3	12	Close monitoring of legal and regulatory developments.	Danish Embassy/ Implementing partners

Danmark's reputation towards the host government is damaged if implementing partners conduct activities, which the host government sees as hostile to itself or its narrative.	Institutional	4	2	8	Ensure close coordination with implementing partners and dialogue especially regarding advocacy activities.	Danish Embassy
Denmark is associated with a legitimization of Rwanda's government's actions.	Institutional	5	2	10	Ensure coordination with EU and other like-minded international actors. Include a clear human rights narrative in Denmark's communication strategies	Danish Embassy
Financial irregularities, audit findings and missappropriation of funds or corruption in partner organizations (C-cases), which can affect Denmark's reputation.	Institutional	4	2	8	Conduct diligent financial and fiduciary risk assessments during partner selection. Require transparent financial reporting and regular auditing exercising.	Danish delegation and implementing partners.
Partners have the insufficient competence to achieve planned results.	Programmatic	3	1	3	Conduction of partners' capacity assessments considering their specific gaps. Integrate realistic evaluation indicators. Include learning and accountability sessions.	Danish Embassy
High staff turnover results in programme management challenges.	Programmatic	2	3	6	Programme managment to ensure solid recruitment and onboarding and proper planning for staff succession. Adopt staff retention strategies.	Danish Embassy
Weak coordination among implementing partners.	Programmatic	3	1	3	Establish an annual stock-taking meeting for all partners (starting with ToC workshop at programme start) to promote cross-learning, identify synergies, and reflect contextual changes, including updates to risks and the Theory of Change Establish clear roles and responsibilities.	Danish Embassy
Inadequate coordination among donors or overlapping initiatives causing duplication or inefficiencies.	Programmatic	3	2	6	Close monitoring and dialogue between the embassy and partners and within the EU, other like-minded international actors, and other donors.	Danish Embassy

# Rwanda programme - Periodized commitment and disbursement budget

MFA Commitment budget					
	2025 (Q4)	2026 (Q1)	2027	2028	TOTAL
LAF (2025-2028)	1,500,000	5,000,000	-		6,500,000
NPA (2025-2028)	5,000,000	14,000,000	-		19,000,000
DIHR (2025-2027)	6,500,000	3,500,000	-		10,000,000
Interpeace (2025-2028)	1,700,000	4,500,000	-		6,200,000
Reviews*	300,000	500,000	-		800,000
	<b>15,000,000</b>	<b>27,500,000</b>	<b>-</b>		<b>42,500,000</b>

MFA Disbursement budget					
	2025 (Q4)	2026 (Q2)	2027 (Q2)	2028 (Q1)	TOTAL
LAF (2025-2028)	1,500,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	-	6,500,000
NPA (2025-2028)	2,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	3,000,000	19,000,000
DIHR (2025-2027)	2,500,000	4,000,000	3,500,000		10,000,000
Interpeace (2025-2028)	1,500,000	2,500,000	2,200,000		6,200,000
Reviews*	300,000		500,000		800,000
	<b>7,800,000</b>	<b>16,500,000</b>	<b>15,200,000</b>	<b>3,000,000</b>	<b>42,500,000</b>

\* Programme support : Partner assessment in 2025 and review in Q1.2027

Detailed partner budget**								
	2025 (Oct-Dec)	2026	2027	2028 (Jan-Jul)	TOTAL	Difference	Rounded	Comments
LAF (2025-2028)	638,778	2,533,211	2,293,845	1,034,166	6,500,000	0	6,500,000	OK
NPA (2025-2028)	1,676,471	6,705,882	6,705,882	3,911,765	19,000,000	0	19,000,000	OK
DIHR (2025-2027)	2,499,925	3,749,888	3,749,888		9,999,700	300	10,000,000	ok (very small difference only), DIHR may include a 300kr contingency
Interpeace (2025-2028)	546,779	2,243,258	2,289,124	1,120,842	6,200,002	-	2	ok (very small difference only), commitment letter will establish that the grant is 6,2 mio only.
Reviews***	300,000		500,000		800,000	-	800,000	
	<b>5,661,952</b>	<b>15,232,238</b>	<b>15,538,739</b>	<b>6,066,772</b>	<b>42,499,702</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>42,500,000</b>	

\*\*Some partners have submitted budgets covering 3 years. The budgets have been split between the calendar years providing a better indication of actual liquidity need. See separate sheets for further details.



STRENGTHENING THE RULE OF LAW IN RWANDA					
Items	34 months	Year 1 budget(DKK)	Year 2 budget(DKK)	Year 3 budget(DKK)	Total cost (DKK)
<b>Outcome 1: Justice actors and legal aid providers are applying improved practices that enhance access to justice for vulnerable groups.</b>		<b>208,078.99</b>	<b>538,629.48</b>	<b>130,580.06</b>	<b>877,288.53</b>
1.1. Train JRLOS actors on ADR and criminal justice policy actions		122,388.66	63,526.56	52,938.80	238,854.02
1.2. Training on small claim procedure for judges and registrars		-	148,029.43	-	148,029.43
1.3. Training for judges, lawyers and prosecutors on plea-bargaining procedure.			60,377.36	-	60,377.36
1.4. Training of ADR service providers on various forms of ADR		-	61,193.27	-	61,193.27
1.5. Train law enforcement officers on human rights promotion and protection.			62,116.02	-	62,116.02
1.6. Training members of the TBRTF on reporting on concluding observations of treaty bodies			95,092.40	-	95,092.40
1.7. Annual dialogue on Human Rights Situation		85,690.33	48,294.44	77,641.26	211,626.03
<b>OUTCOME 2: Justice Sector Institutions achieve stronger coordination and more effective implementation of ADR, CJ and legal aid policies</b>		<b>549,860.15</b>	<b>665,933.10</b>	<b>340,078.04</b>	<b>1,555,871.29</b>
2.1. National dialogue on court annexed mediation procedure			33,267.77		
2.2. Dialogue to discuss effective implementation of small claims procedure			45,652.12		
2.3. Support the development of SOPs for ADR practices			35,696.07		
2.4. Support operationalisation of ADR center					
2.4.1. Staffing		422,568.44	412,855.22	327,645.12	1,163,068.78
2.5. Develop standardised Legal aid guidelines			34,239.09	-	34,239.09
2.6. Drafting of sentencing guidelines			57,550.81	-	57,550.81
2.7. Support legal reforms informed by both policies		12,432.92	12,432.92	12,432.92	37,298.75
2.8. Develop a national Paralegal curriculum			34,239.09	-	34,239.09
2.9. Benchmarking study on Kenya's Alternative Justice Systems (5 days) *6 people		114,858.79	-	-	114,858.79
<b>Outcome 3: Vulnerable and marginalized populations increasingly access legal aid services</b>		<b>1,467,751.82</b>	<b>884,958.78</b>	<b>742,322.26</b>	<b>3,095,032.86</b>
3.1. Provision of legal aid services via call center, walk-in and MLACS)		1,467,751.82	884,958.78	742,322.26	3,095,032.86
<b>4. Monitoring evaluation and Learning</b>		<b>57,906.41</b>	<b>130,755.54</b>	<b>53,111.95</b>	<b>241,773.90</b>
<b>5. Visibility materials</b>		<b>24,283.04</b>			<b>24,283.04</b>
<b>6. Financial costs</b>		<b>90,632.12</b>	<b>90,632.12</b>	<b>80,788.09</b>	<b>262,052.33</b>
<b>7. Administrative costs 7%</b>		<b>156,599.26</b>	<b>156,599.26</b>	<b>130,499.38</b>	<b>443,697.90</b>
<b>Total costs of the project</b>		<b>2,555,111.78</b>	<b>2,467,508.28</b>	<b>1,477,379.78</b>	<b>6,499,999.84</b>

STRENGTHENING THE RULE OF LAW IN RWANDA										
Items	34 months									
Outcome 1: Justice actors and legal aid providers are applying improved practices that enhance access to justice for vulnerable groups.	Unit	# of units	Unit cost (in DKK)	Year 1 budget(DKK)	Year 2 budget(DKK)	Year 3 budget(DKK)	Total cost (DKK)	Contribution from EU	Contribution from Mott foundation	Justification of the budget items
1.1. Train JRLOS actors on ADR and criminal justice policy actions										
1.1.1.Trainer	Per day	4	1,456.98	5,828			5,828			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. S/he will devote four working days to the assignment, which will include preparing training materials, conducting the sessions, and reporting. 300,000 Rwf *4 days=1,200,000 Rwf equivalent to 5,828 DKK.
1.1.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	70	291.40	20,398			20,398			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 60,000 Rwf* 35 participants*2 days =4,200,000 rwf equivalent to 20,398 DKK
1.1.3.Acomodation	Per pers/night	70	388.53	27,197			27,197			This budget line will cover the accommodation costs for participants attending the training. 80,000 Rwf*35 participants*2 nights =5,600,000 Rwf equivalent to 27,197 DKK
1.1.4.Transportation	Per participant	70	72.85	5,099			5,099			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf * 35 participants*2 sessions =1,050,000 Rwf equivalent to 5,099 DKK.
1.1.5.Training certificates	Per participant	35	9.71	340			340			This budget line will cover the cost of certificates for participants at the end of the training, as a formal acknowledgment of their participation and achievement. 2,000 Rwf *35=70,000 Rwf equivalent to 340 DKK.
1.1.6.Director of programs 40%	Per month	34	5,294	63,526.56	63,526.56	52,938.80	179,992	96,589	64,393	The director of programs is responsible for organizing and coordinating all trainings and workshops under the project, including developing detailed concept notes, identifying and inviting participants, and engaging with relevant stakeholders. She will also compile comprehensive reports capturing outcomes, lessons learned, and follow-up actions, as well as prepare narrative progress reports on the project's implementation. Her oversight will ensure coherence across activities, consistency in reporting, and effective communication of progress and impact throughout the project cycle.
<b>Subtotal 1.1.</b>				<b>122,389</b>	<b>63,527</b>	<b>52,939</b>	<b>238,854</b>	<b>96,589</b>	<b>64,393</b>	
1.2. Training on small claim procedure for judges and registrars										
1.2.1.Training of Registrars				-						
1.2.1.1.Trainer	Per day	4	1,456.98		5,828		5,828			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. S/he will devote four working days to the assignment, which will include preparing training materials, conducting the sessions, and reporting. 300,000 Rwf *4 days=1,200,000 Rwf equivalent to 5,828 DKK.
1.2.1.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	90	291.40		26,226		26,226			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 2 days * 60,000 Rwf* 45=5,400,000 rwf equivalent to 26,226 DKK.
1.2.1.3.Acomodation	Per pers/night	90	388.53		34,968		34,968			This budget line will cover the accommodation costs for participants attending the training. 80,000 Rwf*45 participants*2 nights=7,200,000 Rwf equivalent to 34,968 DKK
1.2.1.4.Transportation	Per participant	90	72.85		6,556		6,556			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf * 45 participants*2 days=1,350,000 Rwf equivalent to 6,556 DKK.
1.2.1.5.Training certificate	Per participant	45	9.71		437		437			This budget line will cover the cost of certificates for participants at the end of the training, as a formal acknowledgment of their participation and achievement. 2,000 Rwf *45=90,000 Rwf equivalent to 437 DKK.
1.2.2.Training of Judges					-		-			
1.2.2.1.Trainer	Per day	4	1,456.98		5,828		5,828			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. S/he will devote four working days to the assignment, which will include preparing training materials, conducting the sessions, and reporting. 300,000 Rwf *4 days=1,200,000 Rwf equivalent to 5,828 DKK.
1.2.2.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	90	291.40		26,226		26,226			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 60,000 Rwf*45 participants*2 days=5,400,000 rwf equivalent to 26,226 DKK participants and acomodation of participants
1.2.2.3.Acomodation	Per pers/night	90	388.53		34,968		34,968			This budget line will cover the accommodation costs for participants attending the training. 80,000 Rwf*45 participants* 2 nights=7,200,000 Rwf equivalent to 34,968 DKK
1.2.2.4.Transportation	Per participant	90	72.85		6,556		6,556			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf * 45 participants*2 days=1,350,000 Rwf equivalent to 6,556 DKK.
1.2.2.5.Training certificate	Per participant	45	9.71		437		437			This budget line will cover the cost of certificates for participants at the end of the training, as a formal acknowledgment of their participation and achievement. 2,000 Rwf *45=90,000 Rwf equivalent to 437 DKK.
<b>Sub total 1.2</b>				<b>-</b>	<b>148,029</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>148,029</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	
1.3. Training for judges, lawyers and prosecutors on plea-bargaining procedure.										
1.3.1.Trainer	Per day	4	1,456.98		5,828		5,828			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. S/he will devote four working days to the assignment, which will include preparing training materials, conducting the sessions, and reporting. 300,000 Rwf *4 days=1,200,000 Rwf equivalent to 5,828 DKK.
1.3.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	72	291.40		20,981		20,981			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 60,000 Rwf*36 participants*2 days= 4,320,000 rwf equivalent to 20,981 DKK
1.3.3.Acomodation	Per pers/night	72	388.53		27,974		27,974			This budget line will cover the accommodation costs for participants attending the training. 80,000 Rwf*36 participants* 2 nights= 5,760,000 Rwf equivalent to 27,974 DKK
1.3.4. Transportation fees	Per pers/night	72	72.85		5,245		5,245			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf * 36 participants*2 days=1,080,000 Rwf equivalent to 5,245 DKK.
1.3.5.Training certificate	Per participant	36	9.71		350		350			This budget line will cover the cost of certificates for participants at the end of the training, as a formal acknowledgment of their participation and achievement. 2,000 Rwf *36=72,000 Rwf equivalent to 350 DKK.
<b>Subtotal 1.3</b>				<b>-</b>	<b>60,377</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>60,377</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	
1.4. Training of ADR service providers on various forms of ADR										
1.4.1.Training of Lawyers and certified mediators							-			
1.4.1.1. Trainer	Per day	3	1,456.98		4,370.95		4,371			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. S/he will devote three working days to the assignment, which will include preparing training materials, conducting the sessions, and reporting. 300,000 Rwf *3 days=900,000 Rwf equivalent to 4,371 DKK.
1.4.1.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	30	291.40		8,741.90		8,742			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 60,000 Rwf*30 participants* 1 day=1,800,000 rwf equivalent to 8,742 DKK participants and acomodation of participants
1.4.1.3.Transportation fees	Per participant	30	72.85		2,185.47		2,185			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf * 30 participants*1 day=450,000 Rwf equivalent to 2,185 DKK.
1.4.2.Training of Embrellas of Religious Leaders and Lawyers and certified mediations							-			
1.4.2.1. Trainer	Per day	3	1,456.98		4,370.95		4,371			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. S/he will devote three working days to the assignment, which will include preparing training materials, conducting the sessions, and reporting. 300,000 Rwf *3 days=900,000 Rwf equivalent to 4,371 DKK.
1.4.2.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	30	291.40		8,741.90		8,742			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 60,000 Rwf* 30 participants*1 day =1,800,000 rwf equivalent to 8,742 DKK participants and acomodation of participants
1.4.2.3.Transportation fees	Per participant	30	72.85		2,185.47		2,185			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf * 30 participants* 1 day= 450,000 Rwf equivalent to 2,185 DKK.

1.4.3.Training of community based paralegals										
1.4.3.1. Trainer	Per day	3	1,456.98		4,370.95		4,371			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. S/he will devote three working days to the assignment, which will include preparing training materials, conducting the sessions, and reporting. 300,000 Rwf *3 days=900,000 Rwf equivalent to 4,371 DKK.
1.4.3.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	30	291.40		8,741.90		8,742			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 60,000 Rwf* 30 participants * 1 day=1,800,000 rwf equivalent to 8,742 DKK participants and accomodation of participants
1.4.3.3.Transportation fees	Per participant	30	72.85		2,185.47		2,185			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf * 30 participants*1 day=450,000 Rwf equivalent to 2,185 DKK.
1.4.4.Training of Labor,Trade unions , Inspectors and private sector										
1.4.4.1. Trainer	Per day	3	1,456.98		4,370.95		4,371			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. S/he will devote three working days to the assignment, which will include preparing training materials, conducting the sessions, and reporting. 300,000 Rwf *3 days=900,000 Rwf equivalent to 4,371 DKK.
1.4.4.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	30	291.40		8,741.90		8,742			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 60,000 Rwf* 30 participants * 1 day=1,800,000 rwf equivalent to 8,742 DKK participants and accomodation of participants
1.4.4.3.Transportation fees	Per participant	30	72.85		2,185.47		2,185			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf * 30 participants*1 day=450,000 Rwf equivalent to 2,185 DKK.
Subtotal 1.4					-	61,193	-	61,193	-	-
1.5. Train law enforcement officers on human rights promotion and protection.										
1.5.1.Trainer	Per day	6	1,456.98		8,741.90		8,742			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. S/he will devote six working days to the assignment, which will include preparing training materials, conducting the sessions, and reporting. 300,000 Rwf*6 days+ 1,800,000 Rwf=8,742 DKK.
1.5.2.Venue	Per package /pers/year	70	291.40		20,397.76		20,398			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 60,000 Rwf* 35 participants*2 days= 4,200,000 Rwf.Thus20,398 DKK.
1.5.3.Accomodation	Per pers/night	70	388.53		27,197.01		27,197			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 60,000 Rwf*35 participants*2 sessions=5,600,000 Rwf. Thus 27,197 DKK.
1.5.4.Transportation	Per participant	70	72.85		5,099.44		5,099			Participants will receive transportation from and to the venue. 15,000 Rwf*70=1,050,000 Rwf Thus 5,099 DKK.
1.5.5.Training certificate	Per participants	70	9.71		679.93		680			This budget line will cover the cost of certificates for participants at the end of the training, as a formal acknowledgment of their participation and achievement. 2,000 Rwf*35*2 = 140,000 Rwf. Thus 680 DKK.
Subtotal 1.5					-	62,116	-	62,116	-	-
1.6. Training members of the TBRTF on reporting on concluding observations of treaty bodies										
1.6.1.Trainer	Per day	5	1,456.98		7,284.91		7,285			This budget line will cover the consultancy fees of the trainer contracted to facilitate the training. He will spend five days on this activity, including preparing training materials, conducting the training and reporting. 300,000 Rwf*5 days=1,500,000 Rwf.Thus 7,284.91 DKK.
1.6.2.Venue	Per package /pers/year	120	291.40		34,967.58		34,968			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the training. 60, 000 Rwf*40 participats*3 days= 7,200,000 rwf Thus 34,968 DKK.
1.6.3.Accomodation	Per pers/night	120	388.53		46,623.44		46,623			This budget line will cover the accommodation costs for participants attending the training. 80,000 Rwf*40 participants*3 nights=9,600,000 Rwf. Thus 46,623 DKK.
1.6.4.Transportation fees	Per participant	80	72.85		5,827.93		5,828			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 rwf*40 participants *2 days= 1,200,000 Rwf Thus 5,828 DKK
1.6.5.Training certificates	Per participant	40	9.71		388.53		389			This budget line will cover the cost of certificates for participants at the end of the training, as a formal acknowledgment of their participation and achievement. 2000Rwf*40 participants=80,000 Rwf.Thus 389 DKK.
Subtotal 1.6					-	95,092	-	95,092	-	-
1.7. Annual dialogue on Human Rights Situation										
1.7.1. Facilitator	Per day	6	1,456.98	4,370.95		4,370.95	8,742			This budget line will cover the professional fees of a facilitator contracted to moderate the dialogue and draft the resolutions. 300,000 Rwf *3 days* 2 sessions=1,800,000 Rwf.Thus 8,742 DKK.
1.7.2.Venue	Per package/pers/year	160	339.96	27,197.01		27,197.01	54,394			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the dialogue every year: 70,000 Rwf *80 participants* 2 sessions=11,200,000 Rwf.Thus 54,394 DKK.
1.7.3.Transportation fees	Per participant/year	160	72.85	5,827.93		5,827.93	11,656			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 rwf*80 participants*2 days= 2,400,000 Rwf.Thus 11,656 DKK.
1.7.4.Director of Operations 30%	Per month	34	4,025	48,294.44	48,294.44	40,245.37	136,834	48,294	177,080	The director of operations will ensure that all logistical and administrative aspects of implementation meet the required procurement standards of quality and compliance. He will be responsible for overseeing the contracting of suppliers and service providers for all workshops, trainings, travels and related events under the project. This includes preparing and reviewing procurement documents, ensuring transparent and competitive selection processes, negotiating terms, and coordinating with the finance and program teams to ensure timely delivery of goods and services. His involvement is essential for maintaining accountability, cost efficiency, and adherence to procurement policies.
Subtotal 1.7				85,690	48,294	77,641	211,626	48,294	177,080	
Sub total outcome 1				208,079	538,629	130,580	877,289	144,883	241,472	
OUTCOME 2: Justice Sector Institutions achieve stronger coordination and more effective implementation of ADR, CJ and legal aid policies										
2.1. National dialogue on court annexed mediation procedure										
2.1.1.Facilitator	Per day	3	1,456.98		4,370.95		4,371			This budget line will cover the professional fees of a facilitator contracted to moderate the dialogue and draft the resolutions. 300,000 Rwf*3 days = 900,000 Rwf Thus 4,371 DKK.
2.1.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	70	339.96		23,797.38		23,797			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the dialogue. 70,000 Rwf *70 participants* 1 day=4,900,000 Rwf Thus 23,797 DKK.
2.1.3.Transportation	Per participant	70	72.85		5,099.44		5,099			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf *70 participants*1 day=1,050,000 Rwf equivalent to 5,099 DKK.
Subtotal 2.1					-	33,268	-	33,268	-	-
2.2.Dialogue to discuss effective implementation of small claims procedure										
2.2.1.Facilitator	Per day	3	1,456.98		4,370.95		4,371			This budget line will cover the professional fees of a facilitator contracted to moderate the dialogue and draft the resolutions. 300,000 Rwf*3 days = 900,000 Rwf Thus 4,371 DKK.
2.2.2.Venue	Per package/pers/day	100	339.96		33,996.26		33,996			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the dialogue. 70,000 Rwf *100 participants* 1 day =7,000,000 Rwf Thus 33,996 DKK.
2.2.3.Transportation	Per participant	100	72.85		7,284.91		7,285			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf per participants*100 Participants* 1 day=1,500,000 Rwf equivalent to 7,285 DKK.
Subtotal 2.2.					-	45,652	-	45,652	-	-
2.3. Support the development of SOPs for ADR practices										
2.3.1.Consultant to develop SOPs										
2.3.1.1.-Assessment	Per day	16	1,456.98		23,311.72		23,312			This budget line will cover the professional fees of a consultant contracted to develop the standard operating procedures. S/he will dedicate 16 working days to this assignment, including research, drafting, and finalization of the SOPs. 300,000*16 days=4,800,000 Rwf.Thus 23,312 DKK.

<b>2.3.2. Validation</b>					-		-			
2.3.2.1.Venue	Per package/pers	30	339.96		10,198.88		10,199			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the validation workshop.70,000 Rwf*30 participants* 1 day=2,100,000 Rwf equivalent to 10,199 DKK.
2.3.2.2.Transportation fees	Per participant	30	72.85		2,185.47		2,185			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf *30 participants* 1 day=450,000 Rwf equivalent to 2,185 DKK.
<b>Subtotal 2.3</b>				-	35,696	-	35,696	-	-	
<b>2.4. Support operationalisation of ADR center</b>										
<b>2.4.1. Staffing</b>							-			
2.4.1.1.ADR Liaison officer	Per month	34	5,827.93	69,935.16	69,935.16	58,279.30	198,150			This budget line will cover the salary of a full-time Liaison Officer based at the ADR Centre. The officer will ensure LAF's presence, support the centre's operations, provide mediation services to legal aid seekers, and report on the centre's activities. S/he will receive a gross amount of 1,200,000 Rwf per month * 34 months= 40,800,000 Rwf equivalent to 198,150 DKK
2.4.1.2.Executive Director 40%	Per month	34	13,889	166,672.80	166,672.80	138,894.00	472,240	168,946	253,418	The executive director will provide overall coordination and strategic oversight of the project. He will ensure that activities are implemented in alignment with the organization's mission, donor requirements, and national priorities. His responsibilities will include supervising the project team, guiding strategic decision-making, ensuring sound financial and administrative management, and representing the project in high-level engagements with partners and stakeholders. His leadership will be critical to ensuring effective coordination, accountability, and the overall success of the project.
2.4.1.3. Staff health insurance	Per year	3	105,572	105,572.20	105,572.20	105,572.20	316,717			
<b>2.4.2. Running cost</b>										
2.4.2.1.Cleaning and consumables	Per month	24	2,913.97	34,967.58	34,967.58		69,935			This budget line will cover cleaning services and office consumables. 600,000Rwf*24 months=14,400,000 Rwf equivalent to 69,935 DKK.
2.4.2.2. Computer	Per computer	2	4,856.61	9,713.22			9,713			This budget line will cover the purchase of two computers. 1,000,000 Rwf *2=2,000,000 Rwf equivalent 9,713 DKK.
2.4.2.3.Communication and Internet	Per month	24	485.66	5,827.93	5,827.93		11,656			This budget line will cover airtime and internet costs for project staff. 100,000 Rwf *24 months= 2,400,000 Rwf equivalent to 11,656 DKK.
2.4.2.4.Photocopying,printing, binding etc 20%	Per month	34	144	1,724	1,723.70	1,436.42	4,884	2,622.57	1,748.38	
2.4.2.5.Water and electricity 40%	Per month	34	1,342	16,101	16,100.52	13,417.10	45,618	12,238.65	8,159.10	
2.4.2.6.Office Consumables and supplies 30%	Per month	34	1,005	12,055	12,055.32	10,046.10	34,157	10,590.35	7,942.76	
<b>Subtotal 2.4</b>				422,568	412,855	327,645	1,163,069	194,397	271,269	
<b>2.5. Develop standardised Legal aid guidelines</b>										
2.5.1.External consultant to develop the legal aid guide	Per day	16	1,456.98		23,311.72		23,312			This budget line will cover the professional fees of a consultant contracted to develop the legal aid guidelines. S/he will dedicate 16 working days to this assignment, including research, drafting, and finalization of the guidelines. 300,000 Rwf*16 days=4,800,000 Rwf equivalent to 23,311,72 DKK.
2.5.2.Validation workshop of the guide							-			
2.5.2.1.Venue.	Per package	30	291.40		8,741.90		8,742			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the validation workshop. 60,000 Rwf*30 participants* 1 day=1,800,000 Rwf. Thus 8,742 DKK.
2.5.2.2. Transportation	Per participant	30	72.85		2,185.47		2,185			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf*30 participants*1 day=450,000 Rwf Thus 2,185 DKK.
<b>Subtotal 2.5</b>				-	34,239	-	34,239	-	-	
<b>2.6. Drafting of sentencing guidelines</b>										
2.6.1.Consultant	Per day	16	1,456.98		23,311.72		23,312			This budget line will cover the professional fees of a consultant contracted to develop the sentencing guidelines. S/he will dedicate 16 working days to this assignment, including research, drafting, and finalization of the sentencing guidelines. 300,000 Rwf*16 days=4,800,000 Rwf equivalents to 23,311,72 DKK.
<b>2.6.2.Focus group discussion</b>							-			
2.6.2.1.Venue	Per package/ day	30	291.40		8,741.90		8,742			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the focus group discussions. 60,000 Rwf*15 participants*2 sessions=1,800,000 Rwf Thus 8,742 DKK.
2.6.2.2.Allowance	Per pers/day	30	485.66		14,569.83		14,570			This budget line will cover allowances for expert participants contributing their time and expertise during focus group discussions. 100,000 Rwf* 15 participants* 2 sessions= 3,000,000 Rwf Thus14,570 DKK.
<b>2.6.3. Validation</b>							-			
2.6.3.1.Venue	Per package	30	291.40		8,741.90		8,742			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the validation workshop. 60,000 Rwf*30 participants*1 day=1,800,000 Rwf. Thus 8,742 DKK.
2.6.3.2.Transportation fees	Per participant	30	72.85		2,185.47		2,185			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf*30 participants*1 day=450,000 Rwf Thus 2,185 DKK.
<b>Subtotal 2.6</b>				-	57,551	-	57,551	-	-	
<b>2.7. Support legal reforms informed by both policies</b>										
2.7.1. Technical meetings for Lawyers	Per package/pers/semest	48	291.40	4,662.34	4,662.34	4,662.34	13,987			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for a team of 8 lawyers t meet quarterly track and participate in legal reforms. 60,000 Rwf*8 participants*2 sessions*3 years= 2,880,000 Rwf equivalent to 13,987 DKK.
2.7.2.Allowance for Lawyers	Per Lawyers/session	48	485.66	7,770.57	7,770.57	7,770.57	23,312			Lawyers will receive sitting allowance of 100,000 Rwf per lawyer*8 Lawyers* 2 quarters*3 Years= 4,800,000 rwf equivalent to 23,312 DKK.
<b>Subtotal 2.7</b>				12,433	12,433	12,433	37,299	-	-	
<b>2.8. Develop a national Paralegal curriculum</b>										
2.8.1.Consultant	Per day	16	1,456.98		23,311.72		23,312			This budget line will cover the professional fees of a consultant contracted to develop the paralegal curriculum. S/he will dedicate 16 working days to this assignment, including research, drafting, and finalization of the curriculum. 300,000 Rwf *16 days= 4,800,000 Rwf. Thus 23,312 DKK.
<b>2.8.2.Validation of the curriculum</b>							-			
2.8.2.1.Venue	Per package	30	291.40		8,741.90		8,742			This budget line will cover the costs of venue hire, refreshments, and basic stationery required for the validation workshop. 60,000 Rwf*30 participants* 1 day=1,800,000 Rwf equivalent to 8,742 DKK.
2.8.2.2.Transportation fees	Per participant	30	72.85		2,185.47		2,185			This budgetline will be used to reimburse participants' transport fees to and from the venue. 15,000 Rwf*30 participants* 1 day=450,000 Rwf Thus 2,185 DKK.
<b>Subtotal 2.8</b>				-	34,239	-	34,239	-	-	
<b>2.9. Benchmarking study on Kenya's Alternative Justice Systems (5 days) *6 people</b>										
2.9.1. Airplane tickets	Per person	6	4,370.95	26,225.69			26,226			This budget line will cover the cost of return flight tickets for the team of 6 people who will go to Kenya for the study visit.
2.9.2.Accommodation	Per person/nigh	24	971.32	23,311.72			23,312			This budget line will cover accommodation expenses for 6 delegates for 4 nights, based on standard rates for three-star hotels in the Nairobi central business district
2.9.3.Subsistence	Per person/day	30	1,724.10	51,722.88			51,723			This budget line will cover subsistence allowances for 6 delegates for 4 days to cater for meals and incidental expenses while in Nairobi
2.9.4.Van hire for local transportation of the delegation	Per day	4	3,399.63	13,598.50			13,599			This budget line will cover the cost of van hire to provide local transportation for the delegation during the study visit in Nairobi.
<b>Sub total 2.9</b>				114,859	-	-	114,859	-	-	
<b>Subtotal Outcome 2</b>				549,860	665,933	340,078	1,555,871	194,397	271,269	
<b>Outcome 3: Vulnerable and marginalized populations increasingly access legal aid services</b>										
<b>3.1. Provision of legal aid services via call center, walk-in and MLACS)</b>										
3.1.1.Head of Legal Empowerment Unit 40%	Per month	34	3,571	42,854.88	42,854.88	35,712.40	121,422	43,439	43,439	The head of legal empowerment unit will be responsible for organizing and conducting monthly mobile legal aid clinics in target communities throughout the project. This will role involve coordinating with local authorities and community partners, planning logistics, mobilizing beneficiaries, and ensuring that each clinic is staffed with qualified legal professionals. Se will also oversee data collection and reporting on the services provided, ensuring that the clinics effectively respond to community justice needs and contribute to the project's overall objectives.

3.1.2.Senior Case Management Officer 40%	Per month	34	3,041	36,489.96	36,489.96	30,408.30	103,388		92,468	Senior case management officer will be responsible for reviewing all legal aid requests received under the project, assessing their eligibility, and assigning cases to appropriate lawyers for representation. He will maintain regular follow-up with lawyers to monitor case progress, ensure timely and quality service delivery, and address any challenges encountered during implementation. He will also compile detailed reports on individuals assisted through the project and document success stories that illustrate the project's impact on access to justice. His role is critical to ensuring that legal aid services are delivered efficiently, transparently, and in line with the project's objectives.
3.1.3.Lawyers	Per month	136	5,827.93	279,740.66	279,740.66	233,117.21	792,599			This budget line will cover the fees of lawyers contracted to provide legal advice and representation to beneficiaries throughout the project. 1,200,000 Rwf*4 lawyers*34 months=163,200,000 Rwf.Thus 792,599 DKK.
3.1.4.Call center operators	Per month/Operator	68	5,827.93	139,870.33	139,870.33	116,558.61	396,299			This budget line will cover the salaries of three call center operators who will receive calls from beneficiaries, provide legal advice, and identify critical cases that require legal representation. Each operator will receive a gross amount of 1,200,000 Rwf per month*2 operators*34 months=81,600,000 Rwf.Thus 396,299 DKK.
3.1.5.IT officer 20 %	Per month	34	1,541	18,493.67	18,493.67	15,411.39	52,399	55,481	92,468	The IT officer will be responsible for overseeing the day-to-day technical operations of the call center (server, data backup systems, and overall network functionality). His duties will ensure that the call center operates smoothly, securely, and without interruption, allowing citizens to access legal aid and information services efficiently. He will also troubleshoot technical issues, coordinate with telecommunication companies, and ensure data protection and system reliability in line with organizational standards.
3.1.6.Reverse bill	Per month	34	2,428.30	29,139.65	29,139.65	24,283.04	82,562			This budget line will cover the monthly reversal billing payments to MTN and Airtel, allowing beneficiaries to call the legal aid call centre at no cost. 500,000 Rwf*34 months=17,000,000 Rwf. Thus 82,562 DKK.
3.1.7. Maintenance	Per quarter	12	7,284.91	29,139.65	29,139.65	29,139.65	87,419			This budget line will cover quarterly maintenance services for the call center, including system servicing, equipment checks, and software updates, to ensure smooth and uninterrupted operations. 1,500,000 Rwf*12 months=18,000,000 rwf equivalent 87,419 DKK.
3.1.8.Purchase a Car	Per car	1	582,793.04	582,793.04			582,793			This budget line will cover the purchase of a project vehicle to facilitate field activities, including transporting lawyers to community legal aid clinics and supporting overall project implementation and coordination. 120,000,000 Rwf equivalent to 582,793 DKK.
3.1.9.Perdiem for Lawyers	Per month/lawyer	68	242.83	5,827.93	5,827.93	4,856.61	16,512			This budget line will cover per diems for lawyers deployed to communities to provide on-site legal services through mobile legal aid clinics. 50,000 Rwf per*2 lawyers*34 months=3,400,000 Rwf equivalent to 16,512 DKK.
3.1.7. Fuel	Per month	34	2,428.30	29,139.65	29,139.65	24,283.04	82,562			This budget line will cover fuel costs for the project vehicle to facilitate field visits and other project-related movements. 500,000 Rwf*34 months=17,000,000 rwf.Thus 82,562 DKK.
3.1.8.Driver	Per month	34	3,205.36	38,464.34	38,464.34	32,053.62	108,982			This budget line will cover the salary of a driver hired to operate the project vehicle and support field activities. S/he will receive a gross amount of 660,000 Rwf per month * 34 months= 22,440,000 Rwf Thus 108,983 DKK.
3.1.9.Vehicle maintenance& insurance	Per month	34	2,428.30	29,139.65	29,139.65	24,283.04	82,562			This budget line will cover the costs of vehicle maintenance and insurance to ensure safe and reliable transport for project activities. 500,000 Rwf*34 months=17,000,000 Rwf.Thus 82,562 DKK.
3.1.10.Office rent 50%	Per month	34	17,222	206,658	206,658.41	172,215.34	585,532	41,331.68	165,326.73	This budget line will cover the project's contribution to office rent to ensure adequate space for coordination and implementation of project activities.
<b>Subtotal outcome 3</b>				<b>1,467,752</b>	<b>884,959</b>	<b>742,322</b>	<b>3,095,033</b>	<b>140,252</b>	<b>393,703</b>	
<b>4. Monitoring evaluation and Learning</b>										
4.1.Project review meetings	Per semester	6	14,569.83	29,139.65	29,139.65	29,139.65	87,419			This budget line will cover the costs of technical sessions to review project implementation, progress, challenges, and feedback from beneficiaries.
4.2.Project evaluation	Per year	1	72,849.13		72,849.13		72,849			This budget line will cover the costs of conducting the project's evaluation to assess results, impact, and overall performance.
4.2.3.Programs Associate 40%	Per month	34	2,397	28,766.76	28,766.76	23,972.30	81,506		86,300	The programs associate will be responsible for planning and coordinating all project review meetings throughout project implementation period, ensuring effective preparation, documentation, and follow-up on agreed actions. She will also provide support in consolidating activity updates, assist in organizing trainings, workshops, and field activities, ensuring that all events are well-prepared, documented, and aligned with project objectives.
<b>Subtotal 4</b>				<b>57,906</b>	<b>130,756</b>	<b>53,112</b>	<b>241,774</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>86,300</b>	
5. Visibility materials	Lumpsum	1	24,283.04	24,283.04			24,283			This budget line will cover the production of various visibility materials to promote and highlight the project's activities.
<b>Subtotal 5</b>				<b>24,283</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>24,283</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	
<b>6.Financial costs</b>										
6.1.Audit fees	Per year	3	31,567.96	31,567.96	31,567.96	31,567.96	94,704			
6.2.Bank charges	Per month	34	72.85	874.19	874.19	728.49	2,477			
6.3.Director of Finance 30 %	Per month	34	4,849	58,189.97	58,189.97	48,491.64	164,872	58,190	213,363	The director of finance will be responsible for monitoring and tracking day-to-day project expenditures to ensure that all financial transactions are accurate, eligible, and aligned with the approved budget. Her duties include preparing periodic financial reports, maintaining proper documentation for all expenses, and supporting compliance with both organizational and donor financial management requirements. She will also oversee the project audit process, ensuring timely preparation of financial statements, coordination with auditors, and implementation of any audit recommendations.
<b>Subtotal 6</b>				<b>90,632</b>	<b>90,632</b>	<b>80,788</b>	<b>262,052</b>	<b>58,190</b>	<b>213,363</b>	
<b>Total activities</b>				<b>2,398,513</b>	<b>2,310,909</b>	<b>1,346,880</b>	<b>6,056,302</b>	<b>537,722</b>	<b>1,206,107</b>	
<b>7. Administrative costs 7%</b>										
<b>7.1.Personnel</b>										
7.1.1.Executive Personal Assistant 30%	Per month	34	1,798	21,575.07	21,575.07	17,979.22	61,129		100,684	
7.1.2.Accountant 30%	Per month	34	1,798	21,575.07	21,575.07	17,979.22	61,129	21,575	79,109	
7.1.3.Admin assistant 20%	Per month	34	663	7,952.40	7,952.40	6,627.00	22,532		12,091	
7.1.4.Procurement Officer 20%	Per month	34	1,199	14,383.38	14,383.38	11,986.15	40,753		115,067	
7.1.5.RSSB employer contribution	Per month	34	3,291	39,488.76	39,488.76	32,907.30	111,885		152,130	
<b>7.2. Office essential</b>										
7.2.1.Security Guard 40%	Per month	34	632	7,586	7,586.16	6,321.80	21,494	5,769.65	3,846.43	
7.2.2.Cleaning services 50%	Per month	34	671	8,050	8,050.24	6,708.53	22,809	6,119.33	4,079.55	
7.2.3.Communication 40%	Per month	34	1,578	18,941	18,940.77	15,783.98	53,666	11,364.46	7,576.31	
7.2.4.Internet connection 30%	Per month	34	1,246	14,949	14,949.36	12,457.80	42,357	15,735.41	10,490.27	
7.2.5.Representation 36%	Per month	34	175	2,098	2,098.05	1,748.38	5,944	1,258.83	1,426.68	
<b>Total administrative costs</b>				<b>156,599.26</b>	<b>156,599.26</b>	<b>130,499.38</b>	<b>443,697.90</b>	<b>61,822.76</b>	<b>486,499.37</b>	
<b>Total costs of the project</b>				<b>2,555,111.78</b>	<b>2,467,508.28</b>	<b>1,477,379.78</b>	<b>6,499,999.84</b>	<b>599,545.02</b>	<b>1,692,606.30</b>	

## CR Project (10/2025-07/2028) Summary Budget

CACR Budget per Output	Output 1	Output 2	Output 3	NOK	DKK
Direct project implementation costs	5,012,122	7,602,730	11,544,032	24,158,884	15,554,966
Management and shared support costs as per	1,110,059	1,683,814	2,556,713	5,350,586	3,445,034
<b>Total:</b>	<b>6,122,181</b>	<b>9,286,544</b>	<b>14,100,745</b>	<b>29,509,469</b>	<b>19,000,000</b>

Percentage Allocation	21%	31%	48%	100%
-----------------------	-----	-----	-----	------

PA planned budget per strategic outcome								
Danish contribution as % of NPA budget 2021	Year 2025	Year 2026	Year 2027	Year 2028	DKK	%	NOK	DKK
Outcome area 1 (39.43%)	3,438,235	3,352,941	3,352,941	1,955,882	12,100,000	38.64%	48,641,900	31,318,628
Outcome area 2 (0%)						0.00%	6,388,000	4,112,985
Outcome area 3 (53%)	4,738,235	3,352,941	3,352,941	1,955,882	13,400,000	52.03%	40,000,000	25,754,444
<b>Total DKK:</b>	<b>8,176,471</b>	<b>6,705,882</b>	<b>6,705,882</b>	<b>3,911,765</b>	<b>25,500,000</b>		<b>95,029,900</b>	<b>61,186,057</b>

## NPA detailed budget

CACR Budget Projection (October 2025 - July 2028)				
Description		Budget (DKK)	1.55313	Budget ( NOK)
<b>TOTAL GRANT</b>		<b>19,000,000</b>		<b>29,509,469</b>
	Transfer to partners	820,432		1,274,238
	<b>Sum Partner salary cost</b>	<b>820,432</b>		<b>1,274,238</b>
	Transfer to partners	96,579		150,000
	<b>Sum Partner travel cost</b>	<b>96,579</b>		<b>150,000</b>
	Transfer to partners	96,579		150,000
	<b>Sum Partner operating costs</b>	<b>96,579</b>		<b>150,000</b>
	Transfer to partners	96,579		150,000
	<b>Sum Partner Procurement costs</b>	<b>96,579</b>		<b>150,000</b>
	Transfer to partners	2,446,672		3,800,000
	<b>Sum Partner other direct activity costs</b>	<b>2,446,672</b>		<b>3,800,000</b>
	Transfer to partners	128,772		200,000
	<b>Sum Partner audit,evaluation and monitoring</b>	<b>128,772</b>		<b>200,000</b>
	<b>Consortium Partner - Transparency Int'l Rwd</b>	<b>3,685,614</b>		<b>5,724,238</b>
	<b>Partner 1 / TBD</b>	<b>2,591,625</b>		<b>4,025,130</b>
	<b>Partner 2 / TBD</b>	<b>2,478,865</b>		<b>3,850,000</b>
	<b>Partner 3 / TBD</b>	<b>1,850,245</b>		<b>2,873,671</b>
<b>Sum Transfer to Partners</b>		<b>10,606,349</b>		<b>16,473,039</b>
	Salary Direct Project Staff	2,858,958		4,440,333
	Salary Direct Shared Support Staff	1,399,149		2,173,060
<b>Total Personnel Costs</b>		<b>4,258,106</b>		<b>6,613,392</b>
	Meetings, courses	74,688		116,000
	HO desk support	64,386		100,000
<b>Sum Capacity Building Personnel</b>		<b>139,074</b>		<b>216,000</b>
	Meetings, courses	643,861		1,000,000
<b>Sum Capacity Building Partners</b>		<b>643,861</b>		<b>1,000,000</b>
	IT equipment	32,193		50,000
<b>Sum Materials and Supplies</b>		<b>32,193</b>		<b>50,000</b>
	Travel cost - Domestic	32,193		50,000
	Travel costs - HO monitoring and control	28,974		45,000
	Travel cost - Hotel costs	7,404		11,500
<b>Travel Costs Project Monitoring</b>		<b>68,571</b>		<b>106,500</b>
	Travel costs - International	17,706		27,500
<b>Travel Costs International - Meetings at HO</b>		<b>17,706</b>		<b>27,500</b>
	Direct Project Running Cost	916,268		1,423,083
<b>Sum Direct Project Running Cost</b>		<b>916,268</b>		<b>1,423,083</b>
	Shared Office Support Costs	646,115		1,003,500
<b>Sum Shared Support Cost</b>		<b>646,115</b>		<b>1,003,500</b>
	Final evaluation	112,676		175,000
	Audit fee	316,090		490,929
<b>Sum Apraisal, Evaluation and Audit</b>		<b>428,766</b>		<b>665,929</b>
	Administrative contribution	1,242,991		1,930,526
<b>Sum Head Office Administration Fee</b>		<b>1,242,991</b>		<b>1,930,526</b>
	<b>TOTAL Direct Project Implementation</b>			<b>24,158,884</b>
	<b>TOTAL Shared Support</b>			<b>5,350,586</b>
<b>TOTAL Project Budget</b>		<b>19,000,000</b>		<b>29,509,469</b>



DIHR budget

DIHR Budget 2025-2027 (2.5 år).

A tentative budget is presented below. An updated budget will be presented to the Danish Project Office in Rwanda in the inception pha

Total budget (2025 – 2027)	
	DKK
Partner activities	5,090,000
Salary*	2,399,774
International and local travel	436,000
Local staff salary*	1,139,540
Local office costs, incl. rent, supplies, ed	280,200
Total project costs	9,345,514
7% admin	654,186
TOTAL	9,999,700








\* The DIHR salary costs are calculated based on the institute’s Fair Share model where a fixed amount is added to the salary costs to cover support functions, including HR, IT and facility costs.

Tentative periodized budget:

total	2025	206	2027	Total
Months	8	12	12	32
Pro rata budget share	2,499,925.00	3,749,887.50	3,749,887.50	9,999,700.00

Interpeace Summary Budget

Budget per Outcome and per output		Year 1 (2025)	Year 2 (2026)	Year 3 (2027)	Total Donor budget	Co fund	Total Budget ( Donor+ Co fund)
01	Outcome 1: Within two years, targeted individuals and families will demonstrate increased emotional resilience, improved intergenerational relationships, and greater economic self-reliance	Curr. DKK	Curr. DKK		Curr. DKK	EU Funded Project	
	Output 1.1: Community-based dialogue spaces for healing and social cohesion operationalized	155,117	265,164	125,070	545,352		545,352
	Output 1.2: Households and community groups trained in livelihood and financial literacy, and provided with Seed funding to run collaborative livelihoods initiatives	-	680,282	226,761	907,042		907,042
	Total Outcome 1	155,117	945,446	351,831	1,452,394	-	1,452,394
02	Outcome 2: By the end of the two-year period, communities engaged in the project will show stronger civic participation and improved trust in governance						
	Output 2.1: Strengthened community-based ADR mechanisms through training of ADR facilitators	27,887.32	8,450.70	4,225.35	40,563		40,563
	Output 2.2: Civic engagement platforms established/revitalized, and facilitated by trained community dialogue facilitators.	735,663	176,056	216,197	1,127,916	915,266	2,043,182
	Total Outcome 1	763,550	184,507	220,423	1,168,479	915,266	2,083,746
03	Other program cost						0
	Coordination, Monitoring & Evaluation, visibility and audit	391,594	390,185	297,697	1,079,476	-	1,079,476
04	Operations						
	Personel	606,488.40	606,488.40	505,407.00	1,718,384	479,645	2,198,029
	Logistics, field travel, fuel, Vehicle maintainance, Vehicle insurance	90,140.85	90,140.85	90,140.85	270,423	182,857	453,280
	Office rent, communication	37,142.86	37,142.86	30,952.38	105,238	29,714	134,952
	Total operations	733,772.10	733,772.10	626,500.23	2,094,044.43	692,216.90	2,786,261.33
	Total Direct cost	2,044,033.18	2,253,910.55	1,496,450.88	5,794,394.62	1,607,483.19	7,401,877.80
	ICR 7%	143,082.32	157,773.74	104,751.56	405,607.62	112,523.82	518,131.45
Total Budget		2,187,116	2,411,684	1,601,202	6,200,002	1,720,007	7,920,009
Pro rata per calendar year							
		oct-dec 2025	jan-dec 2026	jan-dec 2027			22%
		546,778.88	2,243,257.70	2,289,123.95	1,120,841.71	6,200,002.24	

National Bank of Rwanda					
About Monetary Policy Statistics News and Publications					
Search					
Country	Currency	Buying Rate	Average Rate	Selling Rate	Date
	DKK	208.426157	210.510208	212.594259	04/04/2025
	EGP	27.70312	27.980123	28.257126	04/04/2025
	GHS	90.421784	91.32591	92.230037	04/04/2025
	GNF	0.161875	0.163494	0.165113	04/04/2025
	HUF	3.855578	3.89413	3.932682	04/04/2025
	GNF	0.161875	0.163494	0.165113	04/04/2025
	HUF	3.855578	3.89413	3.932682	04/04/2025

Int

Budget Item	Quantity	Unit Cost (FRW)	Total (FRW)	Y1 Allocation (DKK)	Y2 Allocation (DKK)	Y3 Allocation (DKK)	Total Donor Budget	Co fund	Total Budget (Donor + Co)
<b>Outcome 1: Within 34 months, targeted individuals and families</b>								EU Project	
<b>Output 1.1: Community-based dialogue spaces for healing and social cohesion operationalized</b>									
Facilitator training (24 new facilitators, 8 per district/ 3 districts): a comprehensive 5-day training in year 1, a 2-day refresher training in year2	24	400,000	9,600,000	30,047	15,023		45,070		45,070
60 Community-based multifamily dialogues & healing spaces setup (12 spaces in year 1, 48 spaces in year 2, 12 spaces in year 3)* 24 sessions per space.	1,440	24,000	34,560,000	40,563	81,127	40,563	162,254		162,254
1,500 individuals (men, women, youth) from 370 vulnerable and conflicting families (of genocide survivors, ex-prisoners, returnees & ex-combattants, supported Multifamily (25 individuals per space/session, each individual going through 24 sessions)	36,000	2,000	72,000,000	84,507	169,014	84,507	338,028		338,028
<b>Output 1.2: Households and community groups trained in livelihood and financial literacy, and provided with Seed funding</b>									
120 CO-LIVE training participants: 8 individuals from each of 15 spaces (in Y1)	120	240,000	28,800,000		101,408	33,803	135,211		135,211
15 Seed grants for CBEs: 12 intergenerational and 3 youth-specific	15	10,000,000	150,000,000		528,169	176,056	704,225		704,225
Business incubation and mentorship support: 1 CO-LIVE consultant, for 3 months	3	4,800,000	14,400,000		50,704	16,901	67,606		67,606
Business incubation and mentorship support: 3 incubators/ 1 per district, for 12 months	36	1,500,000	54,000,000						
<b>Subtotal outcome 1</b>			<b>309,360,000</b>	<b>155,117</b>	<b>945,446</b>	<b>351,831</b>	<b>1,452,394</b>	-	<b>1,452,394</b>
<b>Outcome 2: By the end of the two-year period, communities engaged in the project will show stronger civic participation and influence governance and reintegration policies</b>									
<b>Output 2.1: Strengthened community-based ADR mechanisms through training of ADR facilitators</b>									
ADR mediators training (24 in Y1: 8 per district)	24	210,000	5,040,000	23,661.97			23,662		23,662
Conflicts monitoring and referral (ADR platforms supported: 24 per quarter in 3 year) 1qter in yr1, 3qters in 2 and 1qter yr3	120	30,000	3,600,000	4,225.35	8,450.70	4,225.35	16,901		16,901
<b>Output 2.2: Civic engagement platforms established/revitalized, and facilitated by trained community dialogue facilitators.</b>									
24Citizen forum facilitators trained (8 per district)	24	400,000	9,600,000	45,070			45,070		45,070
240 Monthly Civic forums (180 in Y2, and 60 in Year 3)	240	30,000	7,200,000		25,352.11	8,450.70	33,803		33,803
4800 citizens, including youth and women empowered to participate in local decision making: (20 participants per each civic forum event) 360 yr2 & 120yr3	4800	5,000	24,000,000		84,507.04	28,169.01	112,676		112,676
45 Local officials trained in trauma-informed leadership & civic engagement	45	80,000	3,600,000		16,901.41		16,901		16,901
District-level stakeholders coordination/ feedback meetings (12 meeting*15 participants) ( 1 in yr1, 2 in yr2, 1 in yr3)	180	50,000	9,000,000	10,563.38	21,126.76	10,563.38	42,254		42,254
Linking the inmates with community leaders and their families before release, through the MINUBUMWE prisoner-specific Itorero programme: facilitate 6 events (2 per year)	6	10,000,000	60,000,000	140,845.07		140,845.07	281,690		281,690
Organise 3 national policy dialogues on good practices and policy recommendations around advancing resilience social cohesion and effective reintegration of prisoners and civic engagement.	3	6,000,000	18,000,000	28,169.01	28,169.01	28,169.01	84,507	85,714	170,221
Train 45 correctional officers on Prisoner-adapted socioemotional skills, positive parenting and masculinity, and Risk and resilience assessment protocol for prisoners entering halfway home	45	285,469	12,846,120	60,310.42			60,310	61,172	121,482
Provide training equipment and materials for at least 120 prisoners to be enrolled in hands-on skills training in at least 2 correctional facilities for smooth reintegration.	120	800,000	96,000,000	450,704.23			450,704	768,380	1,219,084
<b>Subtotal outcome 2</b>			<b>248,886,120</b>	<b>763,550</b>	<b>184,507</b>	<b>220,423</b>	<b>1,168,479</b>	<b>915,266</b>	<b>2,083,746</b>
<b>Coordination, Monitoring &amp; Evaluation, and visibility</b>									
National closing conference (60 participants)	60	120,000	7,200,000		33,803		33,803		33,803
Pre-intervention assessments (participants screening)	3	20,000,000	60,000,000	281,690			281,690		281,690
Annual assessment/outcomes harvesting and endline	3	35,000,000	105,000,000		246,478.87	187,793.43	434,272		434,272
Regular (Quarterly) field monitoring (12, 3 persons)	36	760,000	27,360,000	42,816.90	42,816.90	42,816.90	128,451		128,451
Communication, publication and visibility actions	3	7,289,490	21,868,470	34,222.96	34,222.96	34,222.96	102,669		102,669
Audit	3	7,000,000	21,000,000	32,863.85	32,863.85	32,863.85	98,592		98,592
<b>Subtotal outcome 2</b>			<b>242,428,470</b>	<b>391,594</b>	<b>390,185</b>	<b>297,697</b>	<b>1,079,476</b>	-	<b>1,079,476</b>
<b>Operational costs</b>									
Personnel costs	1		366,015,749	606,488.40	606,488.40	505,407.00	1,718,384	479,645	2,198,029
Logistics, field travel, fuel, Vehicle maintenance, Vehicle insurance	3	19,200,000	57,600,000	90,140.85	90,140.85	90,140.85	270,423	182,857	453,280
Office rent, communication	3	5,200,000	15,600,000	37,142.86	37,142.86	30,952.38	105,238	29,714	134,952
<b>Subtotal operations</b>			<b>439,215,749</b>	<b>733,772</b>	<b>733,772</b>	<b>626,500</b>	<b>2,094,044</b>	<b>692,217</b>	<b>2,786,261</b>
<b>Grand total</b>			<b>1,239,890,339</b>	<b>2,044,033</b>	<b>2,253,911</b>	<b>1,496,451</b>	<b>5,794,395</b>	<b>1,607,483</b>	<b>7,401,878</b>
ICR 7%							405,607.62	112,524	518,131.45
<b>Total Budget</b>							<b>6,200,002</b>	<b>1,720,007</b>	<b>7,920,009</b>

## Process Action Plan for programme preparation, approval and implementation

Action/product	Deadlines	Responsible/involved units	Comment/status
<b>Identification</b>			
Approval of consultancy budget	December 2024	TILSKUD	19 December 2024 Via forundersøgelseskontoen
Single sourcing of external consultant (<250,000)	January 2025	Kigali	Contract signed 22 January 2025
Start of identification process incl. field visit	February	Consultant / Kigali	Field visit week 8
Identification report	March	Consultant / Kigali	Received draft identification report on 11 March
<b>Formulation, quality assurance and approval</b>			
Formulation report	April	Consultant / Kigali	Draft programme document received on 10 April
Single sourcing of appraisal consultant (<250.000)	May	Kigali	Signed Contract with TANA on 14 May Via forundersøgelseskontoen.
Appraisal report	June	Consultant	Final appraisal report received on 2 July
Finalisation of the programme document	July-August	Consultant / Kigali	Including taking into consideration all appraisal recommendations +
Submission of programme for approval by Under-secretary for development policy	Beginning September	Kigali	
<b>Initial actions following the approval</b>			
Programme start	15 October	Kigali	
Single sourcing external consultant for financial capacity assessment of partners	October	Kigali	Visit to Rwanda 21-25 October.
Signing of agreements with partner(s)	October	Kigali	DIHR will receive 1 <sup>st</sup> disbursement after signing agreement as only local partner NGOs are focus of financial assessment.
Register commitment(s)	After agreement(s) are signed	Kigali	
<b>Inception phase</b>			
Financial capacity assessment	Beginning November	Consultant / Kigali	In time for partners to implement recommendations bf. receiving disbursements
First disbursement to local partners	End November	Kigali	
Partner meeting to review Theory of Change	Beginning December	Kigali	See appraisal recommendation.

## ANNEX 6

Action/product	Deadlines	Responsible/involved units	Comment/status
<b>Implementation</b>			
Desk monitoring incl. finance/budgets	End of each quarter	Kigali Emb. /partners	Quarterly meetings with partners
Field monitoring and stock taking	Every 6 months	Kigali Emb. /partners	
Periodic disbursements	Every 6 months	Kigali Emb. /partners	Based on continuous desk and field monitoring
Programme review	Q1-2027	LÆRING/ Consultant / Kigali Emb.	Mid-term assessment of programme implementation