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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Government of Rwanda (GoR) through the Ministry for Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) has proposed the launch of the LWH project which is a comprehensive project that deals with a comprehensive watershed management, water-harvesting in valley dams for hillside-irrigation and horticultural development that uses commercial-value fruit species. The project rationale stems from EDPRS that aims at robust growth of commercialized agriculture such as in export in coffee, tea and horticultural fruits such as avocado, mangoes, pineapple, cooking banana, etc. It also originates from the country’s Strategic Plan for Agricultural Transformation (SPAT 2004) which is designed to contribute to poverty reduction and to support economic growth through increased productivity and diversification of revenue opportunities and protection of the rural environment in effectively decentralized and transparent governance.

The purpose of this Process Framework (PF) for the Land Husbandry, works in Gatsibo-8 site is to establish a process by which members of potentially affected communities participate in design of land terracing activities, determine measures necessary to achieve livelihood restoration, and implement and monitor relevant project activities in order to restore their livelihoods as affected by land husbandry activities and therefore meet the requirement of the World Bank social safeguard policy regarding involuntary resettlement (OP 4.12). The Section I briefly introduces the LWH Project and its concordance with the stipulations of OP 4.12 while Section II presents a brief project description. Section III is the administrative and legal context, and the roles of the different stakeholders. The subsequent sections of this PF (Sections IV-VII) provide specific guidance for the development of the PF: Section IV is about criteria for Eligibility of affected persons section V covers livelihood restoration measures; Section VI discusses grievance mechanism procedures; Section VII outlines monitoring arrangements; and Section VIII outlines the project budget and timeline.

As mentioned above, the land husbandry activities under LWH project will potentially cause some disturbance to the crops which will be on the targeted lands during the construction period. In collaboration with the local authorities and the project beneficiaries, the project conducted different consultation meetings in order to sort out the potential adverse impact related to the implementation of land husbandry activities and eligible persons as Project Affected Persons (PAPs). Subsequently, the mitigation measures for reported adverse impacts were agreed on in participatory manner with all stakeholders. In Gatsibo-8 site, the crop disturbance was reported as the main adverse impact related to the land husbandry activities. Cassava and banana are the major crops to be disturbed because others will be harvested during the land husbandry activities period (September, 2010). Each person who owns land that will be affected by the land husbandry activities
through the temporary loss of crops during the land husbandry works is eligible for compensation through cash for work supplemented as necessary by a disturbance allowance, and is considered a PAP. However, there is no resettlement of PAPs in this project activity, and no PAPs will suffer a permanent loss of crops.

The socio-economic survey conducted revealed that in Gatsibo-8 site 194 PAPs were recorded. The potential crops to be disturbed were also assessed with a value of 5,754,240 Rwf. To restore the income related to the crops disturbance, the PAPs were explained about the cash for work program and accepted it as the suitable measure for income restoration. In case the cash for work does not meet the equivalent of the crop disturbance, the balance will be paid as disturbance allowance. This is the case for the most vulnerable groups of the PAPs who will not be able to work during the land husbandry activities the socio-economic survey recorded two disabled person, four orphans head of their family and one old people (more than 70 years old). In addition to the cash for work, additional income restoration measures will be provided to the PAPs including agriculture inputs (seeds, fertilizers and training) and other community development program such as VUP, Ubudehe program and One cow per one poor family agreed to support the income restoration for the PAPs under LWH project especially the most vulnerable group in Gatsibo-8.

During the income restoration process, the PAPs are well informed about their rights about expressing any case of dissatisfaction. In all cases, the grievance procedure will be simple and administered as far as possible at the local levels to facilitate access, flexibility and ensure transparency.

For an effective implementation of this PF a participatory monitoring including all stakeholders (PIT, PAPs, income restoration committee and local authorities) will be required. Some key performance indicators will be focused on during this process including the number of contentious cases as a percentage of the total cases; the number of grievances and time and quality of resolution; agricultural productivity of new lands; Seasonal or inter-annual fluctuation on key foodstuffs; general relations between the project and the local communities etc.

Finally, the project budget and timeline is also recalled in this PF in order to clarify the source of funds and the implementation period of different sub-component activities under LWH project with regard to the land husbandry works.
# ACRONYMS

**CBOs:** Community Based Organizations  
**RSSP:** Rural Sector Support Project  
**Hh:** Household  
**PAPs:** Project Affected Persons  
**PF:** Process Framework  
**PIT:** Project Implementation Team  
**RPF:** Resettlement Policy Framework  
**Rwf:** Rwandan Francs  
**SWAp:** Sector Wide Approach  
**VUP:** Vision 2020 Umurenge Program
I. INTRODUCTION

A. LWH Objectives

The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to increase the productivity and commercialization of hillside agriculture in target areas. This PDO, and the key performance indicators below, were developed together with Government and development partners as part of the Common Framework of Engagement for the Government’s wider LWH Program.

B. Compliance with OP 4.12 (Process Framework) IN the Context of LWH

The land husbandry technologies are one of the key activities under the Land husbandry, Water harvesting and Hillside irrigation (LWH) Project. These Land husbandry technologies consist of sustainable and comprehensive land husbandry measures which include the radical/bench terraces, cut off drain and waterways, liming, compost application and the reforestation. The main objective of these technologies is to create a favorable and sustainable environment within the project catchment for hillside agriculture intensification in order to meet the food requirement and diversify the source of income of the targeted communities.

The implementation of land husbandry measures within the project sites will obviously lead to the physical and economical disturbance of the project beneficiaries which includes the temporarily loss of access to their land during the preliminary land husbandry works and the potential destruction of on field crops, especially the annual crops during the project construction period only. This effect directly triggers the World Bank Operational Policy OP4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement. However, there is no resettlement of PAPs in this project activity and no PAPs will suffer a permanent loss of crops. Therefore, the mitigation measures need to be put in place where the Project Affected Persons (PAPs) are consulted and participate in the decision making process about sustainable tools for the restoration of their livelihoods.

The purpose of the process framework is to establish a process by which members of potentially affected communities participate in decision making process for land husbandry measures implementation with regard to on-farm resources restriction, determine measures necessary to achieve livelihood restoration implement and monitor relevant project activities with regard to the agreed mitigation measures.

C. Outline of this Process Framework

The first section presents the objectives of the LWH, and then focuses on the specific activities that may entail restriction of access to crops (Section II). Section III then delineates the development and approval process for the PF.

The subsequent sections provide guidance on specific aspects of the PF:
- Section IV: Eligibility Criteria for Compensation Measures;
- Section V: Livelihood restoration,
- Section VI: Grievance mechanism,
- Section VII: Monitoring and evaluation, and,
- Section VIII: Budget and timeline.

The emphasis in this PF is on local involvement and participation in the definition of options and initiatives, as well as on mitigation or compensatory actions.
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project and Component Activities

The Land Husbandry, Water Harvesting and Hillside Irrigation (LWH) Project uses a modified watershed approach to introduce comprehensive and sustainable land husbandry measures for hillside agriculture on selected sites, as well as developing hillside irrigation for sub-sections of each site. The Project envisions the production of high-valued (organic) horticultural crops with the strongest marketing potential on irrigated portions of hillsides, and the improved productivity and commercialization of rain fed crops on the rest (the majority) of the site catchment-area hillsides. The section below describes in detail sub-component B-1 which is related to land husbandry activities and trigger O.P. 4.12 and hence remains of significant focus of this PF.

B. Sub-Component B-1: Land husbandry Infrastructure

The Project will develop participatory, comprehensive and sustainable land husbandry practices in a sub-watershed setting. Activities will include soil conservation measures and infrastructure appropriate to differing slope categories (e.g. soil bunding, green manuring, progressive and radical terracing, cut off drain and water ways etc). Given the acidity of Rwandan soils, additional activities such as liming may be necessary. The sub-component is designed to improve hillside agricultural management to protect against water erosion and enhance sustained crop productivity and ecosystem conservation. The activities described will benefit all farming households in the project-affected area.

Project land husbandry activities will be done in the three Project catchments in three different sites namely Karongi-13 in Karongi and Rutsiro Districts, Nyanza-23 in Nyanza District and Gatsibo-8 in Gatsibo District. These activities include the construction of radical/bench terraces, cut of drain and water ways. Reforestation will be also done in some marginal area of the Project catchment. The description of different land husbandry activities under LWH project is summarized below:

1. Grass strips on agricultural land

The grass strips are planted on land with slope gradient from 0 to 6%. The width of the grass strip is 1m and the spacing between two different grass strips is 10m whereas the spacing between two sods/columns is 20cm on the same line and 25cm between two lines. Planting materials are perennial grass such as Rhodes (*L. chloris gayana*), elephant grass (*L. Pennisetum purpureum*), and phalaris (*L. phalaris aquatic*).

2. Construction of level soil bunds

Level soil bunds will be constructed on farm land between 6% and 16% of slope gradient. The construction is done in 1m vertical interval. The soil bunds are also strengthened by planting grasses or other perennial legumes such as *desmodium* and *ciratro*. 
3. Radical/bench terraces

The radical/bench terraces will be constructed on land with slope gradient between 16% and 40%. The construction is done from cutting and filling of the sloping lands spaced in 1 m vertical interval giving it average density of 2.7km /ha. Width of the Radical Terraces is calculated on the basis of the vertical interval for the specific slope of the land. Like in the case of level soil bunds, the terraces riser are also strengthened by planting grasses or other perennial legume species. Note that the constructed terraces will be supplemented by agricultural inputs (lime and organic manure or compost) in order to improve the soil productivity.

4. Cut off drain and waterways construction

The Cut-off drains will be constructed along the contour in a spacing of vertically (against the contour) 300m apart and slope gradient of 1 – 1.5 %, interspaced by the many of the level bunds. The construction is done in an inverted trapezoid form, having a bottom width of 30cm, top width of the cutoff drain 50cm and depth of 50cm. Length of the cutoff drain before it gets into the water way that drains into ground recharge facility will be 200 meter maximum. On the other hand, the water ways are constructed to discharge the water coming from the cut off drain. The construction is done in the same way as for the cut off drain; however the construction will follow 15% from the contour line.

5. Reforestation

Reforestation will be done in existing woodlots and in other marginal land in the Project catchment. The trees to be grown must respond to the site specific agro-ecological requirements and should offer high potential for income source. Therefore, the re-afforestation will not only contribute to the ecosystem conservation of the Project catchment but also to the income generation for the Project beneficiaries (high value timber species).

C. Component Activities that Involve Restrictions on crop Use

As mentioned in the section above, the implementation of some of the land husbandry measures may affect the Project beneficiaries’ on-farm resources or cause temporarily access limit to their land. It is in this regard that the Project design and implementation schedule especially for land husbandry works has been designed in such way that it minimizes the potential adverse impacts related to the implementation of land husbandry works. This includes the participatory planning with the project beneficiaries in order establish a suitable timeline for the land husbandry works which will reduce significant adverse impact to the Project beneficiaries/PAPs by implementing construction activities insofar as possible, during a seasonal period of low agricultural productivity.

Among the land husbandry technologies designed under LWH Project, the radical/bench terraces construction and soil bunds are the only activities which may cause potential restriction on crop use or temporarily limit access to land use. In fact, the construction of radical/bench terraces and soil bunds require a total disturbance of the agricultural land which may affect the crops which are on field during the construction period. Note that the disturbance especially affects the annual crops such as cassava, taro or banana whereas the seasonal crops are in most cases harvested before the construction period. On the other hand during the radical/bench terraces and soil bunds construction period, the land owners may temporarily have limited access to their land use (seeds, lime, manure etc) for the valorization of the constructed terraces. However, there is no resettlement of PAPs in this project activity, and no PAPs will suffer a permanent loss of crops.
D. Local Participation in Project Design

The participatory planning has shown to be as one of the success keys for any development project. Like in other development projects, the local participation in LWH project design was considered at two levels: the community as a whole, and those segments of the community who are most impacted by the project (through crop disturbance). This community participation in project design allows the gathering of all views and concerns of all Project beneficiaries as per their different social and economic categories and therefore harmonizes the project implementation approach with regard to the community requirements and feelings. This will lead not only to the success of the project but also to its sustainability through the strong ownership from the beneficiaries as built up during the participatory planning.

1. Community-wide Participation

As mentioned above, local community participation at every step of the Project (from design through implementation to monitoring) is a key to success for the project. Under LWH, this process was also strictly followed.

At the outset, the Project Implementation Team (PIT) under the LWH carried out an initial socio-economic baseline assessment in order to gather all information reflecting the socio-economic status of the people in Gatsibo-8 Project site.

The table below recapitulates the main socio-economic features of the community members in Gatsibo-8 site:

*Table 1: Socio-economic characteristic of the PAPs in Gatsibo-8 site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Gatsibo</th>
<th>Hanika</th>
<th>Kabuga</th>
<th>Kararitse</th>
<th>Kavumu</th>
<th>KararitseB</th>
<th>Mugera</th>
<th>Nyakagar ama</th>
<th>Nyarukonj</th>
<th>Rwimbog o</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relation to Head of Household (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men as household head</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sex (%)                         |         |        |        |            |        |            |        |               |            |          |       |
| Male                             | 100.0   | 66.7   | 16.7   | 50.0       | 48.1   | 40.0       | 83.3   | 51.1          | 49.5       | 46.2      | 48.5  |
| Female                           | 0.0     | 33.3   | 83.3   | 50.0       | 51.9   | 60.0       | 16.0   | 48.9          | 50.5       | 53.8      | 51.5  |
| Not specified                    | 0.0     | 0.0    | 0.0    | 0.0        | 0.0    | 0.0        | 0.0    | 0.0           | 0.0        | 0.0       | 0.0   |
| Total                            | 100.0   | 100.0  | 100.0  | 100.0       | 100.0  | 100.0       | 100.0  | 100.0         | 100.0       | 100.0     | 100.0 |
The figures reported in the table above show that the major proportion of the PAPs household members in Gatsibo site is composed by children (59.1%) while the relatives represent 7.3%. Female represent 51.5% while male are 48.5%. Within Gatsibo community, only a portion of 45.3 % is in the age category able to work (18-55 years) while 46.7% of the PAPs are under 17 years old. This numbers show that the proport  
ion of people able to work in Gatsibo site is almost equal to those who are in charge to their respective family which need a particular attention while developing the income restoration measure. Concerning the education level, majority has not completed the primary education (38.5%).
During the field survey, farming activities were also reported as the main source of income for the PAPs in Gatsibo site. In fact, 90.5% of the PAPs confirmed that on farm activities constitute their main sources of income while 4.5% are salaried workers. Only 3.9% reported that they get income from off-farm casual labor. As secondary occupation, farming activities also occupies a major place (63.8%) as source of income for the PAPs in Gatsibo-8 site. The table 2 below contains the major source of income as reported by the PAPs in Gatsibo-8 site.

Table 2: Source of income for the PAPs in Gatsibo-8 site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Gatsibo</th>
<th>Hanika</th>
<th>Kabuga</th>
<th>Karitse</th>
<th>Kavumu</th>
<th>KavumuB</th>
<th>Mugera</th>
<th>Nyakagarama</th>
<th>Nyarukoni</th>
<th>Rwinbogo</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of income: Main Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried worker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual labor on farm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual labor off farm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Source of income: Secondary Occupation** |         |        |        |         |        |         |        |             |           |          |       |
| Farming       | 0       | 0      | 0      | 0       | 64.2   | 100     | 100    | 82.5        | 21.1       | 75.8     | 63.8  |
| Salaried worker| 0       | 0      | 0      | 0       | 10.4   | 0       | 0      | 0           | 0         | 9.1      | 5.7   |
| Casual labor on farm | 0     | 0      | 0      | 0       | 13.2   | 0       | 0      | 3.2         | 15.8       | 3        | 9.3   |
| Casual labor off farm | 0      | 0     | 100    | 0       | 12.3   | 0       | 0      | 14.3        | 63.2       | 12.1     | 21.1  |
| Not specified  | 0       | 0      | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0           | 0         | 0        | 0     |
| **Total**     | 0       | 0      | 100    | 0       | 100    | 100     | 100    | 100         | 100        | 100      | 100   |

In collaboration with the Project beneficiaries and local leaders, an implementation committee (site committee) was put in place in all the Project sites. This site committee is composed of all representatives of different socio-economic categories of the Project beneficiaries including the direct affected communities, the vulnerable groups, women, youth, farmers’ organization and community leaders. The main responsibility of this site committee is to provide advocacy for the Project beneficiaries and act as the Project community level implementation team which has decision making ability with regard to the on-site project implementation activities. This implementation team participates also in the continuous mobilization of the project beneficiaries for their full participation in the project implementation and monitoring.

Decision-making by the Site Committees is either by consensus or by representative voting. While preparing the Project activities implementation, multiple community consultation meetings were done to ensure that all people in the community have the opportunity to learn about and understand the particular issues under consideration, and to voice their views on the matters. This community meeting was done for every step of the Project right from project design and will continue through project implementation and monitoring.
2. Directly Impacted People's Participation and Ensuring Adequate Representation in Site Committees

Within the context of local community decision-making, it is imperative that the voice of the most directly affected and the most disadvantaged groups in the community be heard in the site committees. It is in this regard that among the project site committees, there are representatives of the most directly affected people; representative of Vulnerable groups (old people, orphans, widow/widower, disabled etc.), representatives of Women and Youth.

While community-wide consultation and participation are generally important, it is critical to ensure the participation of specific segments of the local community groups (e.g., widows, orphans, the disabled) who may be disadvantaged for any number of reasons. Special outreach efforts are commonly needed to ensure that their voices are heard in community councils and in decision-making process. This was ensured in the held consultation meetings in each Project site where all relevant resource user groups in local community were consulted before any meeting, and each group was accorded the opportunity to present its views during council or community meetings.

III. NATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The Rwandese organic law determining the use and management of land stipulates in its 62nd article that any person who owns a land must use it in a productive way and in accordance with its nature and intended purpose. The law also recognizes the private ownership of the land except the marshlands which are owned by the Government. In order to confirm this private ownership, the Government has started to register all lands and provide title to the owners. It is in this regard that the Project is in collaboration with the National Land Centre which is in charge of land registration in order to ensure that all Project beneficiaries are provided with title for their lands. In this frame all lands in Karongi-13 and Nyanza-23 sites have been registered and the process with other sites is in good progress.

While being provided with title, land owners are requested to use their lands in a productive way. This means that they must protect it from erosion, safeguard its fertility and ensure its production in a sustainable way. Thus, land husbandry activities to protect the land against erosion are the responsibility of every Rwandan who owns a land. However, regarding the relevance of land husbandry activities with regard to its contribution to sustainable land use management; considering the technical and financial requirement for some land husbandry activities (radical terraces) the Government provides both technical and financial support to the farmers for the sustainable land husbandry management. In addition to the financial and technical support, the Government also provides to the farmers with some agricultural input such as fertilizer and improved seeds. However, the implementation of different land husbandry works may lead to the disturbance or temporal access limit of the farmers from their land. That is why the implementation is done in full collaboration with the beneficiaries in order to maximize their contribution and minimize potential related adverse impacts.

A. National Administrative and legal Context

1. Roles of the LWH project

The Land Husbandry, Water harvesting and Hillside irrigation project will play a coordination role in the planning and monitoring for the preparation of this PF. The consultation meeting and mobilization
was done in collaboration with the PAPs and local authorities in order to minimize the project activities related adverse impacts. For the inventory of crops to be affected, the PAPs have been informed in advance and explained their contribution during this process. The transparent and fair census was one of the concerns of the project during this process. In addition to this, the project will coordinate all activities related to the implementation of this PF always in collaboration with all stakeholders (PAPs, district and local authorities).

2. Role of the district authority

The District authorities play an important role during inventory and valuation of crops to be affected by land husbandry activities in the project site. Physical measurements of area covered by the crops were done by technicians of the project together with the site committee in the presence of the PAPs. The district also facilitated in mobilizing the PAPs to open account in Umurenge SACCO trough which payment for affected crops will be made, (in case in which the compensation under the cash for work program does not equal to the lost revenue from affected crops, requiring a supplementary payment as disturbance allowance).

3. Roles of the PAPs

The project Affected Persons (PAPs) play a potential role in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of this PF. In fact, the PAPs fully participated in the screening of Project component which may have potential adverse impact on their resources and in collaboration with the local leader, the Project and the PAPs identified the suitable mitigation measures. With the direct support of the site committee, the PAPs participated in the inventory of potential crops which may be affected during the land husbandry works.

4. Role of the Saving and Credit Cooperative (Umurenge SACCO)

As explained in the previous chapter, the Umurenge SACCO is a local financing institution which has been recently introduced in the country. This financing institution will play a major role in the implementation of this PF. In fact, after the agreement with both district authority and the PAPs that the disturbance allowance will be paid through bank account, the Umurenge SACCO was in the right position to support in this matter. It is in this regard that the Umurenge SACCO has agreed to facilitate the PAPs to get bank account through which they will get their disturbance allowance. The Umurenge SACCO will also continue to support in process of the PAPs livelihoods improvement by facilitating the credit access for farmers income generating projects.

The table below recapitulates role and responsibilities of each stakeholder in the preparation and implementation of this PF.

**Table 3: Role and responsibility of each partner in the preparation of PF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Implementation Team (PIT) | ▪ Screening of sub-projects to identify the crop disturbance and income restoration requirements;  
   ▪ Work with targeted District to create crop disturbance Committee; |
| **District authorities** | - Organize consultation meetings for the identification of crops disturbance mitigation measures;  
- Provision of capacity building and technical support relating the identification of crops disturbance mitigation measures  
| **District authorities** | - Mobilization and sensitization of the project beneficiaries for the project activities  
- Support to the inventory of potentially affected crops for the PAPs  
- Participation to the monitoring of PF implementation process  
| **Resettlement and Compensation Committee** | - Inventory and valuation of PAPs and their crops to be affected during the land husbandry works,  
- Participation to the grievance redress  
- Participation to the counseling process for the PAPs  
- Facilitate coordination of information collection activities (such as surveys, supervising documentation) for monitoring purposes, in accordance with procedures put in place by the District authorities.  
- Elect a representative of the Committee to act as Project Liaison Officer who has regular contact with PAPs and can lead consultation, public participation and grievance mechanisms.  
- Playing a role in ensuring effective grievance mechanisms are in place that meets legislative requirements (the Resettlement and Compensation Committees will be responsible for ensuring that these mechanisms meet the requirements of the RPF).  
| **Saving and Credit Cooperative (Umurenge SACCO)** | - Ensure that all PAPs get their compensation fees on time once transferred to their account  
- Facilitate the PAPs to get credit from the cooperative and help them to make it profitable.  

IV. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

The eligibility criteria for the people concerned by this PF come from the following elements: (i) geographical coverage of the targeted area for the land husbandry work in the project site and (ii) the potential physical existence of crops in the land husbandry targeted area during the land husbandry works period. All people that fulfilled the above two elements were considered as eligible PAPs and the cut-off date in all the project sites for PF was 21st July 2010 and we have tried to make sure that all PAPs are done and informed of the cut-off date.

Note that most of lands in the project site are being exploited by their owners as self employed. However, some potential casual farm laborers who may be on the site will also benefit from the cash for work program under the project.

A. IDENTIFICATION OF THE COMMUNITIES THAT WILL COLLABORATE IN THE PROGRAM

To identify the eligible persons, the process started by the different consultation meetings in each Project site in collaboration with the local authorities from district level to the village level together with the site committee, the mentioned eligibility criteria were agreed upon by all stakeholders. This process created accountability and transparency of this program within the communities and strengthened the participation and ownership of the Project beneficiaries in the design and development of all interventions related to the development of land husbandry technologies in the Project targeted areas.

B. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MEASURES IN THE PROJECT TARGETED SITES

The development of this Process framework by screening out the whole process by which the potential affected persons by land husbandry works through crops disturbance are identified and the mitigation measures for income restoration were identified in participatory manner coupled to other existing national community development measures in order to build up its synergy and so that it contributes to the common goal of improving the livelihoods of the rural communities. In collaboration with the local authorities, the project identified the existing community development measures in the Project targeted sites and evaluated its potential contribution to the support of the PAPs with regard to the Project implementation approach. The paragraph below recapitulates the identified community development measures in the project targeted sites and its potential contribution to the PAPs

1. Vision 2020 Umurenge Program (VUP)

This program is designed and developed under the Ministry of Local Government in order to speed up the achievement of the wide national Vision 2020 targets. The implementation of this Program is based on the baseline socio-economic data which have been previously collected from all sectors (Imirenge) of the country and therefore rank them from the poorest in each district. According to these socio-economic data, the interventions designed under this Program should start by the poorest Sector in each District. The development interventions designed under this Program are grouped into three components: (i) the community development public works in which the ranked poor people in the targeted sector who are physically fit for work are given job in different community development
works such as terracing and reforestation works, rural road construction etc. The aim of this component is to improve the cash stock within the rural communities so as to increase the purchasing capacity of the community member to meet and accede the daily needs of their families. (ii) The financial support to the rural communities to strengthen the entrepreneurial spirit. This component encourages the poor rural communities to invest themselves in entrepreneurial activities and the capacity building for developing the income generating small projects is offered to them and the financial support is provided for implementation. (iii) The direct support to the most vulnerable groups. This component targets the most vulnerable groups as identified in the community. This group is composed in most cases by old people who do not have relatives to take care of them, the disabled people and the young orphans who are not able for the community development works. This group is directly supported by the Program by a monthly financial support to meet their basic daily needs. So it the responsibility of the LWH Project management to collaborate with the VUP Program management to make sure that the identified vulnerable PAPs are considered among others within this VUP and benefit from this monthly financial assistance.

2. One cow per poor family Program

The soil fertility degradation was identified as the major cause of food insecurity within Rwandese rural families. The one cow per poor family was designed under the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources in order to empower the poor rural families in the struggle for soil fertility replenishment. In addition to soil fertility management by the organic manure from the cow, the program also contributes to the nutritious status improvement of the rural families and generating potential source of income for the communities. The identified poorest families within the community by the members of the entire community are given cow which will help them to get manure for soil fertility replenishment and milk to improve their food diet. The program is designed in such way that the first calf from the given cow is given to another family till all concerned families are served. This program matches with LWH interventions as far as the fodder production is concerned and the fodder bank is one of the eligibility criteria for the one cow per one poor family program. It is in this regard that the identified poor families in LWH targetted sites will be the first to be served by one cow per one family program given the fact that they, as a result of the project, will have enough fodder to feed the given cows.

3. UBUDEHE Program

Ubudehe program is a national community development Program which is developed under the Ministry of Local Government and implemented at village level in the whole country. The primary objective of the Ubudehe program is to reduce poverty with a particular emphasis on poor and most vulnerable households in rural areas. It aims at enabling local people to create social capital and solve their problems through collective action.

The program works through two kinds of projects, the umudugudu (Village) projects targeting entire communities and individual projects aimed at specific vulnerable household. The projects include agriculture, construction of markets, electrification, livestock, desks for schools and water conveyances.

Like other local community development programs, Ubudehe program will also contribute to the income restoration for the potentials vulnerable groups in LWH sites. For this purpose, consultation meetings were held with the Ubudehe program management in each Project site in order to discuss about the income restoration for the most vulnerable groups which will not be able to benefit from the cash for work program. In this line both parties agreed on the relevancy of these particular groups.
and put in place a mechanism for the monitoring of the income restoration support for the vulnerable groups in Gatsibo-8 site.

Apart from these specific communities’ development programs which will contribute to the income restoration for the potentials PAPs in Gatsibo-8 site, the existing social support program at Sector level will also support in livelihoods restoration for the PAPs especially the most vulnerable groups. For this purpose discussion about the issue was held with Gatsibo sector authorities and recognized the support needed for the most vulnerable groups in LWH targeted site and agreed that they will benefit from the support which is commonly offered to the vulnerable groups which includes the supporting fees, the payment of medical insurance etc.

4. Umurenge SACCO PROGRAM

The Umurenge SACCO program is a recent financial support program developed at community level in order to support the rural communities in the financial matters. The main objective of this program is to develop a saving culture within the rural communities and strengthen the entrepreneurship within the communities. Through this program, the capacity building is provided to the community members for the design of small bankable project and small credit are given to the communities for the developed Project. Now the Umurenge SACCO Program is convinced that LWH targeted communities are privileged because they will get all required basic material to develop bankable agricultural project to be financed by the program (Well treated land by land husbandry measures and ready to give good yields) Also it is the role of the project to collaborate with the SACCO management so the project affected persons are considered among priority people to be given credits.

C. IDENTIFICATION OF ADVERSE IMPACT RELATED TO LAND HUSBANDRY WORKS

The land husbandry works related impacts identification is one of the key activities under this PF. In order to ensure that the identified impacts reflect the views and concerns of the targeted communities, the participation of the communities was highly required. For this purpose, the Project in collaboration with local authorities and the targeted communities initiated a process to identify the potential adverse impact related to the implementation of land husbandry works and three approaches were used at this end:

1. Community meetings

Different consultation meetings with the targeted communities were held in all project sites. The main objective of these meetings was to gather all potential adverse impacts related to the land husbandry works from the communities. During these meetings, all specific segments of community groups including the likely most affected groups were able to voice out the probable adverse impacts related to Land husbandry works and the following were raised by the community:

- Crop disturbance
- Delay of payment once they participate in terrace construction works
- Lack of seeds

2. Group discussion

The group discussion is also another approach used by the project in order to get the potential adverse impacts related to the land husbandry works implementation from the community. This was done by the project rural sociologist by conducting different group discussions with small group of people (15) in each project site discussing among themselves about the probable adverse impacts related to the land husbandry works. During these group discussions, the same concerns were revealed by the community members with slight difference where some of the community members were reporting the lack of required skills for the management of the terraces to be constructed.

3. Use of questionnaires through socio-economic survey

Identification of potential adverse impacts related to the land husbandry implementation works was also done through an individual interview with the PAPs by a pre-designed questionnaire. The project staff (rural sociologist) with the support of enumerators were tasked to carry out a confidential socio-economic interview in each project site and the expected potential adverse impacts related to the land husbandry works implementation was one of the key questions to be answered by the PAPs during this interview and the results from this interview show that the mentioned potential adverse impacts related to the land husbandry works implementation are the same as those reported during the community meetings. The crop disturbance was reported by 95.9% of the PAPs as the main adverse impact related to the land husbandry works while the loss of the season was reported by 1.4% only. 1.8% of the PAPs revealed that there are no adverse impacts related to the land husbandry works. Note that this interview was confidential and the PAPs were notified about this before the process. The table below summarizes the potential adverse impact related to land husbandry works implementation as reported by the community members Gatsibo-8 site during the interview. Table below indicates the potential adverse impacts as reported by the PAPs in Gatsibo-8 site.

Table 4: Potential adverse impacts related to land husbandry works in Gatsibo-8 site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Gatsibo</th>
<th>Hanika</th>
<th>Kabugia</th>
<th>Kararitse</th>
<th>Kavumu</th>
<th>KavumuB</th>
<th>Mugera</th>
<th>Nyakaragama</th>
<th>Nyarugonjera</th>
<th>Rwimbogo</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crops disturbance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season loss</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of pasture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely payment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of seeds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. IDENTIFICATION OF MITIGATORY MEASURES OF ADVERSE IMPACTS AND ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

After gathering all potential adverse impacts related to the implementation of land husbandry works, in collaboration with the PAPs, different mitigation measures for the mentioned adverse impacts were identified. The job opportunities during the land husbandry works, the timely payment of the engaged people in land husbandry works were the most reported compensatory measures by the community members at a rate of 72.5% and 25.8% respectively. A small number (9.7%) of the community
member suggested the supply of food during the land husbandry works period as suitable compensatory measure to them. The eligibility of the different reported mitigation measures was dictated by its prevalence during the interview. In order to harmonize this, consultation with the PAPs suggested the cash for work as suitable mitigation measure for crop disturbance and the project was committed to timely pay the people who will be engaged in different land husbandry works. The reported mitigation measures for land husbandry works related impact are presented in the table below.

Table 5: Mitigation measures for adverse impacts related to the land husbandry works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Gatsibo</th>
<th>Hanika</th>
<th>Kabuga</th>
<th>Karatise</th>
<th>Kawumu</th>
<th>KawumuB</th>
<th>Mugera</th>
<th>Nyagarama</th>
<th>Nyarukon</th>
<th>Rwimbog</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash for work</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely payment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. INCOME RESTORATION MEASURES

The outcome from this PF is the acceptable income restoration measures for the adverse impacts inherited from the land husbandry works implementation. These income restoration measures are identified in full participation with the PAPs in order to make sure that it is acceptable to them. As mentioned in the paragraph above, the cash for work was reported by the most PAPs as the suitable income restoration measures. However, some segment of the community groups may miss out from this mitigation measure. Those include the young orphans who are not able to work, the disabled people and the old people etc. This category will be integrated in existing community development programs especially Ubudehe Program, VUP and one cow per poor family program.

A. CASH FOR WORK PROGRAM

As mentioned in the point II regarding the national legal framework for land husbandry works, it is in the responsibility of every Rwandan who owns a land to manage it in sustainable manner by protecting it from soil erosion. While implementing the land husbandry works under LWH project initiatives, the land owners will be given payable jobs even if they will be working on their own land. Through a consultation meeting, the job opportunity through cash for work was agreed on between LWH Project and the PAPs in presence of local authorities and the site committees in the meeting that was held on 23rd July 2010 as the suitable income restoration for the crops disturbance impact related to the land husbandry works. Therefore, all PAPs who are able to work will be given a job in land husbandry works as compensatory measures for the crop disturbance during the land husbandry works. In case the cash for work does not compensate the total crops disturbance, the balance will be paid as disturbance allowance to the PAPs. The following table shows the ability of the PAPs to work in land husbandry activities in Gatsibo-8 site.

Table 6: Ability of the PAPs to work in land husbandry activities
### Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Gatsibo</th>
<th>Hanika</th>
<th>Kabuga</th>
<th>Kararite</th>
<th>Kavumu</th>
<th>KavumuB</th>
<th>Mugera</th>
<th>Nyakagarama</th>
<th>Nyanjovu</th>
<th>Rwinbog</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ability to work on land terracing as employee (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Duration of work in land terracing (%)

From the table above, it is clear that the majority of the PAPs in Gatsibo site are willing to be employed in cash for work during the land husbandry activities. A portion representing 12.7% of the PAPs revealed that they are not able to work in land husbandry activities and the reason reported was due to the fact that they are working as casual in other projects (RSSP).

### B. INCOME RESTORATION MEASURES FOR THE VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES

The income restoration for the vulnerable groups will be done in collaboration with existing community development programs such as VUP, Ubudehe program and one cow per poor family program. For this purpose, the project consulted the management authority of these community development programs in Gatsibo-8 site in order to make sure that all vulnerable group members who cannot benefit from the cash for work are integrated in VUP program. For this purpose a closer collaboration and monitoring mechanism will be developed between both parties in order to ensure that the income restoration of the vulnerable groups in Gatsibo-8 site is met.

The socio-economic survey results show that one person or 0.5% of the PAPs are old people (over 70 years old), 2 persons are disabled or 1% while 2% are orphans. Consultation meetings with existing community development programs in Gatsibo-8 site come up with agreement that this group will benefit from the livelihoods improvement facilities offered by these programs and a closer monitoring for implementation will be done by all stakeholders.

### VI. GRIEVANCE RESOLUTION MECHANISMS

The targeted district is an acknowledged institution for which the PAPs have been made aware of as avenues for expressing their discontent and disapproval to the income restoration process.

To ensure that the affected parties are fully aware and to reduce possible backlog of complaints, it was noted in advance that most members of the rural communities take time to decide to complain within 30 day period required to file their complaints. As per international standards, grievances logged outside this timeframe may still be valid and legitimate. Customarily, the government local authorities ensure that all affected people are fully informed, and will issue warnings about the consequences of failure to lodge their complaints in time. Within this customary procedure, affected people were informed of the procedures before the crop disturbance by land husbandry works start.

Grievances resolution are encouraged to be resolved at Cell level, as they are aware of and involved in the whole process. If the grievance is not resolved in this way, local courts (ABUNZI) should be used. If not resolved then the high court or court of appeal of Rwanda remains an avenue for voicing and resolving these complaints.
VII. MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PF IMPLEMENTATION

For the successful implementation of this PF, a participatory monitoring will be carried out by all stakeholders. The monitoring for the PF development and implementation will be carried out during the whole period from the first consultation meeting to the final payment of the crop disturbance allowance step to the PAPs. Further monitoring will also continue during the project lifetime in order to guide the implementation process towards the project objective. This monitoring process is to ensure that the objectives of the PF are successfully achieved; in case of some eventual gaps, corrective measures are taken at the right moment.

For the successful implementation of this PF, a participatory monitoring will be carried out by all stakeholders. The PAPs will play a major role in order to make sure that all developed income restoration measures are effectively implemented.

A. BASELINE INFORMATION

For the monitoring of this PF, some baseline information will be gathered in order to develop the key performance indicators upon which the monitoring will focus. This information include the total PAPs concerned by this PF, the different categories and total number of the most likely vulnerable persons affected by the project land husbandry works, the contribution of other community development programs to the income restoration of the PAPs. This information will guide the monitoring process by focusing on the right indicators for the measurement of the PF implementation.

B. ENVIRONMENT CONDITIONS

The information about the environment conditions in the project site will also help in the implementation of this PF. As the land husbandry work may disturb not only on field crops but also other in situ environment component especially the soil, the extent to which the land husbandry works are implemented with regard to the previous situation will also be monitored in order to make sure that no PAP is forgotten while implementing the income restoration measures.

C. LIVELIHOODS RESTORATION

The livelihoods restoration of the PAPs at least at the same level as it was before the project activities is one of the major concerns of the project. Therefore, the monitoring of implementation of the developed income restoration measures is very crucial in order to make sure that the overall objective of this PF is achieved.

1. Baseline indicator to be monitored during the PF implementation

During the monitoring process of this PF, some key baseline indicators will be focused on and the following are among others

- The number of grievances and time and quality of resolution
- Agricultural productivity of newly treated lands;
- Seasonal or inter-annual fluctuation on key foodstuffs
- The percentage area covered by the land husbandry works
- Livelihood improvement status

In order to monitor these indicators, the following activities will be undertaken
- Periodic data collection on income restoration measures and livelihood improvement

- Each PAP will have an income restoration record book recording his or her initial situation, all subsequent project use of crops/improvements, and income restoration measure agreed upon and received;

- The District authorities will maintain a complete database on every PAP and the PIT will prepare an income restoration completion Reports for this PF, in addition to other regular monitoring reports.

The table below summarizes the rights and responsibilities of each stakeholder in carrying out this monitoring:

Table 7: Monitoring timeframe of the preparation and implementation of the PF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Responsible institutions</th>
<th>Frequency of monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Consultation with the Project beneficiaries including PAPs | - Consultation meeting with the PAPs on Gatsibo-8 site to discuss with them about the planned activities and potential related adverse impacts  
- Explanation and discussion with the PAPs about the cash for work program as income restoration measure  
- The necessity of PF and the contribution of each party on the preparation and implementation of the PF | - Gatsibo District  
- LWH Project  
- Gatsibo sectors  
- Concerned cells and villages | From July, 2010 |

Baseline data collection | Gathering the baseline information about the socio-economic status of the PAPs, inventory of all crops which will be disturbed during the land husbandry works | -Gatsibo Districts  
-Site committee  
-LWH Project  
-PAPs | 11th July to 22nd July, 2010 |
---|---|---|---|
Income restoration for the PAPs | • Payment of the cash for work  
• Disturbance allowance payment when necessary | -LWH Project  
-Umurenge SACCO | From September, 2010 to June, 2011 |
---|---|---|---|
Monitoring and evaluation | • Follow up of the implementation of PF | -Gatsibo District  
-LWH Project  
-PAPs  
-Site committee | From June, 2010 to July, 2011 |

2. Communication of the monitoring findings

In order to ensure the transparency and participation of each concerned party, the monitoring findings will be communicated to all stakeholders. It is in this regard that the quarterly monitoring report about the implementation of this PF will be done by the project whose copies will be submitted to the local authorities (district and sector) and the communities. This will be done after translation of the produced report in the local language (Kinyarwanda) in order to facilitate the PAPs to benefit from the information given in the monitoring report.

VIII. PROJECT BUDGET AND TIME LINE

The costs related to the implementation of this Process Framework are those which will be allocated to the logistic issues related to consultation meetings with the PAPs, baseline data collection in the Project site, livelihoods restoration for the PAPs and the monitoring process. This fund will come from the Government funds which will be channeled and managed by the Project. In addition to this fund, other funds and/or services for the PAPs income restoration, especially for the identified most vulnerable groups will come from other national development programs as described in the previous sections. These programs include UBUDEHE Program, Vision 2020 Umurenge Program and One cow per one family program.

In order to ensure that all commitments from these programs are met and the PAPs income are restored at acceptable level, Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs) are being developed between the Project and the targeted development programs in order to clarify the role and responsibilities of each and one within this process for PAPs income restoration. These MoUs will also highlight the monitoring process in order to ensure that all commitments are met as per the MoUs statement. The table below summarizes the estimated budget for the implementation of this Process framework.
Table 8: Estimated budget for the implementation of Process Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Estimated cost (Rwf)</th>
<th>Sources of funding</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with the Project beneficiaries including PAPs</td>
<td>Consultation meeting with the PAPs to inform them on scheduled activities and their roles to accomplish the PF</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>Government fund to be channeled and managed by the Project</td>
<td>June-July, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline data collection</td>
<td>Documentation of potential crop disturbance during land husbandry works</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>Government fund to be channeled and managed by the Project</td>
<td>July, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income restoration for the PAPs</td>
<td>Payment of cash for work to the PAPs and disturbance allowance</td>
<td>5,754,240</td>
<td>Government fund to be channeled and managed by the Project</td>
<td>September 2010-July, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Continuous scrutiny of the implementation of the income restoration measures</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>Government fund to be channeled and managed by the Project</td>
<td>June 2010-July, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11,454,240</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex

### Annex 1: Crop disturbance Estimate in Gatsibo-8 site

### Annex 2: Site committee members in Gatsibo-8 site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
<th>CELL/VILLAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NSENGIYUMVA Bonaventure</td>
<td>Representative of farmers’ organization</td>
<td>0783342806</td>
<td>Mugera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MUCYOWERA Fiacre</td>
<td>Village leader of Kavumu</td>
<td>0782233221</td>
<td>Mugera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NYINAWABAHIZI Cecile</td>
<td>Representative of Gatsibo cell leader</td>
<td>0783212589</td>
<td>Gatsibo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BAMPORINEZA David</td>
<td>Village leader of KAYISHA</td>
<td>0783446337</td>
<td>Mugera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MUYOMBANO Evariste</td>
<td>Village leader of NYAKAGARAMA</td>
<td>0783476693</td>
<td>Gatsibo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NTAMBARA Silvestre</td>
<td>Vulnerable representative of MUGERA Cell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NIYITEGEKA J’Darc</td>
<td>Representative of Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MUKAYUHI Erussa</td>
<td>representative of Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MUKANTAYOMBA Immaculate</td>
<td>Vulnerable representatives in GATSIBO Cell</td>
<td>0782767854</td>
<td>Gatsibo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SEBAHUTU Augustin</td>
<td>Village leader of NYARUKONI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MUNEZERO Eugene</td>
<td>Village leader of KIRARITSI</td>
<td>0783895438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NYAGAHIGI Apollinaire</td>
<td>Farmers representative and president of Site committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MUNTAROBIBI J.Claude</td>
<td>Village leader of RWIMBOGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>GATEMBEYI Samuel</td>
<td>Cell leader of MUGERA</td>
<td>0783028365</td>
<td>Mugera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>KARERA Francois</td>
<td>Sector Agronomist Gatsibo</td>
<td>0788579398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>BUTERA J.Claude</td>
<td>District Agronomist</td>
<td>0788507206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Map of the catchment in Gatsibo-8 site