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Abstract

The aim of this study is to analyze the role played by Civil Society Organizations (CSO) in public policy (PP) process in Rwanda, a case of Rwanda Civil Society Platform. Specifically, the study aims: (i) to explore the activities carried out by CS with regard to the agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; (ii) analyze strengths and weaknesses of Rwanda civil society organizations in public policy formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; (iii) assess the challenges that Rwanda civil society organizations face when they seek to influence public policies; identify civil society organizations opportunities with regard to public policy processes and how they are utilized.

The study is both qualitative and quantitative and relied on two sources of information: primary and secondary data whereby primary data were collected through questionnaires and qualitative in-depth interviews, while secondary data were collected through desk review.

The study revealed that the level of participation of CSOs in public policy process is only highest when it comes to the implementation of public policies as confirmed by 43.3% of respondents. However, the involvement of CSOs in policy agenda setting becomes lower as affirmed by only 15.0% of respondents. This does not augur well for CSOs which are expected to influence public policy process and bring a change in government’s performance. 62% of respondents affirmed that CSOs don’t carry out research on public policy that interest their beneficiaries, members and constituents. The collaboration of CSOs with leaders is highest at District level (33.3%) while CSOs collaboration at ministry and parliament levels is very low as only affirmed by 5.1% of respondents which implies that CSOs are decreasingly involved in policy formulation and adoption from lower to higher government institutions. These statistics indicate that CSOs perform better in pointing out government’s shortcomings but their involvement in decision making is very limited.

There exist various challenges that become a hindrance to an efficient and effective participation of CSOs in public policy process. These include but are not limited to the low level of understanding by CSO of their role in public policy process, reluctance to confront the government for fear of spoiling their relations with the government, total donor dependency, limited human and material resources, etc. Even so, there are many opportunities that CSOs can be seized to overcome existing challenges and improve performance as well as participation level in public policy process. Existence of political will to involve CSOs in Public policy process, the existence of legal framework and formal structures, open for CSOs, such as JADF, open day within various public institutions, Sector Working Groups, thematic commissions at parliament level, several networks and coalitions at national, regional and international levels to which CSOs are members, availability of donors and development partners which can financially support CSOs in their programs with regard to the agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Key concepts: Civil society, public policy, advocacy, public policy advocacy
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Chapter I: General introduction

This study focuses on the role of civil society organizations in peace process in Rwanda. The study begins with the context, which leads to the problem and rationale. The study discusses the methodology used in data collection and analysis and provides the conceptual and theoretical framework against which empirical findings are discussed.

1.1. Background of the study

Participation of citizens in political decision making is a core concept of functioning democracies. Civil society has therefore tremendously important roles to play within democracies. This is equally reflected in the international cooperation discourse. Since at least the early 1990s it has become clear that a functioning participatory democracy is a prerequisite for sustainable development. As stated by Paffenholz & Spurk (Paffenholz & Spurk, 2006:7), vibrant civil society is considered as precondition to go beyond ‘formal’ democracies, to achieve long lasting attitude changes and to overcome resistance by former, undemocratic leaders and elites. An active civil society and civic engagement are widely accepted as critical to boost the accountability of governments toward their citizens, to strengthen public policy decisions and to increase the effectiveness of development interventions.

Rwanda as any other country develops and implements various policies. The years following the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi have seen several policies introduced. Most of those policies have been guided or heavily influenced by the ultimate objective of ensuring the unity of Rwandans undermined by the genocide; and the reconciliation to get Rwanda rebuilt. Most of current policies find their guidance in the Rwandan vision 2020. The vision 2020 expresses the aim of attaining per capita income of a middle-income country in an equitable way, and the aspiration to become a modern, strong and united nation, without discrimination between its citizens (MINECOFIN, 2000).

Considering that the term civil society refers to the wide array of non-governmental and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious or philanthropic considerations, (UN, 2010) there could be linkages between democracy and
civil society, between public policy and the role of civil society in social change and sustainable development. More on that, there can’t be sustainable development without good policies and adequate strategies coupled with ownership and commitment of civil society in influencing the formulation and proper implementing of those policies.

Since at least the early 1990s it has become clear that a functioning participatory democracy is a prerequisite for civil society and sustainable development. As stated by Gopakumar K Thampi & Suresh Balakrishnan (Gopakumar K Thampi & Suresh Balakrishnan, 2002), civil society has a mandate of representing people, engage them in the entire process of public policies and influence positive changes. They highlight four specific areas where civil society institutions can make significant impacts: influencing public policy & decision making, enhancing state performance & accountability, enforcing social justice, rights and rule of law. Civil society institutions can make significant impact by influencing and engaging the state institutions and facilitate a forum to strengthen state legitimacy and relations of trust between public officials, and ordinary citizens. They also indicate what the state could do to facilitate stronger civil society involvement: Opening up of a sphere for autonomous activities, creating favorable institutional structures, evolving active state policies in support of civil society.

In Rwanda the Civil Society has been in existence from 1956 when its first segments were established in form of farmers associations who were answerable to the church. It grew to sizable proportions when several associations, Community Based Organizations (CSOs), Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), formed umbrellas that brought together NGOs and CSOs with common interest. This organizational set up left CSO deprived of the capacity to coordinate and engage with different partners. This gap made the CSO not only perceived as weak but also vulnerable.

In the period preceding the genocide of 1994 perpetrated against the Tutsi, there were a good number of civil society organizations. But, still, most of them were operating in rural development, economic transformation, while others were involved in women’s promotion and human rights protection. Very few of them were active in promoting citizen participation, making government accountable to the people or influencing public policies. The number of grassroots associations increased sharply during the 1970s, 1980s, and after 1994 thanks to initiatives and support provided by the state and donors. Rather than lobbying the government
to support local priorities and concerns, these associations generally were used to implement policies and agendas set by the state and donors (Uvin, 1999:155-163).

There was an increase of civil society organizations intervening in various domains including unity and reconciliation, good governance, as a result of the fact that it is the bad governance which led to genocide, etc. Given the increase number of Civil society organizations and their role in social and economic development, in 2002, the Government of Rwanda (GoR), developed a National program for strengthening good governance for poverty reduction in Rwanda, and one among its objectives was to “develop and strengthen the capacity of Civil society organizations including the media to enable them play their role in democratization, accountability, public information, education, mobilization and service delivery” (MINALOC, 2002:48). Through that program, the government of Rwanda had also committed to implement some activities leading to a well organized and committed civil society such as develop a centralized and integrated database containing comprehensive information on Rwandan CSOs including their current areas of activities, expertise and proven capabilities, engage consultation and dialogue to identify areas in the law on association for revision on the basis of mutual interest, establish Coordination forums with agreed mandates to bring together CSOs on a regular basis and to enable them participate more in drafting and debating public policies, encourage the reinforcement of capacity in CSOs, to organize, to be informed, and to participate in policies and laws relating to their mandates and activities, support local associations and encourage their efforts to mobilize local resources so as to reduce dependency on external financing to mention the few.

Later in 2004, motivated by a desire to combine their efforts to contribute to the integral development of the country and promotion of the rule of law, 8 umbrellas, CCOAIB, CESTRAR, CLADHO, IBUKA, the Union IMBARAGA, CEJP, THE PRESS HOUSE and PRO-FEMMES TWESEx HAMWE initiated the idea of setting up a platform that would enable them to achieve their mission, playing a role in public policy included. This was realized at the Constituent Assembly held on July 9, 2004 when civil society members came together and formed the Rwanda Civil Society Platform-RCSP that brings together all actors of the civil society. It was created as a framework for exchange and dialogue between member organizations and between the latter and their partners, government included. The Platform's mission is to “serve as a framework for dialogue, reflection on common issues, information exchange, mutual support and reinforcement and build a valid interlocutor to
various partners of the civil society”. To achieve this, one of the objectives is to analyze the context and challenges that the Rwanda population is facing with a view to adopt common position and strategy for specific actions (RCSP, 2011:11). Even though it is not clearly stated, it is understood in the mission of the RCSP, a mandate of contributing to public policy formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation to ensure human rights, social justice, democracy and sustainable development of all Rwandans.

Public policy process requires the involvement of various players such as political parties, bureaucracies, donors and international development partners, private sector, civil society that includes non-governmental organizations, interests groups, Medias and individual citizens among others. The ultimate goal of involving various players is to ensure that public policies are designed in a participatory way, if needs and concerns of citizens, especially those of poor and marginalized groups are taken into consideration, properly analyzed and addressed through policies (World Bank, 2008) Since many years ago, the civil society organizations have been among public policy players and have assigned more responsibilities and gaining greater visibility and power at both national and global levels about supporting government’s initiatives in different domains.

Uvin reports that by the beginning of the 1990s, Rwanda had one of Africa's highest densities of NGOs. There was approximately one farmers' organization per 35 households, one cooperative per 350 households, and one development NGO per 3,500 households (Trocacire, 1999). ICNL, reports that there were an estimated total of 37,000 informal groups, with about 319 registered as non public organizations NPOs Domestic with action plan presented to local authority and application to Ministry of Justice (ICNL, 2009).

Some are comprised of people who form “interest groups”, such as labor unions, human rights organizations, professional and scientific associations, philanthropic foundations, church groups. Others are involved in the delivery of human services such as education, health care, credit and economic support, and conflict resolution. Still others are focused on such issues as civil rights for women and minorities, other human rights, environmental protection, civic engagement, democratic governance, corruption and abuse of power. (UN, 2010:3).
1.2. Research problem and research questions

The relations between government and CSOs vary greatly depending on levels of democratization. Command regimes are generally suspicious of and show little tolerance for independent nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) seeking to play active into public policy and advocacy (ICNL & UNDP, 2009: 6). Nonetheless, there is not a consensus on the steps and specific role that civil society is expected to play in public policy processes. The legal framework through which CS operates is also not well defined and how government should be supportive. Bearing in mind that a state’s legal framework is one of many factors that affect how conducive the overall environment is towards civil society and its organizations, an enabling legal framework is certainly no guarantee of a vibrant civil society, and a disabling or restrictive legal framework is not necessarily an insurmountable barrier for civil society engagement and participation in public affairs. (ICNL & UNDP, 2009:10).

The ICNL &UNDP report that the success of democratic governance depends on the existence of both a robust state and a healthy and active civil society. Strong levels of civic engagement are an essential element of participatory governance which today increasingly focuses on creating inclusive and responsive democratic institutions and increasing opportunities for citizen voice. (ICNL & UNDP, 2009:5).

Getting policies right is of crucial importance. If economic and social structures are inequitable and if policies (either for preserving the status quo or reform) are inappropriate, then the mere expansion of funds and programs in any country would not be enough and may indeed increase the problems. This applies to structure and policies at both national and international levels” (Khor, 2003). In that move, to make public policy more successful and affective tool of social change and sustainable development, various actors have to intervene and play their roles. If they don’t properly intervene, there are risks of failures associated with the policy formulation, adoption, implementation and evaluation. It is at each of these stages that other stakeholders and partners beside the state may intervene. Among them, civil society organizations can play key role.

For Kasfir, CSOs may ideally be seen as ‘schools of democracy’, where the citizens learn democratic thinking and acting, tolerance of diversity and pluralism, mutual acceptance and willingness to compromise, as well as trust and cooperation. Secondly, advocacy
organizations can influence government officials to adopt positions supporting their members and follow formal rules that facilitate open, free and fair political debate and decisions. Thus, building organizations and groups that can act independently and are willing to confront the government, either to hold it to account or to influence a policy is instrumental in democratization processes. (Kasfir, 1998).

This statement, leads us to think about the raison d’être of civil society in Rwanda particularly the mandate of RSCP. Currently, civil society operates both at local and national levels. At local level CS features prominently in districts development activities in the form of Joint Action Development Forum (JADF). At national level and with respect to policy formulation and analysis, the government has constituted the Rwanda Economic and Social Development Council (RESC), comprising both public and private sectors and CSOs, with the object of critically analyzing policies before they can be passed by the cabinet. CSOs organizations were part of thematic clusters in charge of designing the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS I, 2007/8) and (EDPRS II, in 2012/13). CSOs should also influence policies through their active participation in thematic commissions at ministerial, parliaments and senate level.

Nevertheless, as reported by (Civivus, 2011:6) there are significant limits in the holding of state and corporations to account and Rwandan civil society plays a moderate role in public information activities and meeting societal needs. More particularly, RCSP was not enough active and effective to influence tangible changes in policy formulation, despite its objective of lobbying and advocating on national, regional and international issues on behalf of the RCSP members and citizens.

Despite the above discussions, it is still unknown how this role of influencing public policies been and should be properly played by CS in Rwanda. This research problem is formulated as follow: What is the role of CSOs with regard to public policy process in Rwanda? On basis of this central question, the study aims at exploring the following questions:

1. What are the activities carried out by civil society organizations with regard to agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?
2. **What are the strengths and weakness of civil society organizations in relation to agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?**

3. **What are the challenges and opportunities for civil society organizations in Rwanda with regard to agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation?**

### 1.3. Research objectives

In light to the background, the problem statement and the research questions, the main objective of this study is to analyze the role played by civil society organizations in public policy process in Rwanda. Specifically, the study focuses on the three following objectives:

1. To explore the activities carried out by CS with regard to the agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;

2. Analyze strengths and weaknesses of Rwanda civil society organizations in agenda setting, public policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;

3. Assess challenges that Rwanda CS face when they seek to influence public policies and identify opportunities with regard to public policy processes and how they are utilized;

### 1.4. Rationale and significance of the study

Rwanda is known as an emerging democratic country. Rwanda has also marked an improvement in creating conducive environment for private sector and civil society organizations, promotion good governance, good services delivery, citizen participation to mention few. Moreover, the constitution and other policies, like the new NGO law N°04/2012 of 17/02/2012 governing the organization and the functioning of national non-governmental organizations in Rwanda are considered to be in that move.

The CCOAIB states that Rwanda has created an environment and public spaces through which citizens can raise their concerns and influence decisions and policies that impact on their lives. Various organized forums and groups that could be categorized as civil society
have been organized. However, there is lack of knowledge about the role and impact of civil society towards public policy process. (CCOAIB, 2011:10). Empirical exploration in this regard is thus lacking and this is the shortcoming that this study endeavors to address.

In addition, other reasons prompted this study to be carried out need are forward. Firstly, the researcher wanted to illuminate and remind actors and activists of civil society in Rwanda about their mandate, which is to promote positive change and sustainable development through influencing public policies. Secondly, the researcher is a sociologist with a professional background in national and international organizations since 1994. Thirdly, he envisages developing and improving his career in civil society sphere where he wants to provide his humble contribution in empowering people and organizations, so that they become actors and catalysts of positive change, social transformation and sustainable development in Rwanda and abroad.

More importantly, the researcher believes that the findings of this study will generate more ideas and insights on the state of civil society organizations in Rwanda, their role in influencing public policies and new strategies to be adopted in order to become more effective in fulfilling their mission. The last reason that motivated this study was a requirement for every student from National University of Rwanda to submit a final dissertation for the fulfillment of Degree of the Masters level in arts and development studies.

In sum, while remaining sociologically rigorous, this research will bear in mind the information needs of leaders from civil society organizations, academicians, decision makers and program planners from public sphere, national and international civil society organizations who are seeking to improve the effectiveness and efficiency and social and economic impact of civil society work in Rwanda.

1.5. Scope and delimitation of the study

As defined in the previous pages, civil society is wide and embraces various domains of social and economical development at various levels. Roles, achievements, strengths, weaknesses, challenges and opportunities of civil society can be traced and assessed in different ways. This study only focuses on the role of national civil society organizations in public policy process in Rwanda by taking a specific case study of RCSP. Given the complexity of public policy management the study was focused on the role of civil society in
agenda setting, public policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The study seeks to know and understand how CS is engaged at each stage. Due to the fact that CS is complex and very large in scope, nature and number, the study targeted only civil society organizations with national scope which accepted to adhere directly in RCSP or through their umbrellas, other organizations outside the RCSP and its members were not concerned.

1.6. Ethical considerations

As asserted by Punch (Punch, 2000:3), “all social researches involve consent, access and associated ethical issues, since research is based on data from people about people”. Therefore, the researcher provided necessary information to participants.

Ethically, the researcher ensured that the questions were asked in a proper way, clear for all respondents and interviewees. He motivated them to make the required effort in providing appropriate answers. Furthermore, during the process of interviewing, the researcher’s conduct was friendly, courteous, conversational, cooperative and unbiased. This was important as it puts respondents at ease so that they talked freely, objectively and fully. Provision of the proper physical location during interviews was ensured and agreed appointments were properly respected. Confidentiality about participants’ information related to this study was clarified and communicated in advance and ensured.

1.7. Organization of the study

Apart from the introduction, conclusion and recommendations, this study is comprised of four chapters. The chapter I provides the background and problem statement, chapter two defines the theoretical framework with a focus on civil society and public policy and linkages among the two, chapter three indicates the methodology through which methods and tools of sampling, data collection and data analysis are described and the chapter four analyzes and interprets collected while the chapter V is a general conclusion. There are references at the end and appendix.
Chapter II: Conceptual and theoretical framework

This section focuses on theoretical framework. It enables readers to capture and get the meaning of the concept of civil society and public policy. The section discusses concepts and theories of authors and scholars on the subject under study. More importantly, it shows the relationships that exist between civil society organizations and public policies. At the end of this section the research conceptualizes the analysis of the role of civil society in the public policy process.

2.1. Understanding the concept of civil society

This section begins with the conceptual understanding of the concept of civil society and explores other literature in this regard.

2.1.1. Definitions on civil society

Recognizing that civil society should have a different meaning to different people at different times, it is very important for this sub-chapter to clarify the concept of civil society, its essence and expansion.

The World Bank has adopted the definition of civil society developed by a number of leading research centers, namely: “the wide array of non-governmental and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious or philanthropic considerations. Civil society organizations therefore refer to a wide array of organizations: community groups, NGOs, labor-unions, indigenous groups, charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, and foundations.” (World Bank, “Defining Civil Society.” 2013:32) However, this definition may exclude some formal, semi-informal or informal, registered or unregistered groups that were supposed to be part of the civil society.

The UNDP defines CSOs as “one of three spheres of interference in the making of democratic societies. Civil society is the sphere in which social movements become organized. The organizations of civil society, which represents many diverse and sometimes contradictory social interests, are shaped to fit their social base, constituency, thematic organizations (e.g. environment, gender, human rights) and types of activity.” (Rwanda civil Society Platform, 2010:1) This definition should include church related groups, trade unions,
cooperatives, service provider organizations (NGOs), community based organizations groups (CBOs), women and youth organizations as well as academic institutions. However, this definition should exclude some actors of civil society.

Another important definition is for academics who define CSOs as those informal, semiformal or formal organizational formations that protect, promote and facilitate principles and practices of democracy, participation, pluralism, rights, equity, justice and peace and among the people locally, nationally or internationally (Gedeon M. Mudacumura, Desta Mebratu, M. Shamshul, 2006). They argue that such CSOs play an ethical and political role within the society in attempt to humanize an increasingly dehumanized world. For academicians, these organizations also function outside the conventional spaces of state power and market forces, though they constantly negotiate, pressurize and persuade the institutions of the state as well as the market to be more responsible and responsive to the needs and rights of the people in general and the marginalized poor in particular. This definition raises an interest for our study because it introduces the role of civil society in persuading the state to be responsible and responsive to the needs and rights of citizens especially the poor and the marginalized.

The World Alliance for Citizen Participation CIVICUS through its project the Civil Society Index (CSI) has long used a working definition of civil society as being “the arena, outside of the family, the state, and the market, which is created by individual and collective actions, organizations and institutions to advance shared interests.” (CIVICUS, 2010:17)

A key principle to add to all definitions is that citizen action should be voluntary, rather than through compulsion. CSOs in all their forms – including nongovernmental organizations, community groups, faith-based organizations, trade unions, informal groups (those without constitutions, boards and other organizational trappings), and many other associational forms, are part of civil society. CIVICUS goes further by indicating that, beyond this, individual activists, including online activists, artists and writers and human rights defenders, when they act in the public sphere to advance or defend a viewpoint that others may share, are part of civil society too. The definition of CIVICUS suggests that the arena for civil society is fluid and dynamic: groups and individuals can move in and out of it, and be within civil society and other spheres simultaneously.
Another feature of CIVICUS definition is that concept of civil society being an arena. The term ‘arena’ is used to describe the particular space in a society where people come together to debate, discuss, associate and seek to influence broader society (CIVICUS, 2010:17). There is also the acknowledgement of the ‘fuzziness’ of the boundaries between the spheres of civil society, the state, the market and family, since, in practice, many forms of collective citizen action are difficult to categorize into a specific sphere. Here, the CSI emphasizes the key function, namely collective citizen action to advance common interests, over the specific organizational form, in which the action takes place (Heinrich, 2005; Uphoff & Krishna 2004).

Properly understood, this research considers civil society as a broader concept, encompassing all the organizations and associations that exist outside the family, state (including political parties) and the market.

Figure 1: Relationship State, Market and Civil Society

Source: Chart adapted from Thania Paffenholz & Christoph Spurk (2006:9)

Civil society is the sector of voluntary action within institutional forms that are distinct from those of the state, family and market, keeping in mind that in practice the boundaries between these sectors are often complex and blurred. It consists of a large and diverse set of voluntary organizations, often competing with each other and oriented to specific interests. It comprises non-state actors and associations that are not purely driven by private or economic interests, rather are autonomously organized and managed, and interact in the public sphere. A civil
society is independent from the state, but it is oriented toward and interacts closely with the state and the political sphere.

2.1.2. Evolution of the concept civil society

The civil society has been defined variously by different scholars but it is important to state that the concept of civil society has evolved over the years. From a historical perspective, the actual meaning of the concept of civil society has changed twice from its original classical form. The Wikipedia elucidates that the first change occurred after the French Revolution, the second during the fall of communism in Europe.

In the classical era, the concept of civil society was seen as synonymous with good society. Generally, civil society was referred to as a political association governing social conflict through the imposition of rules that restrain citizens from harming one another (Edward, 2004:6). In the modern era, G.W.F Hegel completely changed the meaning of civil society, giving rite to a modern liberal understanding of it as a form of market society as opposed to institutions of modern nation state. Hegel held that civil society had emerged at the particular period of capitalism and served its interest: Individual rights and private property (Dhanagare, 2001:169). Hence, he used the German term “burgerliche Gesellschaft” to denote civil society as “Civilian Society” – a sphere regulated by the civil code (Zaleski, 2008).

The second change in civil society conceptualization in what is referred to as the post-modern era. The post modern way of understanding civil society was first developed by the political opposition in the former Soviet block East European countries in the 1980s. From then, the term civil society replaced that of political society. However, in the 1990s with the emergence of the nongovernmental organization and the new social movements (NSMs) on a global scale, civil society as a third sector became a key terrain of strategic action to construct an alternative social and world order. Henceforth, postmodern usage of the idea of civil society became divided into two main as political society and as the third sector (www.wikipedia.org ). On this basis, the Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, puts that civil society is composed of the totality of voluntary social relationships, civic and social organizations and institutions that form the basis of a functioning society as distinct from the force backed structures of a state (regardless of that states political system) and the commercial institutions of the market.
Together, state, market and civil society constitute the entirety of a society and the relations between these components determine the character of a society and its structure. The London School of Economics, Centre for Civil Society postulates that civil society refers to the arena of uncoerced collective action around shared interests purposes and values. In theory, its institutional form is distinct from those of the state and market, though in practice, the boundaries between state, civil society and market are often complex, blurred and negotiated. Civil society commonly embraces a diversity of spaces, actors and institutional forms, varying in their degree of formality, autonomy and power. (www.wikipedia.org).

2.1.3. Role of civil society in development

Nongovernmental organizations do play important and growing roles in developed and developing countries. They shape policy by exerting pressure on governments and by furnishing technical expertise to policy makers. They foster citizen participation and civic education. They provide leadership training for women and young people who want to engage in civic life but are uninterested in working through political parties. (Thomas Carothers, 2000) from Civil Society think again.

In many countries, however, NGOs are outweighed by more traditional parts of civil society. Religious organizations, labor unions, and other groups often have a genuine base in the population and secure domestic sources of funding, features that advocacy groups usually lack, especially the scores of new NGOs in democratizing countries.

Moreover, civil society organizations (CSOs) are credited with having a role to play with regards to making research relevant, and with using it to contribute to changes in policy and practice in the developing world. For all actors in the field of development, there is a need to understand the strategies and the contributions of these institutions in order to strengthen, expand, and facilitate this type of work.

As stated by United Nations “an organized civil society is an imperative condition for and an expression of democracy. It is an intermediary between state and society and a key element in good governance. It is not an alternative to the state but it complements its activities. (UN, 2010:33)

By being engaged with government, business and international organizations, civil society actors can and should provide the resilient dynamism the world urgently needs. The power
and influence of civil society are growing and should be harnessed to create trust and enable action across sectors. The changes that civil society is undergoing strongly suggest that it should no longer be viewed as a “third sector”; rather, civil society should be the glue that binds public and private activity together in such a way as to strengthen the common good.

In playing this role, CIVICUS states that civil society actors need to ensure they retain their core missions, integrity, purposefulness and high levels of trust. The world will always need independent organizations and individuals to act as watchdogs, ethical guardians and advocates of the marginalized or under-represented. Civil society in all its forms has an important role in holding all stakeholders, including itself, to the highest levels of accountability. (CIVICUS, 2010:17).

For the purpose of this study, we adhere to the Edwards’ Roles Model of civil society. Edwards made a similar attempt to structure the meanings of civil society. Out of the diversity of concepts and roles offered by multiple actors regarding civil society and “recognizing that civil society does indeed mean different things to different people” (2005:3). He elaborated three key roles.

- **Civil society as associational life:** Civil society is the world of voluntary associations that act as ‘gene carriers’ for developing values such as tolerance and cooperation. This is the central role the ‘neo-Tocquevillian school’ ascribes to a rich associational life (Edwards 2004:18-36).

- **Civil society as the good society:** The second role sets this rich associational life in a proper context, fostering specific positive norms and values, emphasizing that activities must be geared toward specific social and political goals (Edwards 2004:37-53).

- **Civil society as the public sphere:** The third role of civil society is to provide a public sphere where citizens argue with one-another about the great questions of the day and negotiate a constantly evolving sense of the common and public interest. This role is central when it comes to finding proper solutions and decision-making in society. It is central for civil society and crucial for democracy to interact fairly in the public sphere. This role gives mandates to civil society to play a role in public policies. For its effective success, civil society should conduct research on issues affecting people’s
needs, create coalitions and building networks, do lobbying and undertake public policy advocacy campaigns on big issues of the society.

Edwards’ main hypothesis is that each of these roles alone cannot achieve effective social change and other positive outcomes normally attributed to civil society. Thus he calls for integration or synthesis of the different roles and to consider them comprehensively when supporting civil society initiatives (Edwards, 2004:10). This will balance the weaknesses of each role by the strengths of the others.

Given the influence and role of civil society towards public interests, there is a need of promoting and protecting rights of civil society organizations.

2.1.4. Rights of civil society

To protect civil society from the regulatory barriers, this sub section seeks to articulate rights and principles that govern and protect civil society from repressive intrusions of governments, particularly when they pursue sensitive policy issues. Tracking the six clusters of legal barriers, the principles are designed to ensure that states honor the following rights:

(1) The right of CSOs to entry (that is, the right of individuals to form and join CSOs);
(2) The right to operate to fulfill their legal purposes without state interference;
(3) The right to free expression;
(4) The right to communication with domestic and international partners;
(5) The right to freedom of peaceful assembly; and
(6) The right to seek and secure resources.

Finally, these principles underscore
(7) The state’s positive obligation to protect the rights of CSOs. (ICNL & NED, 2012:36)

These rights of civil society are rooted in the concept of freedom of association as guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant for Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), and a substantial list of other human rights conventions and declarations. Freedom of association involves the right of individuals to interact and organize among themselves to collectively express, promote, pursue and defend common interests.
Moreover, Under Articles 3(7) and 12(3) of the African Charter on Democracy, Elections, and Governance, which Rwanda has signed and ratified, citizens have a right to effective participation in the affairs of their country, and the state has a duty to “create conducive conditions for civil society organizations to exist and operate within the law.”

In Rwanda rights of civil society organizations are guaranteed by the Constitution and other laws and policies in place.

- Constitution
- Organic Law N° 55/2008 of 10/09/2008 Governing Non-Governmental Organizations
- Law Nº04 /2012 of 17/02/2012, Governing the Organization and Functioning of National Non-Governmental Organizations
- Law Nº05/2012 of 17/02/2012, Determining the Organization and Functioning of International Non-Governmental Organizations Operating in Rwanda
- Law Nº06/2012 of 17/02/2012 Governing Functioning of Religious Communities and Freedom of Worship in Rwanda

For instance, the constitution in its articles, 33, 34, 35 and 36 highlights fundamental human rights, freedom of thoughts, freedom of associations and public manifestation. The Law No 04/2012 of 17/02/2012 Governance the organisation and the functioning of national Non-Governmental organizations: The article 28 of this new NGO law stipulates that any national non-governmental organisation has the following rights:

1. To put forward their views on the national policies designing and legislation related to operation of the national non-governmental organisations;
2. To advocate, protect and promote human rights and other national values.
3. To express their opinions and views on national policies and legislation;
4. To enter into contracts with other organisations and entities;

In addition to these laws, there are also open spaces through which CSOs have full rights and obligations to participate in, such as Joint Action Development Forum (JADF) at Districts and sector level, Sector Working Groups (SWGs) at ministerial levels, and thematic commissions at parliament and senate. However, CSOs to maximize the enjoyment of these rights must be guided by principles and core-values. Most of these core-values and principles

---

1 Official Gazette n° 15 of 09/04/2012
are fundamental and can serve as indicators of how a CSO was created, governed and deals with internal and external issues.

2.1.5. Core-values and principles of civil society

2.1.5.1. Core values

The core values of an organization are those values which form the foundation on which work is performed and which determines our behavior. We have an entire universe of values, but some of them are so primary, so important to us that throughout the changes in society, government, politics, and technology they are still the core values abided by. In an ever-changing world, core values are constant. Core values are not descriptions of the work done or the strategies employed to accomplish a mission. The values underlie a work, how interact with each other, and which strategies are employed to fulfill a mission. The core values are the basic elements of how work is done. They are the practices used (or should be used) every day in everything that is done. The core values of a CSO include:

Autonomy: Political and sociological definitions of CSOs agree on the centrality of autonomy as a CSO characteristic, and this is usually referred to as the freedom and independence of civil organizations to set their own agenda without the direct intervention or dictation from external forces, especially the state and donors. In reality, CSOs exist, not in a vacuum but in historical, political, and socio-economic contexts and their autonomy is circumscribed by these contextual factors. Autonomy may, therefore, be relative: a matter of degree and subject to negative or positive change. Furthermore, CSOs interact with other organized social forces including state, donor communities and other civic organizations, which circumscribe and limit their ability to act independently.

Voluntarism: CSOs vary from small membership organizations, informal, semi-formal, registered or not mainly engaged in self-help activities, to large and medium scale organizations engaged in all sorts of service, development and advocacy activities. Accordingly, they exhibit differences in their style of organization, internal democracy, and level of membership participation. The self image of CSOs as democratic, participatory and accountable needs close inspection. However, voluntary membership and participation is one of the important characteristics and principles of CSOs.

RCSP, CS Mapping report 2010
**Plurality:** The notion of plurality indicates not only the large number and types of associations and organizations occupying the sphere but also the diversity of interest objectives, organizational forms and capacities. Academics have noted that civil society is not a uniform and homogeneous group of institutes. On the contrary, the institutions of CSOs are myriad of particular interests, which have an institutional form or an institutional expression. They express conflicts, rivalries, and struggles – or consented action. They may act as integrating or disintegrating elements.

2.1.5.2. **Principles of civil society**

Civil society organizations are a vibrant and essential feature in the democratic life of countries across the globe. CSOs collaborate with the full diversity of people and promote their rights. The essential characteristics of CSOs as distinct development actors – that they are voluntary, diverse, non-partisan, autonomous, non-violent, working and collaborating for change – are the foundation for the Istanbul principles for CSO development effectiveness. These principles guide the work and practices of civil society organizations in both peaceful and conflict situations, in different areas of work from grassroots to public policy advocacy, and in a continuum from humanitarian emergencies to long-term development.

1. **Respect and promote human rights and social justice**

   *CSOs are effective as development actors when they* ... develop and implement strategies, activities and practices that promote individual and collective human rights, including the right to development, with dignity, decent work, social justice and equity for all people.

2. **Embody gender equality and equity while promoting women and girls’ rights**

   *CSOs are effective as development actors when they* ... promote and practice development cooperation embodying gender equity, reflecting women’s concerns and experience, while supporting women’s efforts to realize their individual and collective rights, participating as fully empowered actors in the development process.

3. **Focus on people’s empowerment, democratic ownership and participation**

   *CSOs are effective as development actors when they* support the empowerment and inclusive participation of people to expand their democratic ownership over policies and development initiatives that affect their lives, with an emphasis on the poor and marginalized.

---

3 Please note that these are Istanbul CSOs Development Principles, as agreed at the Open Forum’s Global Assembly in Istanbul, September 28 -30, 2010. These principles are the foundation of the Open Forum’s *International Framework on CSO Development Effectiveness.* These principles are further elaborated and can be found on the Open Forum’s web site, [www.cso-effectiveness.org](http://www.cso-effectiveness.org).
4. Promote Environmental Sustainability

*CSOs are effective as development actors when they* develop and implement priorities and approaches that promote environmental sustainability for present and future generations, including urgent responses to climate crises, with specific attention to the socio-economic, cultural and indigenous conditions for ecological integrity and justice.

5. Practice transparency and accountability

*CSOs are effective as development actors when they* demonstrate a sustained organizational commitment to transparency, multiple accountability, and integrity in their internal operations.

6. Pursue equitable partnerships and solidarity

*CSOs are effective as development actors when they* commit to transparent relationships with CSOs and other development actors, freely and as equals, based on shared development goals and values, mutual respect, trust, organizational autonomy, long-term accompaniment, solidarity and global citizenship.

7. Create and share knowledge and commit to mutual learning

*CSOs are effective as development actors when they* ... enhance the ways they learn from their experience, from other CSOs and development actors, integrating evidence from development practice and results, including the knowledge and wisdom of local and indigenous communities, strengthening innovation and their vision for the future they would like to see.

8. Commit to realizing positive sustainable change

*CSOs are effective as development actors when they* collaborate to realize sustainable outcomes and impacts of their development actions, focusing on results and conditions for lasting change for people, with special emphasis on poor and marginalized populations, ensuring an enduring legacy for present and future generations.

Guided by these Istanbul principles, CSOs are committed to take pro-active actions to improve and be fully accountable for their development practices. Equally important will be enabling policies and practices by all actors. Through actions consistent with these principles, donor and partner country governments demonstrate their Accra Agenda for Action pledge that they “share an interest in ensuring that CSO contributions to development reach their full potential”(…….). All governments have
an obligation to uphold basic human rights – among others, the right to association, the right to assembly, and the freedom of expression. Together these are pre-conditions for effective development.

Through these roles we can trace the state role of civil society in public policy processes.

2.2. Concept and theory of public policy and related concepts

This section is focused on the concept of public policy, advocacy, and public policy advocacy before getting the its linkage with CSOs

2.2.1. Concepts and definitions

2.2.1.1. Public policy

Scholars and authors have defined this concept differently but in most of cases all definitions are convergent. Dye defines it as whatever governments choose to do or not to do. (Dye, 1972:18), as a proposed course of action of a person, group or government within a given environment providing obstacles and opportunities which the policy was proposed to utilize and overcome in an effort to reach a goal or realize an objective or purpose, (Frederich, 1963:79) and as broad framework of ideas and values within which decisions are taken and action, or inaction, is pursued by governments in relation to some issue or problem (Brooks, 1989:16).

As Thomas Dye (Thomas Dye, 1995:15) cogently argues, public policy is an art as well as a craft. For this author it is an art because it requires insight, creativity, and imagination in identifying societal problems and describing them, in devising public policies that might alleviate them, and then in finding out whether these policies end up making things better or worse. As a craft, public policy is the management of ideas, which are often embedded in the technical knowledge and ability of decision makers and their associates to translate the abstract ideas in governance, social structure and statistical data into practical and pragmatic policies for the entire society. The concept of public policy leads to advocacy and public policy advocacy.

Thus, for policies to be relevant to domestic realities, and for such technical knowledge to have the desired effect of changing the lives of people for the better, analysts and decision
makers must be cognizant of the fact that changes are derived from preconceived ideas about how to correct perceived problems or enhance existing good in society.

2.2.1. Advocacy

Moreover, in this context advocacy is another concept to public policy. While CARE International defines advocacy as deliberate process of influencing those who make policy decisions or targeted actions directed at decision makers in support of a specific policy issue (CARE, 2001), the same concept is defined by USAID as a set of actions designed to persuade and influence those who hold governmental, political, and economic power so that they will adopt and implement public policy in ways that benefit those with less political power and fewer economic resources, (USAID, 2001). This study adopts the USAID’s definition because it seems to be more comprehensive, but the general meaning of the previous one still relevant as well.

2.2.1.3. Public policy advocacy

Another concept which is associated to the previous ones and calls-upon the subject under study, is the public policy advocacy. We retained for this study that public policy advocacy is an effort to influence public policy through various forms of persuasive communication (USAID, 2001) or a set of targeted actions directed at decision-makers in support of a specific public policy issue. Here, the public policy advocacy should be considered to be to the entire process that any advocate should go through to influence public policies.

To understand the role that can be played by CSOs, it is necessary to understand the steps of public policy.

2.2.2. Stages and models of public policy processes

There are many different stages and models to explain the public policy process, but one of the oldest and most common approaches to the study of policy-making derives from the early work of Harold Dwight Lasswell (H. D. Lasswell, 1951). This American political scientist was the first to have taken into account and analyzed policy as a process, which is like a set of phenomena organized in time and led by a number of specific and self-induced mechanisms. The model that he helped build is usually known as the stages model of policy, since it separates policy-making into its component steps, or stages, and analyses each in turn. The original version of the model included seven stages, though more recent versions
have reduced the process to fewer steps, varying between four and six. For this study public policy process was summarized into four main stages (see the figure below).

Figure 2: Stage of Public Policy Process

Source: Chart adapted from Porter, R.W., & Hicks, I., 1995:8)

Broadly speaking, such stages include:

1. The identification of policy problems or issues, through demands for action;
2. Agenda-setting, or focusing on specific problems/issues (this stage is sometimes merged with the previous one);
3. The formulation of policy proposals, their initiation and development, by policy-planning organizations, interest groups, and/or the executive or legislative branches of government;
4. The adoption of and rendering legitimate of policies through the political actions of government, interest groups, political parties;
5. The implementation of policies through bureaucracies, public expenditures, and the activities of executive agencies; and,

By breaking the policy process up into different stages, and thus clarifying the stages that are required for a policy to be born and exist, this model has several strengths and limitations.

Its major strength is that it reduces the complexity of policy-making to manageable, analytical units, facilitating understanding. By separating the process into a series of clear and identifiable steps, one can focus on the distinct procedures and activities necessary to develop a policy, instead of losing oneself in the intricacies of the overall policy process. This model does not primarily focus on the actors and institutions involved in policy-making but rather emphasizes the fact that policy-making, as a comprehensive process, cuts across and sometimes links this variety of actors and institutions (i.e. the executive and the legislative branches of government and the courts, civil society, intergovernmental bodies, etc.). As noted by Porter and Hicks in one of their papers on the process of policy formulation, by shifting attention to the process and its component steps, this model “transcends the boundaries of specific institutions and points to the ways in which individuals and groups interact across them”.

Although this model is extremely important in the policy-making literature and is considered a traditional approach by many authors, it has also been subject to criticism. The main criticism focuses on the so-called linearity of the model.

The stages model is usually viewed as presenting the policy process in terms of a policy cycle, where the last stage of the process, “evaluation,” overlaps with the first, “problem identification”; where each step is considered as temporally and functionally distinct; and where different sets of actors are associated with different stages and periods of time. Critics say that this is extremely misleading since, although policy-making may well proceed in stages, it is not linear; the entire process is in no way automatic and can change directions or even cease to be at any point. Reality is not a fixed sequence: the “formulation” stage may be an opportunity for a new “identification of problems,” the “implementation” phase usually requires a redefinition of the “formulation” of the policy proposal, and the “evaluation” can lead to a new “problem identification.” Far from being linear, the policy process is dynamic and, at times, even chaotic. For instance, a policy can end without having been subject to evaluation and another can be implemented before having been formally or legally adopted.
It has been said that the stages model gives the illusion that policy-makers arrive at a decision through a rational and systematic approach to problem-solving: defining the problem, analyzing alternative solutions, adopting a solution, and testing and evaluating that solution. But policy-making only rarely follows this pattern. A vast number of players, civil society organizations are usually involved in the policy process, and this tends to result in a process in which decisions are made collectively, often after resolving conflicting interests by bargaining.

### 2.3. Public policy and civil society organisations

#### 2.3.1. A general perspective

Civicus holds that as in many countries CSOs are influencing public policy in a myriad of ways. But, the capacities of CSOs are limited and therefore their interactions with government are not always as effective as they would have been hoped. (Civicus, 2012). The statement reveal that myriad of ways should be used by SCOs but the issue should be how effective, consistent and systematic they are to achieve the positive outcomes for all citizens.

In addition to limited internal capacities, lack of knowledge and commitment, Norwegian People’s Aid (NPA) reports that the role of CS especially in public policy advocacy and monitoring was still unclear to both CS and Government. There appears to be wide disparities within CSOs and especially between CSOs and Government officials on what CSOs should engage in. It was revealed that some NGOs think Government should give them orientation of where they should intervene, while others insist that NGOs should have independent agenda and not be influenced by Government to enable them speak and work independently for the citizens, while collaborating with Government and other partners. (NPA, 2010:41).

*On the CS ability to play the role of influencing public policy*, NPA in its survey added that “perceptions are mixed but both pessimistic and optimistic views converge on the fact that it depends on the circumstances and the strengths of the Government position”. (NPA, 2010:42).

However, CSOs assume advocacy roles to promote the interests of their constituents or broader public interests pertaining to particular issues (Uvin in Trocaire, 1999). Thus as stated by (UN, 2010) one important function of CSOs is the mobilization of “volunteerism”,...
which can be for all kinds of social activities and human. This is done in what so called service delivery through outreach programs. In addition to that and through the mobilization of constituents and resources, those organizations play a role of influencing national policies and their effective implementation through what is called public policy advocacy (UN, 2010). However, Rwanda Governance Board (RGB) reports that data generated within Rwanda to assess Rwanda’s governance along eight internationally-accepted indicator criteria, on the measure of “vibrancy of non-state actors in policy formulation,” Rwanda scored 57 out of 100.

This “problem” concerning the place of CSOs into public policy processes was described in a survey by researchers at Johns Hopkins University as follows: “Despite their growing presence and importance however, civil society organizations have long been the lost continent on the social landscape of our world. […] Social and political discourse [remains] heavily dominated by a ‘two-sector model’ that acknowledges the existence of only two social spheres outside of the family unit – the market and the state, or business and government… As a consequence, the civil society sector’s ability to participate in the significant policy debates now under way has been seriously hampered and its potential for contributing to the solution of pressing problems too often challenged or ignored”. (Salamon, Hens, Land Chinock, 2000).

In Africa, the role of civil society have been a challenge, essentially, the ideas that frame public policies in most African states are either lacking in substance or poorly conceptualized because debates, alternative positions and policy preferences are often ad hoc and centrally controlled by the top echelon of government without regard on the impact of such policies on ordinary citizens.

### 2.3.2. Background of civil society in Rwanda

In Rwanda, the concept of civil society coincides with the arrival of Christian churches in 1900, especially the Catholic Church with its specialized missions. However, the dense associational movement was witnessed in the early 1980s under the Habyarimana regime, with the banner of development especially in rural areas. It was mainly concerned with agricultural cooperatives, and associations for mutual aid. Donors injected large amounts of resources into the country and hailed Rwanda’s dense network of vibrant grassroots
associations (Uvin, 1998). According to three important phases trace the historic emergence of Rwandan civil society.

The first civil organizations emerged in the 1980s. Most of them are developmental NGOs, and peasants’ associations. The sharp increase in development assistance during that time nurtured their expansion and set their agenda (Uvin, 1998). In 1987, INADES (an African support NGO), sponsored by the World Bank, inventoried 143 registered NGOs. In 1991, this figure increased to 170 (Bugingo and Mutambuka, 1998). These organizations have considered themselves as apolitical (Uvin, 1998:172), whose roles are to support small developmental projects in rural areas.

The second group encompasses mainly human rights organizations, which emerged in the early 1990s during the short-lived period of political liberalization. It includes human rights organisations such as the Ligue Rwandaise pour la Promotion et la Défense des Droits de l’Homme (LIPRODHOR), women groups such as Réseau des Femmes and Haguruka, and labour unions such as the Conseil National des Organizations Syndicales Libres au Rwanda (COSYLI). These have always fought for civil liberties, and social justice (Nkubito, 2001:50).

The third group is made up of associations and organizations created after the 1994 Genocide against the Tutsi, whose principal aim was to channel the emergency aid to the Rwandan population, and to address the consequences of the genocide. They include organizations such as Ibuka and Avega Agahozo dedicated to protect the rights, and assist survivors of the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi. One can therefore argue that the socio-political conditions of the emergence of civil organizations have shaped their identity and determined the scope of their intervention.

However, this research has added the fourth category of CSOs one made by new associations and organizations created after around 2000 with the aim of promoting sustainable development by being involved in community development, environmental protection, youth empowerment, good governance among others. They include ADTS, SDA-Iriba, Never Again Rwanda, AJEPRODHO, PAJER, among others.

In 1999, CNL accounted estimated total of 37,000 informal groups, with only about 319 registered NPOs. The Rwanda Civil society Platform was created in 2004 and accounts 15 member organizations, including 11 umbrellas. These umbrellas totalize 628 associations and
organizations. However, worth noting that all civil society organizations formal or informal, registered or not registered are not member of RCSP. Hence, to date, accurate data on civil society still unknown because any institution whether public or private has managed to avail such data.

2.3.3. Cycle of public policy in Rwanda and the role of CS

There exist opportunities and open spaces for CS to play a role in public policy process.

Below is the chart that shows how CSOs can play a role all along the process of agenda setting, public policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation passing through the executive or legislative.⁴

Figure 3: Cycle of public policy process and the role of CS in Rwanda

Source: Chart adapted from (TROCARE, 2009:32) Training Report on Public Policy Monitoring

⁴ Note: (*) Indicates free spaces and open rooms where CS should participate and provide inputs in public policy processes
Through this chart, it is found out that in the public policy process, CSOs can intervene through ministerial and parliamentarian levels. They can do lobbying for policy issues to be put on the political agenda; they can provide their inputs throughout the whole process by participating in meetings and commissions, using persuasive communications, developing position papers, petitions and by working with medias among others. As many CSOs have strong basis at grassroots levels, where they support poor communities and marginalized groups, their collaboration with other development partners and local authorities in identifying policy issues at that level can help to put those issues on political agenda.

Given the spaces established by the Government of Rwanda to CSOs for their inputs in public policy process, civil society organizations should take advantage of these opportunities/open spaces to play effectively their role of influencing public policies.

2.3.4. Pre-requisites for civil society to play a role in public policy process

The figure below presents pre-requisites for any civil society organization to efficiently and effectively play its role in public policy process. Various key elements that determine the growth of a CSO in the social, cultural, economic and political context hinge on each other to enable the organization fully fulfill its role and responsibility in the public policy process.
Figure 4: Pre-requisites for CSOs to play a role in public policy process

Source: Our study July 2013

The key drivers of an organizational readiness for public policy advocacy involve: existence of CSO with clear vision, clear and shared mission shared co-values and organizational principles; legitimacy that enables the CSO integrate in the social, cultural, economic and political context; capacity to design and implement plans which is in line with the mission; effective performance of leadership and transparent management, competent and human resources (motivated staff), ownership and accountability of systems and procedures, the quality of internal and external communication, outreach strategies, media relations, fundraising strategies, networking and advocacy strategy among others.
As long as a CSO increases its visibility and reputation, it increases its chances to become credible and have an influence on the big issues of the society. As indicated in the figure, any CSO, whether small or big, registered or not, formal or informal, operating at local or national level, must bear in mind that a thorough analysis of social, cultural, economical and political context is fundamental for any work related to public policy process.

2.4. Conceptual framework

This study was conceptualized bearing in mind the three levels of analysis: the first was internal capacities where strengths and weaknesses have been identified and analyzed. The second level was the analysis of opportunities and challenges of CSOs vis-à-vis of the public policy process. At this level enabling and disabling factors and actors were identified and analyzed. The third level was the identification and analysis of the role played by CSOs with regard to agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, policy implementation and policy monitoring and evaluation. At this level, activities carried out by CSOs were analyzed and the ways through which CSOs interact with decision makers and other stakeholders were also assessed. Worth is noting that at each level, a series of questions through a questionnaire and an interview guide were developed to collect required data.

For the summary see the figure below.
The role played by CS in public policy process in Rwanda

Activities carried out by CS with regard to the agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation

Civil society organizations opportunities with regard to public policy process and how they are seized

Challenges that Rwanda CS face when seeking to influence public policies

Strengths and weaknesses of Rwanda civil society organizations in public policy formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation;

Analysis of Existing internal strengths and weaknesses

Analysis of external actors and factors

Quantity and quality of activities with regard to PPP

Q1-6, 8-11, 13-16, 18-21

Q7,12,17, 22, 24, 25,26

Q23

Source: Our study, July 2013

The next chapter is the research methodology
Chapter III: Research methodology

This chapter describes the research methodology with emphasis on study design, source of data, study population, sampling techniques and sample size, methods of data collection, data collection procedures, data presentation, analysis and reporting.

3.1. Design and source of data

This study is both quantitative and qualitative. It relied on two sources of information: primary and secondary. Primary information was collected through questionnaires administered to people from various civil society organizations that were sampled for that end. It was also collected from qualitative in-depth interviews with key informants of civil society and public sector, who were purposively selected. Secondary information was collected from books, empirical studies, journals, policies, reports and websites among others.

3.2. Population and sample size

This section is concerned with the categories of the population concerned by the study, as well as the sampling procedure.

3.2.1. Study Population

This study investigates organization members of the Rwandan Civil Society Platform which is made of 5 individual organizations, 10 umbrella organizations. The 10 umbrellas are comprised of 404 member organizations as detailed in the table below:
### Table 1: List of Organization investigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th># of member organizations</th>
<th>RCSP member organizations + CSOs in umbrellas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>AMUR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>NUDOR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>COPORWA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CCOAIB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>CEJP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CEPR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>CLADHO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Transparency International</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>FORUM DES ONGs SUR LE SIDA</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>IBUKA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>INTEKO IZIRIKANA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Media Press House</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>PF/TH</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>IMBARAGA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>404</strong></td>
<td><strong>419</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: RCSP July, 2013*

### 3.2.2. Sampling size

According to (Onwuegbuzie and Leech , 2007) cited in Collins K. M. T and Onwuegbuzie A.J. (Collins K. M. T & Onwuegbuzie A.J ,2007: 289); 3 respondents per sub group (umbrella in our case) is the minimum sample size recommended in most qualitative and quantitative research designs. Indeed, to ensure representation of civil society organizations the researcher took all organizations in RCSP. The researcher targeted all 5 individual member organizations of the RCSP, but only 3 out of 5 responded. He targeted also 10 umbrella organizations but only 8 out of 10 responded. For the member organizations within umbrellas, the researcher randomly selected 30 organizations taking at least 3 organizations per each umbrella. The number of respondent organizations per umbrella is good enough to represent the entire umbrella. Indeed,

For this sample size the researcher opted to meet the minimum sample size of 30 respondents recommended for simple quantitative research (Collins K. and Onwuegbuzie A. 2007: 288).
Therefore, the sample size for this study was represented as follow:

**Table 2: Sample size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Individual organizations</th>
<th>Umbrella organizations</th>
<th>Organizations member of each umbrella</th>
<th>Total organizations population of the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total study population</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responded</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Our study, July 2013

This sample has been a true representative of the study population. In fact, Kenneth D. (Kenneth D 1990:215) argues that sample selection is the one which is representative so that the analysis tends to involve individuals that are able to deliver true information for example experts, observers, or actor representatives. In this kind of sampling, the researcher always focused on targeted population and tried to eliminate everything that was not concerned with the study.

For the purpose of this study, the sample size (respondents and key informants) was taken from different categories of CSOs, member of RCSP, such as their leaders or members of board of directors and senior staff.

Key informants were also purposively selected from International Non-Governmental organizations, and public institutions that are more knowledgeable about the role of civil society in public policy process.

**3.3. Techniques for data collection**

This study used desk-based study, questionnaire and in depth interviews for data collection, while data presentation and analysis were done through Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.
3.3.1. Desk research review

Kenneth and D. Bailey (Kenneth and D. Bailey, 1978: 266), define document study as a careful reading, understanding and analysis of any written materials that contain the information about phenomena we wish to study. In this research, the desk-based study was used to collect factual information and hard data were extracted from the relevant and available documentation in relation to the subject under study. Data from desk-based study were supplemented and completed by data from questionnaires and individual interviews.

3.3.2. Questionnaire

Mbaaga (Mbaaga, 1990: 25) defined a questionnaire as a set of questions which are asked to get information from a respondent. It is also currently used to mean a set of questions, which are self-administrated. For this study, a questionnaire was designed and pre-tested before administering it to all selected respondents.

The questionnaire was developed in line with objectives of this study, research questions were answered and indicators were tested. The questionnaire was comprised of three categories, identification of the civil society organization, the respondent and afterwards questions. The entire questionnaire was encompassed 27 questions categorized as follow: Question 1 is general and cross-cuts to all the rest, questions Q.2-Q6 focused of the role of CSOs in agenda setting, Q.8-Q11 dealt with the role of CSOs in policy formulation and adoption, Q13-16, dealt with the role of CS in public policy implementation, question 18-21, were related to monitoring and evaluation, q23. Were of comprised of indicators to access strengths and weaknesses of CS in public policy, whereas questions 25-26 assessed the support provided by RCSP and umbrella organizations to their members with regard to public policies. The question 27 was about recommendations. However, questions 7, 12, 17, 23, were on strengths and weaknesses of civil society organizations with regard to their role and influence in agenda setting, p formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public policy process.
3.3.3. In depth interviews

An interview is as “a conversation that has a structure and a purpose. The interview is more than the spontaneous, everyday exchange of opinions; it is a way for the interviewer to receive carefully tested knowledge”. (Laws, Harper and Marcus: 2003, 297). They add that “participants not only answer formulated questions, but also express their ideas in a dialogue, an understanding of his or her world”

In depth interviewing was thus judged to be a valuable tool to this study, as it offers the opportunity for interviewees and key informants to open up and provide confidential information about the relations that exist between civil society organizations and decision makers in Rwanda. It also helped the researcher not only to be free in asking questions and probe for more clarifications, but also to interpret the likely validity of what was said by the interviewees (tone voice and body language).

In this study, individual qualitative interviews with open ended questions served as the main primary source of qualitative information.

During interviews, the researcher was guided by an interview guide and spent sufficient time, at least 30 minutes with each individual interview. Interview guide was developed in Kinyarwanda and latter translated in English. The in depth interviews were conducted in one among the three official languages used in Rwanda. Interviews targeted heads of RCSP, heads of Umbrella organisations member of RCSP, government institutions dealing with CSOs, Internal Non-Governmental Organizations or donors operating in Rwanda and supporting national CSOs.

After completion of each interview, its content was carefully examined in order to see what to discover in relation to the study’s objectives and research questions. Therefore, at the end of each session of interviews, the researcher reviewed the notes he had taken and as a result, was able to have a working idea of which important concepts and themes were present.
3.4. Data collection procedures

An introductory letter was presented to the National Executive Secretary of RCSP, requesting a permission to carry out this study in that institution. The request was supported by the to whom it may concern letter provided the Faculty of Arts, Medias and Social Sciences stating that the researcher is a student at master level from NUR who needs to be facilitated to carry out a research. RCSP members (umbrellas) contacts were reached through the National Secretariat of the RSCP, while individual organizations were reached through their umbrellas. Questionnaires were administered to selected respondents, filled and collected, while others were sent through e-mails, filled and returned back to the researcher.

Key informants outside the RSCP were contacted individually through their cell phones and/or e-mail address to fix appointments for interviews.

3.5. Data presentation and analysis plan

The empirical data collected was quantitative (from questionnaire) and qualitative from (in-depth interviews). The data was presented quantitatively and qualitatively in the form of words (from questionnaire and interviews. The analysis used SPSS software package. The analysis entailed the editing, coding, organizing, classifying, comparing, weighing, and combining all empirical materials.

The editing enabled the researcher to detect and collect errors and omissions in the filled questionnaires. The coding was used to facilitate the data entry and make easy reading data. The classification was a process of arranging data in to groups or classes on the basis of common characteristics, while the tabulation was the entire process of summarizing raw data and displaying the same in compact form for further analysis. It is an orderly arrangement of data in columns and rows. Tabulation was essential for this research because, it conserved space and reduces explanatory and descriptive statement to a minimum. It made easier and facilitated the process of data comparison, and led to further explanation of some variables.

During data presentation, concepts, themes, and testimonies as collected from the respondents and key informants were examined and various tables, diagrams, cross-tabulations were generated to get the meaning and coherence around the themes and questions under exploration.
Therefore, data collected from questionnaires, transcribed interviews and field notes were analyzed together, in order to pull out coherent and consistent descriptions and themes, which should bring about eventual conclusions and recommendations. The objective was to portray shades and light of meaning through the words of respondents and responses of key interviewees. It is worth noting that data analysis was done after complete data collection (questionnaires filled, qualitative interviews conducted), notably after the transcription of field notes and interviews in the SPSS software; that is, during data presentation and analysis.
Chapter IV: Data presentation, analysis and interpretation

This chapter presents analyses and discusses empirical data that has been collected from 43 people representing civil society organizations. It is comprised of three sub sections: identification of targeted CSOs, identification and characteristics of the respondent, presentation and analysis of findings from the field.

4.1. CSOs identification

Taking into account the fact that the Civil Society is complex and very large in scope, nature and number, the study only targeted civil society organizations with national scope which accepted to adhere in RCSP directly or through their umbrellas. Other organizations outside the RCSP were not concerned. This sub-section gives details about creation date of CSOs respondents, areas of interventions, their constituents, and level of intervention.

4.1.1. Creation date of CSOs

**Figure 6: Creation date of CSOs**

The majority of CSOs (29%) respond to this study were created between the year 1990-1994 and between 1995-1999. They present an average of 30.8% and 18% respectively. Given this increase, worth is noting that during this period Rwanda and most African countries were in wave of democracy. The period of 1990-1994 was characterized by an extreme poverty, especially in rural areas and repression of human rights that led to a liberation war. As seen before CSOs like ARDI, DUHAMIC-ADRI, CESTRAR, LIPRODHOR, COSYLI, Reseau des Femmes, Haguruka, AMIZERO, among others, were created in that period. However, the situation culminated into the Genocide perpetrated against the Tutsi in 1994, whereby CSOs
both international and local NGOs, came in to assist in emergency period and later in sustainable development. There are CSOs like AVEGA Agahozo, DUHOZANYE, COCOF, Rwanda Women NetWork, RDO, AJEPRODHO, ADTS, among others

4.1.2. Areas of interventions

Figure 7: Specifies various Civil Society Organizations’ areas of intervention

As shown in figure 7, CSOs that participated in this study intervene in the area of community development (18.3%), human rights and justice (13%), good governance (13%), agriculture (12.2%), promoting rights of people with particular issues (9.6%) and health (8.7%). CSOs working in media, environment protection, and academia were less represented in this study and represent a very low percentage.

4.1.3. Level of intervention

Figure 8: Level of intervention
As indicated in this figure, 48.0% and 41.3% have their offices at National level in the City of Kigali, and at provincial level respectively. Only 5.3% of them have their offices and district and community levels.
4.2. Identification and characteristics of respondents from CSOs

The table below illustrates the characteristics of respondents from CSOs in relation to their age, gender, and marital status, level of education, position and experience within the organization.

Table 3: Identification and characteristics of respondents from CSOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 years old and above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's level</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters level</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD level</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in the table above, respondents aged of 50 years old and above present a highest percentage with an average of 25.6% in CSOs whereas those aged between 25-30 years old represent the lowest percentage with an average of 2.6%. Both male and female participated in this study with an average of 35.9% for female against 64.1% for male. Among respondents, 71.8% are married, 17.9% are single and 10.3% are widows. No divorced among respondents. With regard to the level of education, 56.4% of all respondents hold master’s Degrees, while 33% are bachelor’s degrees. An average of 59% of respondents occupy higher leadership and management positions in their organizations as Executive Secretary, General Secretary, Coordinator, Director, etc. The study revealed also that 61.5% of respondents have served their organizations for more than 5 years. These data indicate that people who participated in this study are married, in an active age, hold high degrees of education and experienced in CS work. Thus, they are supposed to help CSOs to fulfill their mandate.

4.3. Role played by CSOs in public policy process in Rwanda

In this section, the role played by CSOs in Rwanda has been analyzed through the key stages of public policy processes. The section refers to the objective one which is “to analyze the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in the organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President/Regal Representative/Chair Person</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Board of Directors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary, General Secretary, Coordinator, Director,</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience within the organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under one year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in the organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President/Regal Representative/Chair Person</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the Board of Directors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary, General Secretary, Coordinator, Director,</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience within the organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under one year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activities carried out by CS with regard to the agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. It summarizes and discusses activities carried out by CSOs, the level of involvement, level of interactions with others stakeholders. At each stage enabling and disabling factors were also identified but will be presented and analyzed in sub-section 4.4. and 4.5.

4.3.1. Participation of CSOs in the entire process of public policy

CSOs should effectively and efficiently participate in Policy agenda setting, adoption and formulation of public policy, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public policy. The figure below illustrates at which extent CSOs’ participate at each stage of the public policy process in Rwanda.

Figure 9: Level of CSOs’ participation in public policy process

Respondents ranked the level of participation of their organizations as follow: implementation of public policy (3) comes first with 43.3 %, monitoring and evaluation (4) come second with 23.3%, while policy formulation and adoption (2) and policy agenda setting (1) come third and fourth with 18.3% and 15% respectively. All key informants interviewed were of the same view that CSOs are more active in policy implementation than in any other stage. One them said “For sure I’m not seeing CSOs coming in the agenda setting. As far as policy formulation and adoption is concerned CSOs are not available to challenge government. (Interview with d Former RCSP) “CSOs have in their mind that providing inputs on policies equates to be opponent to government”. However CSOs are
active on the field, where they run and implement projects in various areas of development. We value their work in that area. (Interview with a Public Official of RGB).

Given the focus of this study, the following pages will go further into the role of civil society in each step of the public policy process and how it interact with other stakeholders.

4.3.2. Role of CSOs in agenda setting

4.3.2.1. Activities carried out by CSOs with regard to public policy processes

The figures below indicate the level at which CSOs play their role in activities leading to agenda setting.

**Figure 10**. Activities of CSOs and level of involvement in agenda setting

The figure above illustrates activities carried out by CSOs, the level of participation and satisfaction. Determining the specific domain of intervention (A), 28.2% of respondents see it as very low while 28.2 see it as high and 23.0% rank it medium. This disparity should be linked to nature and mandate of CSOs that responded. The role in the identification of issues that require policy (B) is high with 38.5%. The role in conducting empirical research to get reliable information and evidence on issues (C) is very low as affirmed by 33.3 % of respondents, and the activity of analyzing existing public policies (D) is low as confirmed by 25.6% of respondents.
Figure 11: Activities of CSOs and level of involvement in agenda setting
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Figure 11 indicates the level of CSOs involvement in community awareness raising on the policy issues (E), is high with 30.8% of respondents, lobbying to the target audience/concerned decision makers about policy issue (F), is medium with 30.8%, meeting with decision makers concerned by the identified issues (G), is medium with 33.3%, writing letters, notes, petitions, press releases, and making the issues known by the decision makers (H) is also medium with 33.3%.

Figure 12: Activities of CSOs and level of involvement in agenda setting
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The collaboration of CSOs with media (I) is medium as confirmed 30.8% of respondents. The partnership of CSOs with research institutions (J) is at the low level (35.9%). The activity of involving decisions makers through working sessions to bear their support on identified issues is medium (35.9%). Instead, CSOs collaboration with other partners in order to
influence decision makers to consider the identified issues (L) is high as responded by 30.8% of respondents.

4.3.2.2. CSOs’ role in research related to public policy

**Figure 13:** Level of involvement in public policy research

As presented in the figure above, 62% of respondents affirm that their CSOs don’t carry out research on public policy that interest their beneficiaries and constituents against 38% who manage to do such work. This percentage is very low considering the importance of research in public policy process as it enables CSOs to get facts, reliable information and evidence that can convince decision makers about the relevance of the issue to be solved by a public policy.

4.3.2.3. Collaboration regularity between CSOs organization and political leaders

**Figure 14:** Level of CSOS’ collaboration with political leaders (Sector, Districts and Public agencies)
30.8% of respondents revealed the CSOs collaboration with leaders at Sector level (A) is high while the medium percentage can be noticed when it comes to its collaboration with local leaders at the District level (B) (41%). The level of interaction and collaboration with Public Agency Authorities (38.5%).

**Figure 15:** Collaboration with political leaders (Ministries and Parliament)

At the ministerial level, views are different. 28.2% respondents state that the level of interaction and collaboration with Ministers (D) is medium, while 25.6% state that it is low and very low. Interaction and collaboration with Parliamentarians (E) is low for 35.9% respondents and very low 30.8% and medium for 20.5% respondents respectively.

The above two figures shows the level of collaboration and interaction between CSOs and decision makers from low level to high level is decreasing. This interaction intends to be good with sector and district authorities while it decreases with ministers and parliamentarians. To play an effective role in influencing agenda setting, CSOs should know whom to target and assess the level of power and influence they have to support their causes.

**4.3.2.4. Involvement in formal structures established by Government**

In order to actively participate in public policy process, CSOs are expected to involve in Joint Action Development Forum (A), thematic commissions at District level of interventions (B), thematic commissions within the Public Agencies ( RDB, RGB, RSSSB,RAB, NAEB, REB, NCC, NWC, NYC, etc.) (C), thematic commission at Ministry
level (D), thematic commission at parliament level (E), thematic commission at senate level (F) and others (G).

**Figure 16:** Level of involvement in formal structures

Figure 16 indicates that 61.5% against 33% of respondents affirm that their CSOs participate in Joint Action Development Forum at district level (A) against 33.3%. 46.2% respondents participate in thematic commissions at districts level (B) while 28.0% don’t participate. 51.3% don’t participate in thematic commissions within public agencies (C) like (REB, RSSB, REB...) while 41% participate. 46.2% of respondents participate in thematic commissions at ministerial level (D) against 43.6% who don’t participate. 10.3 % participate in thematic commissions at parliament level while 53.8% don’t participate and 35.9 % didn’t respond to the question. 12.8% participate in thematic commissions at Senate level while 59.% don’t participate and 28.2% didn’t respond to this indicator. In JADF (A):61%; Thematic commissions at district (B):46.2%; Public Agencies (C):41; Ministry (D) 46.2%; Parliament (E) 10.3%, Senate (F) 12.8%. At Parliament and Senate levels missing data is high. Given these statistics, CSOs participation in various formal structures established by government is very low at ministry, parliament and Senate levels. However, a good number of laws and public policies are designed, formulated, and adopted at this level. The interpretation of these indicators is that CSOs organizations are unaware of right audiences to target during the agenda setting.
4.3.2.5 Cooperation between CSOs and media on issues affecting constituents

**Figure 17:** Level of cooperation of CSOs with media
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As illustrated in the figure 17, 41% of respondents revealed that the level of cooperation between their CSOs and media is very low, while 23% responded that this collaboration is low and medium. Only 10% and 3% of respondents said that the collaboration between CSOs and media is high and very high respectively.

These statistics indicate that CSOs perform better in pointing out government’s shortcomings. However, their role in influencing the policy agenda setting is very limited. The failure of CSOs to play an effective role in agenda setting is explained by respondents where they affirm that CSOs don’t conduct policy research, lack of partnership with research institutes, low level of collaboration with media and other key stakeholders among others. Beside this, poor coordination and suspicion among CSOs were reported by informants to be another factor limiting CSOs to play an effective role in agenda setting. Some of them in the example of two accounts below said:

“For sure I’m not seeing CSOs in influencing agenda setting, the level of research is poor and CSOs lack arguments to convince decisions makers”.

Interview with the Former Chair Person of RSCP and Current Executive Secretary of the Rwanda Development Organization.

“In the context of Rwanda, the advocacy on public policy, especially influencing the policy agenda is not something easy. This role is perceived as a private duty of government not for CSOs”. “CSOs that dare to intervene in such work are most of times taxed to be opponent to
government. It is the reason why most CSOs prefer to keep silent even on issues that affect their members and constituents” (Interview with Senior Staff from CCOAIB)

However, this view is not the same for all:

“the legal framework is clear and the political will is there. Unfortunately, CSOs are not active in policy agenda setting not because they are unaware of that role, but due to the fact that some CSOs leaders are money driven and simply want easy ways to getting money” (Interview with the Head of the Department of CSOs and Political Parties at RGB).

At this stage of influencing the policy agenda the legal framework is crucial and evidence through policy research is critical to improve the effectiveness of policy development initiatives. Capitalizing on the practical knowledge and experience of many CSOs require careful analytic work to understand how technical skills, expert knowledge and practical experience can inform one another. However, existing enabling factors and mechanisms already in place must be properly enforced.

4.3.3. Role of CSOs in policy formulation and adoption

4.3.3.1. Activities carried out by CSOs with regard to policy formulation and adoption

The figure 18 presents the level at which CSOs play a role in various activities with regard to public policy formulation affecting citizens and constituents.

Figure 18: Activities carried out by CSOs with regard to policy formulation and adoption
The figure below indicates that CSOs involvement in the constitution of coalitions with other partners (A) is low with an average of 33.3% of respondents. The collaboration with other partners to influence political leaders in order to make them consider issues raised by constituents in policy formulation (B) ranks also low with an average of 33.3% whereas CSOs’ collaboration with media (C) at this stage ranks medium with an average of 30.8% of respondents.

**Figure 19:** Activities carried out by CSOs with regard to policy formulation and adoption

The collaboration of CSOs with research institutions (D) and lobbying by CSOs to target (E) is very low as 43.6% of respondents indicated. However, participation in consultative meetings with decision makers whose mandate is to formulate and adopt policy audiences (F) is medium as indicated by 38.5% of respondents.

**Figure 20:** Activities carried out by CSOs with regard to policy formulation and adoption
CSOs role in organizing working sessions with decision makers in order to convince them to consider identified issues (G) is medium with 43.6% of respondents. The community mobilization and keeping good relationships with constituents affected by the issue (H) is higher as indicated by 33.3% of respondents.

4.3.3.2. Circumstances that led CSO participate in policy formulation and adoption

The figure below illustrates the level and occasions at which CSOs are involved in formulation and adoption of a public policy.

**Figure 21**: Level of involvement in formulation and adoption

The figure above indicates that 43.6% of respondents affirm that CSOs sometimes participated in formulation and adoption of a public policy under the invitation of the decisions makers (A) while 20.5% of respondents declared that the participation was often under the influence of donors (B). The same percentage of respondents affirmed that the participation was under the organization’s own initiative (C) and 25.6% of them said it was often under the initiative of their umbrella and networks they belong in.
4.3.3.3. Influence of CSOs in policy formulation and adoption

Figure 22: Level of influence in the formulation and approval of policies

According to 39% of respondents, the level of CSOs’ influence in the formulation and approval of policies in the last five years has been medium against 31% of respondents who found it low. With these figures, CSOs are far from influencing public policy process as the major part of their role.

Key informants supported the data presented above as follow:

“The role of CSOs in policy formulation is low, even very low. CSOs are not consulted and when they are invited they do not bring relevant inputs. Their added value is not consistent. CSOs are dormant and say only yes, yes, and accept blindly. However, I’m aware that it is not easy to challenge our government. What CSOs should do is to research and work in coalitions for a strong common voice, otherwise, change in policies will never come (Interview with COPORWA Leader)

“As far as policy formulation and adoption is concerned, CSOs are not ready to challenge government. Most of them only participate in policy formulation when they are invited. CSOs have in their mind that providing inputs on policies equates to be opponent to government. Something which is totally wrong. (Interview with a RGB Official.

As stated by (R. Mukamunana and P A Brynard 2005:12) the democracy activists in Rwanda are afraid to be seen as oppositionist and as such, most of them are averse to the idea of collective action. Other studies by USAID (2001) and Trocaire (2002), ARC, (2008) indicate that with the exception of human rights groups, many of the civil society organizations fear criticizing government policies and practices. Consequently, most civic organizations focus
on the execution of punctual programs, relegating policy advocacy and lobbying on policy formulation for a second plan.

4.3.4. Role of CSOs in policy implementation

4.3.4.1. Activities carried about by CSOs with regard to policy implementation

The CSO is supposed to play a role in awareness raising of the target groups, general public, constituents on the adopted policy (A), partnership with concerned public institutions (B), meetings with decision maker concerned with the adopted policy (C), design of projects and programs aiming at implementing the policy (D), design and implement joint projects with other partners (E), reporting on the implementation progress of that policy (F), collaboration with media (G) and others (H). Tables below indicates how these activities have been carried out and at which level CSOs were involved.
Figure 23: Activities carried out and level of involvement in implementing policies

CSOs always participated in awareness raising of the target groups, general public, constituents on the adopted policy as revealed by respondents (15.4%). The participation in the design of projects and programs aiming at implementing policies has always been very low as reflected by the low average of respondents (7.7%) in the figure above.

Figure 24: Activities carried out and level of involvement in implementing policies

CSOs often design and implement joint projects with other partners as affirmed by 20.5% of respondents and reporting on the implementation progress of that policy is also often done as indicated by 23.1% of respondents.
4.3.4.2. Level of intervention in the implementation of policies

An effective implementation of policies calls for CSOs interaction with Local authorities at the sector level (A), Local authorities at the District level (B), Public Agencies (C) Ministries (D) and Others (E).

Figure 25 indicates at which level CSO participate in the implementation of policies

**Figure 25:** Level of intervention in policy implementation

As indicated in figure above, CSOs mostly participate in the implementation of policies at District level with an average of 38.5%, while 32.1% intervene at community level with an average of 23% of respondents and 23.1% at national level. Only 6.4% intervene and province level. The scope of CSOs that participated in this study was national. However, worth is noting that even if big organizations like umbrellas pretend to operate at national level, they have also sub offices or representation at district level. Another reason that explains a high level of CSOs interventions at district level is that to be registered at Rwanda Governance Board, every CSO must present at least three recommendations from Districts authorities. Therefore, as far as the policy implementation is concerned, projects are implemented at districts and community levels.
4.3.4.3. Interactions between CSO and authorities in the implementation of policies

Figure 26: Level of collaboration and interaction between CSOs and authorities in policy

High and medium at sector (A) and district level (B), (33.3% & 23.1% and 38.5% & 25.6%) respectively while, it is low and very low at (C) and low and medium (30.8% and 28% respectively).

4.3.5. Role of CSOs in policy Monitoring and Evaluation.

4.3.5.1. Activities carried out with regard to policy monitoring and evaluation

In order to ensure effective participation in monitoring and evaluation of public policies, CSOs are required to select a public policy to be monitored-evaluated by their organization (A), determine objectives to be achieved during the monitoring and evaluation of that policy (B), select approaches to be used in monitoring and evaluation of that policy (C), identify and analyze stakeholders who will be part of the process of monitoring and evaluation (D), do further examination of the policy and its key priorities (E), develop methods and tools for data collection and information gathering on that policy (F), collect a data about the policy under monitoring and evaluation (G), analyze data and produce report and share it with decision makers (H), develop advocacy plan to influence decision makers to adopt necessary changes in the policy (I), participate in evaluations commissioned by the public sector (J), Participate in validation workshops organized by public sector on public policy evaluation (K), Others (L). The figures below indicate how these activities are performed by CSOs 214

Figure 27: Activities carried out with regard to policy monitoring and evaluation
Selection of a public policy to be monitored-evaluated by their organization (A), is done rarely (39.5%), determining objectives to be achieved during the monitoring and evaluation of that policy (B) is done rarely (35.9%), select approaches to be used in monitoring and evaluation of that policy (C), is also done rarely (38.5%).

Figure 28: Activities carried out with regard to policy monitoring and evaluation

Identification and analysis of stakeholders who will be part of the process of monitoring and evaluation (D), is done rarely (41%), further examination of the policy and its key priorities (E), is done rarely (33.3%), develop methods and tools for data collection and information gathering on that policy (F), 33.3% of affirm that it is rarely while 33.3% others say it is never done.
**Figure 29:** Level of Participation in monitoring and evaluation of public policies

According to this figure above, only 43.6% of respondents affirmed that CSOs rarely participated in the collection of data about the policy under monitoring and evaluation whereas 48.7% of them revealed CSOs have never developed advocacy plans to influence decision makers to adopt necessary changes in the policy.

**Figure 30:** Level of Participation in monitoring and evaluation of public policies

CSOs’ participation in evaluations commissioned by the public sector has often been very low as reflected by a low average of only 2.6% of respondents against 10.3% of respondents who affirmed CSOs’ participated in validation workshops organized by public sector on public policy evaluation.

4.3.5.2. Influence of CSOs in Monitoring and Evaluation of policies in the last five years (2007-2012)
Figure 31: Level of influence in Policy Monitoring and Evaluation

The level of CSOs’ influence in Monitoring and Evaluation of policies in the last five years (2007-2012) has been ranked medium as confirmed by 38.5% of respondents who participated in this study. While 35.9% and 10.3% respondents said it was low and very low respectively.

The statistics in the figure above are discouraging considering the crucial role of the CSOs of influencing the whole public policy process starting from agenda setting, policy formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

4.4. Strengths and weaknesses of CSOs with regard to public policy process

This sub-section refers to the objective two that seeks to identify and analyze strengths and weaknesses of CSOs with regard to agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation. To respond to this objective, indicators have been identified and used to measure where CSOs have strengths and weaknesses and how these internal factors can impact on their role with regard to public policy process. To play an effective role in public policy process the CSO should have a clear mandate and mission of CSO which are shared with its constituents, public and decision makers (1), have strong and credible governance (2), establish fair and solid internal capacities of management and administration (3), set up effective system and clear procedures for informing the community and public about its programs and resources, including written material (4), a clear and systematic process for assessing, reviewing and responding to ideas, suggestions, and perceptions from: a. Individuals, b. Community groups, c. the general public and decision makers (5), conduct research on public policies (6), develop an advocacy strategy on public policies which is in line with the CSO mandate (7), develop and advocacy plan on public
policies and allocate budget for its implementation (8), develop a public policy monitoring plan and allocate budget for its implementation (9), have a well qualified, skilled and committed staff in charge of research on public policy and advocacy (10), have access to internet and social media networks aiming at influencing public policies (11) belong in coalitions and networks at national level to strengthen their voice on policy (12), and at regional and international levels (13), build partnership with the private sector (14), availability of funds and capacity of secure own funds (level of financial autonomy) (15).

To assess what kind of internal strengths and weaknesses, the researcher used the scoring model as described below: Disagree=0-25 scores, somewhat agree=26-50, agree=51-75 and strongly agree=75-100.

The following graphics indicate how these indicators were ranked with CSOs that participated in this study.

**Figure 32:** Capacities and skills of CSOs to play a role in public policy process
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In the Figure above indicates that 71.8% of respondents agree that their CSO have a clear mandate and mission shared with constituents, public and decision makers (1). 46.2% respondents agree that their CSOs have strong and credible governance (2) while 35.9% are somewhat agree on the same indicator. 61.5 % are somewhat agree that CSOs have established fair and solid internal capacities of management and administration (3). 53.8% of respondents are somewhat agree that CSOs has put in place an effective system and clear procedures for informing the community and public about its programs and resources, including written material (4). 56.4% of respondents disagree that CSOs have clear and
systematic process for assessing, reviewing and responding to ideas, suggestions, and perceptions from: individuals, community groups, general public and decision makers (5). CSOs still have a long way to go as far as to the public policy process is concerned.

**Figure 33:** Capacities and skills of CSOs to play a role in the public policy process

As indicated in figure above, 51.3% of respondents disagree that CSO conduct research on public policies (6) while 28.2 are somewhat agree on the same indicator. 38.5% disagree that their CSOs develop advocacy strategies on public policies which is in line with the mandate (7) while 30.8% somewhat agree about this indicator. 51.3% of respondents disagree that CSOs develop advocacy plan on public policies and allocate budget for its implementation while 23.5% somewhat agree on this indicator (8). 51.3% of respondents disagree that their CSOs posse a specific and written public policy monitoring plan (9). 43.6% disagree that their CSOs have skilled and competent staff in charge of policy research and public policy advocacy (10) while 30.8% and 17.9% somewhat agree and agree respectively on this indicator.

**Figure 34:** Capacities and skills of CSOs to play a role in the public policy process
53.8% of respondents somewhat agree that CSOs use internet and social media networks to influence public policies (11). 61.5% of respondents somewhat agree that CSOs belong in national coalitions and networks to strengthen their voice on policy (12). 35.9%, somewhat agree that CSOs belong in regional and international networks to strengthen their voice on policy (13). 43.6% respondents disagree, that partnership with private sector (14), while 28.2% and 25.6% somewhat agree and agree respectively on the same indicator. 41% of respondents disagree that CSOs have enough funds and capacity to secure own funds (financial autonomy) (15), while 20.5% respondents somewhat agree and 28.2% failed to respond this indicator.

Major strengths and weaknesses are summarized in the table below:

**Table 4: Summary of strengths and weaknesses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Existence of structures and compliance to legal requirement;</td>
<td>1. CSOs mandate and mission not properly shared with all members, constituents and public;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National coverage of CSOs in various areas of national development;</td>
<td>2. Low level of understanding by CSOs about their role in public policy process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community development programs and appropriate approaches for citizen engagement;</td>
<td>3. Poor capacities of leadership, management and administration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Belongingness in national coalitions and networks;</td>
<td>4. Weak human and financial resources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Availability of qualified staff in given areas of interventions;</td>
<td>5. Lack of policy research and evidence on public policy issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Inexistence of formal partnership with key stakeholders (media, private sector, others)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Our study August 2013
4.4.1. Weaknesses

4.4.1.1. CSOs mandate and mission not properly shared with members, constituents and public

71% of Respondents revealed that their CSOs have written mission and vision statement. However, it was noted that their mission and mandate are not properly disseminated and shared with all constituents, decision makers and the public. Moreover, CSOs don’t necessary follow their mission when the design proposals and action plans. Many CSOs are money driven. They are not focused, in their interventions. There exists a donor dependency syndrome within Rwanda CSOs”. Head of Department of CSOs and Political parties at RGB.

4.4.1.2. Poor capacities in leadership, management and administration

The study has revealed that CSOs lack internal democracy and accountability coupled with the personalization of these organizations. Most CSOs in Rwanda are above all accountable to their donors (through making reports and financial statements) but not to the beneficiaries of their services who have little or no insight into financial, administrative and decision making matters. If NGOs are to be agents of democratization, they should themselves use democratic methods of work towards their constituencies and the wider community.

4.4.1.3. Weak human and financial resources

It was noted that more 56.4% and 33.3% (Table 3) of respondents hold Master’s and Bachelor’s degrees in education. But, on the other side the study revealed a lack of skilled and competent staff in charge of policy research and public policy advocacy. CSOs strategies of policy monitoring and advocacy. In addition to that, there is a problem of scarce of funds in all CSOs (41%) (Figure 26c) which was supposed to be solved by the design of competitive projects that meet donor’s requirements. These internal weaknesses decrease the performance of CSOs particularly in the area of public policy process. On the side of financial capacity, Rwandan civil society organizations are poor, unable to self-finance their operations, which exacerbates their limited roles in decision-making. Civic organizations and associations in poor nations, unlike their counterparts in rich countries, are financially weak and depend for the execution of their programs on aid coming from either government or foreign donors. The consequence is that civil society organizations execute the programs that are likely to get funding from donors sometimes at the expense of the real needs of
constituencies. (Mukamunana, R & Brynard, PA, 2005). Hence, existing resources should be used to influence public policy process.

4.4.1.4. Lack of policy research and evidence on public policy issues

More than 51% of respondents of this study stated that their CSOs don’t carry our policy research (Figure 26.b). They have not formalized partnership with research institutions. However, CSOs managed to conduct research on public policies. As reported by respondents during the last five years (2007-2012), CSOs managed to undertake research on policy issues such as Policy research on the process of the Execution of Court Judgments for a sound rule of law in Rwanda by TR-Rwanda in 2011, Conduct a justice sector user perception and victimization study by TR-Rwanda in 2011. Civil Society Barometer Index, 2012 by TR-Rwanda, Land use consolidation by IMBARAGA in 2011, Judgments Courts execution by Transparence International Rwanda, Contribution of Gacaca Jurisdictions in consolidating the Rule of Law and Promoting of Unity and Reconciliation in Rwanda by LIPRODHOR in 2011, Health Insurance Scheme by RCSP in 2012 among others.

4.4.1.5. Lack of public policy monitoring plans and advocacy strategies

51% of respondents have revealed a lack of advocacy strategy, lack of written public policy monitoring plan, lack of advocacy plans and budget for their implementation (see figure 26b). However, this corroborates what stated by (Mukamunana, R & Brynard, PA,2005), Rwandan civil society is young and still weak; it has not yet clearly defined its role as an actor in the public policy-making. There are still in services delivery rather than following public policies.

4.4.2. Strengths

4.4.2.1. National coverage

CSOs in Rwanda intervene at national wide. They operate at national, local and grassroots community levels. Umbrellas organizations are supposed to operate at national level but also implement activities at district level with or not collaboration with their member organizations. The study has shown that CSOs are more active in community development, agriculture, governance and human rights among others. Donors and governments are aware and highly appreciate achievements of CSOs in that particular area.
4.4.2.2. Community development programs and approaches

One among the role of civil society is to fill the gaps of government. These gaps may be originated from the limited capacity of the state or the unwillingness of its officials to accomplish properly their duties. Rwanda CSOs have been playing and still play a role in assisting poor communities, marginalized groups, people affected by particular issues among other. Most of these peoples and their groups live in rural areas where CSOs implement various community development projects using various development approaches and techniques to reach them, work with them and help them to survive and build their future.

4.4.2.3. Belongingness in coalitions and networks

So far, only RCSP accounts 15 member organizations. Among them 10 CSOs are individual organizations while 10 are umbrellas. The 10 umbrellas are comprised of 628 organized groups, associations and organizations. For the matter of this study, only 419 organizations have been considered to have formal structures, be legally registered, and have financial autonomy and capacity to engage in a partnership with any other public and/or private institution. Worth noting is that a CSO may belong in more than one umbrella, more coalitions and networks of its choice.

4.4.2.4. Availability of human, material and financial resources

It was revealed that 56.4% and 33.3% of respondents to this study are bachelor’s and master’s degree holders respectively in multidisciplinary fields. In Rwanda, CSOs are known to be a pepiniere where public and private sector use to pull qualified and skilled staff. In addition, to human resources, respondents indicated that their CSOs have own equipment and materials (fixed and not fixed assets) that facilitate them to design and implement various projects.

4.4.2.5. Good collaboration with public institutions and targeted beneficiaries

Both respondents and informants who participated in this agree on the good relationships between CSOs and public authorities and between and target beneficiaries. This statement corroborates with the CS Barometer Index of 2012, which states that 90%
4.5. Challenges and opportunities for CSOs with regard to public policy process in Rwanda

This sub-section refers to the objective three that seeks to assess challenges and identify opportunities for CSOs with regard to agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Challenges and opportunities are summarized in the following table below:

Table 5: Opportunities and challenges of CSOs in public policy process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Legal framework and political will;</td>
<td>1. Improper enforcement of existing legal framework;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Existence of donors in the areas of public policy process and public policy advocacy;</td>
<td>2. High dependence of CSOs on external funds;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support from umbrellas and national networks;</td>
<td>3. Suspicion and over control by government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistance provided by RCSP to its members and CSOs;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Existence of international organizations and networks defending CSOs</td>
<td>4. Narrow social and geographical basis CSOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Our study August 2013

4.5.1. Challenges

4.5.1.1. Improper enforcement of existing legal framework

The study revealed that there exists political will to involve CSOs in public policy process and existence of the legal framework which is in place such as conventions ratified by the GoR, constitution, NGO laws, religious organizations laws, existence of formal structures and commissions open for CSOs,…). However, respondents are of different views whereby the question of how these laws and policies are enforced in Rwanda. Interviewee from Internal Organizations stated that “I agree that the legal framework was established, but for the political will and conducive environment for CSOs, I doubt. Would you please for instance tell me why the State interferes in internal conflicts of CSOs while the NGO law
stipulates internal mechanisms to be applied?” The concern about legal environment was raised by CIVICUS Civil Society Index (CSI) project of 2008-2011, cited by World Economic Forum, WEF (2013:7) where their report state that across CSOs in 33 countries, only 8% believe that the legal and policy environment for civil society is fully enabling for their operations, and a higher amount (47%) find it either quite limiting or highly restrictive compared to those that find it moderately enabling (45%). To seize and use this opportunity of having legal instruments and open spaces should be an asset for CSOs to play a role in the public policy process, but the Government has a mandate of protecting civil rights.

4.5.1.2. High dependence of CSOs on external funds

In this report, whether respondents or key informants both from civil society and public institutions had pointed out the challenge with regard to a high level of dependence of CSOs to external funds. Invariably this undermines their independence and the sustainability of their programs. In addition, this problem contributes to further weaken any social bases CSOs may have and results in the fact that CSOs are not accountable to the communities they aim to serve, or to their domestic constituencies, but to their pay masters. The relatively easy availability of foreign funding may also result in CSOs approaching donors rather than trying to engage in local and popular mobilization in support of a cause.

4.5.1.3. Suspicion and over control by governmental

The limited space (s) within which CSOs may advance democratization and governance issues combined with the threat to further control their registration and activities. This problem is compounded by the fear or lack of courage by many CSOs to confront or contradict the state on some policy issues. Most local CSOs have remained remarkably silent on political issues and respect for civil and political rights in the country, choosing as they do, to work behind the scenes without active agitation for the respect and observance of human rights (Trociare:1999). They have for the most part avoided a confrontational approach with the state.

However as stated by (Jerry VanSant,)\(^5\) where mutual trust develops, government may invite NGOs to the policy making table to benefit from their experience and, in some cases, research on a public policy issue. He argues also that the nature of government policy toward the NGO sector

is determined by a number of factors including the type of regime, political culture, and the degree of political stability in a given country. As you would expect, pluralism and political space correlate with a healthy and active NGO sector.

**4.5.1.4. Narrow social and geographical basis CSOs**

CSOs are largely characterized as an elite phenomenon with a narrow social base; a weak numerical base and a thin geographical coverage. Most leading CSOs are also urban-based. Most are concentrated in Kigali and conduct only limited activities outside the capital. They have no defined (given) membership at the grassroots level. This reality has a consequence that urban based NGOs don’t assist their constituents living in rural areas in a coordinated way. With minimal representation in rural areas where the majority of constituents reside, these advocacy groups or NGOs cannot justifiably claim to speak on behalf of the rural poor.

**4.5.2. Opportunities**

Beside challenges, there are opportunities that can be seized and used by CSOs to play an effective role in public policy process.

**4.5.2.1. Legal framework and political will**

The GoR has ratified international conventions guarantying rights of association, freedom of expression, and constraining government for defend and protect civil society. In addition, the constitution guarantees fundamental rights political rights and civil liberties included. The existence of NGO law, religious law, access to information law and others may be facilitate the works of CSOs to influence policy.

**4.5.2.2. Existence of donors in the area of public policy advocacy**

A good number of donors and international NGOs are willing to support CSOs in area of public policy process in Rwanda. We have in Rwanda NPA, TROCAIRE, USAID, Trade Mark, to mention few.

**4.5.2.3. Support from umbrellas and national networks**

Figure 27 indicates the support/contribution received by CSO from umbrella/coalition

**Figure 35:** Support of Umbrellas to their member organization
As illustrated by figure 64% CSOs didn’t receive any funds from RCSP, while 36% of respondents revealed that their CSO received funds from umbrella/coalition in the last five years which enabled its involvement in the agenda setting, formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of a public policy. Working in coalition and networks should help CSOs to make their voice heard by decision makers.

**4.5.2.4. Assistance provided by RCSP to its members and CSOs**

**Figure 36:** Assistance provided by RCSP to its members and other CSOs

According to 72% of respondents, CSO received assistance/support/contribution to CSO from the Rwanda Civil Society Platform (RCSP) during the last five years. However, the existence of the RCSP as a forum of a good number of CS intervening in various areas is an opportunity for CSOs to get information, improve coordination and plan together for their effectiveness in public policy process.
Whilst the majority of respondents affirm that most CSOs in belong to umbrella organizations, other sources like (CIVICUS 2010:25) indicate that CSOs have not tried systematically to work together as part of civil society, neither to advocate towards authorities, nor to build links with private sector partners. However, some endeavors have been made, but they lack adequate organization and support.

4.5.2.5. Existence of international organizations and networks defending CSOs

There exist a good number of organizations, networks and UN agencies defending the cause of civil society such as East Africa Civil Society Organizations Forum EACSOF, Human Rights Watch, World Economic Forum (WEF) World Alliance for Citizen Participation (CIVICUS), International Center for Not for Profit Law (ICNL) among others.

4.5.2.6. Existence of media, internet and media social networks

It was revealed that CSOs use internet and social media networks but not for public policy purposes. Given the existence and increase of mass media, print, audio-visual and on lines, CSOs should use them for public policy monitoring and advocacy purposes.
Chap. V. General conclusion

This chapter is comprised of the conclusion, concluding remarks and recommendations and suggestion to further research with regard to CS and public policy process.

5.1. Conclusion

This research has evaluated the role played by civil society organizations in the public policy process in Rwanda through a case study of Rwanda Civil Society Platform. The study was conceptualized having in mind three levels of analysis. The first analysis was focused on activities carried out by CSOs aiming at influencing public policies and the level of interactions with other stakeholders, the second was the analysis of internal capacities of CSOs (strengths and weaknesses) with regard to public policy process, while the third was the analysis of challenges and opportunities of CSOs vis-à-vis the agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

The study applied both quantitative and qualitative research methodology. The study population was 419 civil society organizations that adhered directly to CSOs or indirectly through their umbrellas. The sample of 43 CSOs was purposively chosen and 39 responded to a questionnaire. Interviews and desk research were also used to collect data. The data analysis used the SPSS.

With its limitations, results from this research revealed that the role of civil society in the public policy process in Rwanda still low. In the four stages of the public policy process, other things being equal, the way CSOs play a role differs from an organization to another depending on internal capacities, external factors and area of interventions. The policy implementation ranks first, the monitoring and evaluation ranks second, while policy formulation and agenda setting ranks third and fourth respectively.

Therefore, in influencing agenda setting, results revealed that Rwanda CSOs whether big or small, whether in RCSP, in umbrellas or individual organizations are not playing a significant role in agenda setting. Only 15% of respondents affirmed to participate at this stage. The study was indicated that CSOs don’t carry out policy research, don’t have skilled staff in research, public policies and in public policy advocacy. CSOs are unaware of their mandate
in influencing the agenda setting. CSO which are aware of that role, are not willing to endorse such responsibility arguing merely that government of Rwanda is not yet ready to hear them and consider issues presented by them. However, it was indicated same CSOs, managed to carry out research and policy.

In influencing the formulation and adoption of policy, the study evidence is important way to establish the credibility of CSOs. Well designed and implemented advocacy strategies and plans are the tools to influence policy formulation. However, influencing policy formulation and adoption is a process that requires commitment, time, and competent human resources in research, public analysis skills and availability of funds from civil society side. Without accurate information, high capacity of policy analysis, valid facts, consistent arguments and various alternative solutions, CSOs role in policy formulation and adoption will remain passive and unvalued.

In the implementation of public policy, the role played by Rwanda CSOS is very high District level with an average of 38.5%, while 32.1% implement policies at community level with an average of 23% of respondents and 23.1% at national level. I was indicated that CSOs in Rwanda implement and disseminate public policies through various ways like audio-visual press, training of target beneficiaries and constituents, organizing public meetings at local and national levels, development of sensitization tools such as training modules, bulletins, booklets, promotion materials, Websites among others. However, if CSOs had played and still playing a important role in the public policy implementation compared to which played in the agenda setting, policy formulation and adoption, there is a risk of CSOs to implement or enforce policies that do not necessary respond to people’s needs. Worth is noting that CSOs are constrained to align strictly their projects, plans and activities under government priorities. Playing an active role in the implementation of government policies, which CSOs were not part of during their formulation, should in the long run contribute to the creation of gaps between rich and poor, and other factors associated to social injustice, human rights abuse, unfair distribution of resources, squeezing the political spaces just to mention the few.

As far as monitoring and evaluation is concerned, the role played by CSOs is medium for 38.5% while for 35.9% of respondents stated that is low. Given requirements for CSOs to effective play significant role In policy monitoring and evaluation stage, such as capacity in
public policy analysis, resources both human and financial, developing monitoring and evaluation plans that includes budget, working in coalitions, collaboration with research institutions, working closely with media among others, the study revealed that RCSP and its members prefer to escape to that role or do it in non systematic and coordinated way. The study revealed also that CSOs are unaware of that role and others merely argue that, they lack means to accomplish it.

Like the three previous stages, the monitoring and evaluation is also crucial. CSOs should play a good role in the first three stages, but once they fail in monitoring and evaluation, their efforts will be substituted in vain. They will never know if public policies adopted and implemented are creating or have created positive or negative impact on beneficiaries, constituents and entire community. CSOs will fail to report on failures, successes and best practices of policies and what government should improve to respond properly to citizens needs. They will never know gaps and new emerging issues that require more attention and which must be put on the next agenda setting. In brief, weaknesses and failures of CSOs in playing a key role in monitoring and evaluation will be like closing the cycle of public policies.

The second objective of this study was to analyze strengths and weaknesses of Rwanda civil society organizations in agenda setting, public policy formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The study has identified the following weaknesses such as CSOs mandate and mission not properly shared with all members, constituents and public; Low level of understanding by CSOs about their role in public policy process; Poor capacities of leadership, management and administration; Weak human and financial resources Lack of policy research and evidence on public policy issues; Lack of public policy monitoring plans and advocacy strategies and inexistence of formal partnership with key stakeholders (media, private sector, others). However, the study identified strengths that should be considered as an asset or a tool to be used to influence the process of public policy such as: Existence of structures and compliance to legal requirement; National coverage of CSOs in various areas of national development; Community development programs and appropriate approaches for citizen engagement; Belongingness in national coalitions and networks; Availability of qualified staff and Good reputation vis-à-vis of the beneficiaries among others.
The third objective was to “Assess challenges that Rwanda CS face when they seek to influence public policies and identify opportunities with regard to public policy processes and how they are utilized” The following main challenges were identified and analyzed: improper enforcement of existing legal framework; high dependence of CSOs on external funds; suspicion over control by government, narrow social and geographical basis CSOs. Even so, there are many opportunities that CSOs can be seized to overcome existing challenges and improve their performance as well as participation level in public policy process. Existence of political will to involve CSOs in Public policy process, the existence of legal framework and formal structures and open for CSOs, such as JADF, open day within various public institutions, Sector Working Groups, thematic commissions at parliament level, several networks and coalitions at national, regional and international levels to which CSOs are members, availability of donors and development partners which can financially support CSOs in their programs aiming to influence public policy process.

Given that context, through which Rwanda CSOs operate, the researcher concludes stating that the critical crosscutting issue that CSOs must negotiate in order to influence public policies effectively is the political context. To do so, CSOs are required to strengthen their internal capacities and increase their visibility and reputation on public scene which will enable them to seize existing opportunities and mitigate current challenges. In the whole process of public policy, research and their evidence must be relevant, appropriate and timely, in a specific social, political and economic context. Furthermore, the institutions that any CSO holds within a particular political system, its relationships with the government, other actors, affects the ways it plays the role of influencing public policy. More broadly, however, CSO engagement will very much vary and depend on the nature of the political context (extent of democracy, political spaces in place and how they are utilized), its internal capacities as well as the specific policy stance a government takes on a specific issue.
5.2. Recommendations

The following recommendations as at the end of the study formulated mainly to CSOs, Government and donors.

**CSOs**

The researcher recommends CSOs to reframe and stand on their mandate and mission whereby they should properly play a role of promoting positive social transformation, democracy and sustainable development. In standing on their mission and CSOs, they will embrace the roles of enabler, facilitator, teacher, watch dog and constructive challenger in entire public policy process. Leaders of Rwanda CSOs should think about how organizations like RCSP and umbrellas like CCOAIB, CLADHO, CESTRAR, Pro-Femmes Twese-Hamwe, CEJP, Media Press House, NUDOR, among others, could empower their members and improve the way they defend their interests and promote their rights. By doing so, individual organizations will do the same for their direct beneficiaries, constituents and the entire community. CSOs should access and acknowledge their weaknesses in influencing public policies and adjust their future strategic plans, programs and projects accordingly. In this regard, CSOs are required to invest. Hence forth, building strong coalitions and networks, working in a partnership with media, research institutions and public sector are highly recommended time and money in policy research, public policy monitoring and public policy advocacy.

**GoR and its institutions**

This study recommends

Recognize the fundamental role that civil society plays in building confidence, promoting democracy, good governance and enhancing long-term economic and political stability. Given international conventions ratified by the GoR, constitution and other domestic laws and policies in place, citizens have a right to effective participation in the affairs of their country, and the state has a duty to “create conducive conditions for civil society organizations to exist and operate within the law. The proper enforcement of this legal framework is highly recommended. GoR should also invest in capacity-building, and build integrated consultation processes to crowd source the expertise, innovation and energy of civil society and leading businesses in developing policy and designing social services.
Donors and development partners
This study agrees with Lorenzo Fioramonti & Volkhart Finn Heinrich (2007: 35) who suggests that donors should focus more consistently on strengthening CSOs’ contribution to policy-making as a whole, without assuming that the existence of institutionalized forums equates to functional avenues for civil society to have a say on policy. The researcher agrees with these authors where they suggest that at the same time, donors should assist CSOs in defining policy priorities and goals, instead of establishing them from the outside. Invariably, such a shift in donors’ approach would help create a locally generated policy agenda capable of increasing the level of CSOs and grassroots ownership.
Additionally, donors’ programs should attempt to encourage CSOs to acquire a stronger policy research capacity, considered by this study as a necessary asset if organizations want to exert any influence on technical matters pertaining to the public policy process. As usual financial support technical assistance and coaching of donors to CSOs will be of high importance.

5.3. Further research
At the end of this research, the research recommends that further research be conducted on others topic similar to this study and which are not yet explored:

_role of umbrella organizations in defending interests and promoting rights of its members by taking the case of any umbrella like the RCSP, CCOAIB, CLADHO, Media Press House, Pro-Femmes Twese Hamwe;
_role of CSOs in promoting democratic governance in Rwanda through influencing public policies;
_Rwanda CSOs in public budget tracking._
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Appendixes
Appendix 1: Questionnaire English Version

We are pleased for your willingness to respond to this questionnaire. This questionnaire was developed for an academic research that closes the Masters’ level in Development of Studies at the Faculty of Arts, Medias of National University of Rwanda. The research is entitled “civil society organizations in public policies process in Rwanda, a Case study of Rwanda Civil Society Platform”. The information and data that will be provided will strictly be used for the end of that research. We would like to ensure you that your information will be protected and treated with a maximum of objectify and confidentiality. We will be more that gratefully, if you should give information on your identification and afterwards respond to all questions and return back the questionnaire to us.

I. ORGANISATION’S IDENTIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Full letters:…………………………………</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acronym:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creation date of Organization</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Before 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1990-1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1995-1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2000-2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2005-2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. After 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains fields/ area of intervention:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Human rights &amp; Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Woman and child rights promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Youth empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Medias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Employees rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. People Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Others:…………………………………</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members (Indicate numbers)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Area of intervention

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>National (the whole country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Grassroots community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESPONDENT IDENTIFICATION

Encircle the appropriate answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Under 25 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 31-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 36-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 41-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 46-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 50 years old and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Window</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Niveau d’étude/ studies/ school level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bachelor’s level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Masters level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PhD level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in the organization:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. President/Regal Representative/Chair Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Member of the Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Executive Secretary, General Secretary, Coordinator, Director,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Senior staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Others (specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...............................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience within the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Under one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 4-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More than 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. QUESTIONS

PARTICIPATION IN THE ELABORATION OF THE POLITICAL AGENDA

1. Does your organization intervene and play a role in agenda setting, formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public policies?

If yes, encircle the appropriate stage on intervention
   a) Policy agenda setting
   b) Adoption and formulation of public policy
   c) Implementation of public policy
   d) Monitoring and evaluation of public policy

If no, in what else your organization intervenes? Specify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. At which level does your organization play a role in the following specific activities aiming at putting citizens and constituents needs on political agenda? (Use a cross in the correspondent area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. Determining the specific domain of intervention
B. Problems or issues identification
C. Empirical Research on issues that require public policy
D. Analysis of existing public policies
E. Community awareness raising on the current policy issues
F. Lobbying to the target audiences / concerned decision makers
G. Meetings with decision makers concerned by identified issues
H. Writing letters, notes, petitions, press releases, et ta make the issue known
I. Collaboration avec les media Collaboration with media
J. Collaboration with research institutions
K. Organizing working sessions with decisions makers to influence them to consider and support identified issues
L. Collaboration/liaise with other partners in order to influence decision makers to adopt the identified issues
M. Others:
   ..........................................................................................................................

3. Does your organization make research related to policy concerning your beneficiaries, constituents?

If yes, Mention the titles & Authors of the publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4. **Regarding the problems which can affect your beneficiaries, constituents how do you assess the collaboration regularity between your organization and the political leaders?** *(Put a cross in the appropriate area)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Local leaders at the Sector level
B. Local leaders at the District level
C. Representative of Public Agencies
D. Ministers
E. Parliamentarians
F. Others: ........................................

5. **Does your organization belong in one or many formal structures established by Government to facilitate exchange on public policies?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what are they? *(Put a cross in appropriate area)*

A. Joint Action Development Forum
B. Thematic commissions at District level of interventions
C. Thematic commissions within the Public Agencies (RDB, RGB, RSSSB, RAB, NAEB, REB, NCC, NWC, NYC, etc ……)
D. Thematic commission at Ministry level
E. Thematic commission at parliament level
F. Thematic commission at parliament level
G. Others: ...............................................................

6. **How do you assess the cooperation between your organization and the media regarding issues affecting your beneficiaries/Constituents?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **What are the challenges you faced or are facing to convince political leaders to discuss with them on your beneficiaries/Constituents needs? Write down two which are the major once:**

1. ........................................................................................................
2. ........................................................................................................
3. ........................................................................................................
8. **At which level does your organization play a role in the following activities with regard to public policy formulation and adoption affecting citizens and your constituents?** (Use a cross in the correspondent area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Constitution of coalitions with other partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Collaboration with other partners to influence political leaders in order to make them consider issues raised your constituents in policy formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Collaboration with media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Collaboration with research institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lobbying to target audiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Participation in concertative meetings with decision makers whose mandate to formulate and adopt policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Organize working sessions with decision makers in order to convince them to consider identified issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Community mobilisation and keep good relationships with constituents affected by the issue and the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **If your organization participated in the formulation and adoption of a public policy, please indicate in which occasion and at the level it was involved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Under the invitation of the decisions makers or public officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Under the influence of donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Under the organization ’s initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Under the initiative of the collective / coalition or network in which the organization is member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………
10. In case your organization had participated in the formulation and approval of a public policy, indicate the:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the Policy</th>
<th>Year of adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How do you assess the degree of your influence in the formulation and approval of policies in the last five years (2007-2012)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What are the factors that can explain the performance of your organization in the formulation and approval of policies? Write down 2 which are the major once

a. Positive factors
   1. ....................................................................................................................................................
   2. ....................................................................................................................................................

b. Negative factors
   1. ....................................................................................................................................................
   2. ....................................................................................................................................................

13. At which level does your organization play a role in the following activities with regard to public policy implementation (execution) affecting citizens and your constituents? (Use a cross in the correspondent area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Awareness raising of the target groups, general public, constituents on the adopted policy

B. Partnership with concerned public institutions

C. Meetings with decision maker concerned with the adopted policy

D. Design of projects and programs aiming at implementing the policy

E. Design and implement joint projects with other partners

F. Reporting on the implementation progress of that policy

G. Collaboration avec les media

H. Others: ....................................................................................................................................................
   ..................
14. Indicate a public policy implementation in which your organization would have participated in and when

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/name of the project</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. At which level do you participate in the implementation of the policies? (Encircle the appropriate response)

A. Community
B. District
C. Province
D. National
E. Others: …………………………………………………………………………………

16. How do you assess the regularity of interactions between your organization and the authorities in the implementation of policies affecting your targeted group/beneficiaries? (Put a cross in an appropriate area)

| A. Local authorities at the sector level | Very low | Low | Medium | High | Very high |
| B. Local authorities at the District level |
| C. Public Agencies |
| D. Ministries |
| E. Others: …………………………………………………………………………………………… |

17. If in the last five years (2007-2012) your organization has been involved in the formulation and adoption of a public policy, what were opportunities and challenges vis-à-vis that role? Give two which are the major once

a. Opportunities
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

b. Challenges/Constraints:
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………
18. During the last five years (2007-2012), what activities and at which level did your organization undertake or participate in monitoring and evaluation of public policies affecting your target groups/constituents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Selection of a public policy to be monitored-evaluated by your organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Determine of objectives for monitoring and evaluation of that policy by organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Selection of approaches to be used in monitoring and evaluation of that policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Identification and analysis of stakeholders in that public policy monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Further examination of the policy and its key priorities by your organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Development of methods and tools for data collection and information gathering on that policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Data collection and information gathering on the policy (under monitoring-evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Analysis of data and producing report on the public policy monitored-evaluated and share it with decision makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Develop advocacy plan to influence decision makers to adopt necessary changes in the policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Participate in evaluations commissioned by the public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Participate in validation workshops organized by public sector on public policy evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Others: ..................................................................................................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. If your organization contributed in monitoring and evaluation of a policy, which one and when?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy title</th>
<th>Period of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How do you assess the regularity level of interactions of between your organization and the authorities during the execution of public policies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Local authorities at the sector level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Local authorities at the District level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Public/governmental agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Others: ..................................................................................................................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. How do you rate your influence in the implementation of policies in the last five years (2007-2012)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear mandate and mission of your organization which are shared with your constituents, public and decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strong and credible governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fair and solid internal capacities of management and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The organization has an effective system and clear procedures for informing the community and public about its programs and resources, including written material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The organization has a clear and systematic process for assessing, reviewing and responding to ideas, suggestions, and perceptions from: a. Individuals, b. Community groups, c. the general public and decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Research publications of public policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Advocacy strategy on public policies in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Advocacy plan on public policies in place with its budget for the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Action plan on public policy monitoring with its budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Well qualified, skilled and committed staff in charge of research on public policy and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Use of internet and social medias to influence public policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Belongingness in coalitions and national networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Belongingness in coalitions, regional and international networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Partnership with the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Availability of funds and capacity of secure own funds (level of financial autonomy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. What are the factors that can explain the performance of your organization in the public policy monitoring and evaluation? Write down 2 which are the major once

a. Positive factors
   1. ........................................................................................................................................
   2. ........................................................................................................................................

b. Negative factors
   1. ........................................................................................................................................
   2. ........................................................................................................................................

23. Capacities and skills in relation to the role of your organization in the public policy processes in Rwanda Put a cross to the correspondent area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear mandate and mission of your organization which are shared with your constituents, public and decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strong and credible governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fair and solid internal capacities of management and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The organization has an effective system and clear procedures for informing the community and public about its programs and resources, including written material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The organization has a clear and systematic process for assessing, reviewing and responding to ideas, suggestions, and perceptions from: a. Individuals, b. Community groups, c. the general public and decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Research publications of public policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Advocacy strategy on public policies in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Advocacy plan on public policies in place with its budget for the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Action plan on public policy monitoring with its budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Well qualified, skilled and committed staff in charge of research on public policy and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Use of internet and social medias to influence public policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Belongingness in coalitions and national networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Belongingness in coalitions, regional and international networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Partnership with the private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Availability of funds and capacity of secure own funds (level of financial autonomy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16.

24. If in the last five years your organization has been involved in the agenda setting, formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of a public policy, has your organization received a support/contribution of your umbrella/coalition?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If yes, indicate, the nature and type of support?

```
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………...
```

If non explain why?

```
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………...
```

25. If in the last five years your organization has been involved in the agenda setting, formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of a public policy, has your organization received an assistance/support/contribution from the Rwanda Civil Society Platform (RCSP)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If yes, indicate, the nature and type of the support?

```
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………...
```

If non explain why?

```
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………...
```

26. If in the last five years your organization has been involved in the agenda setting, formulation and adoption, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of a public policy, what are the opportunities observed and challenges with encountered by your organization?

a. Opportunities:

1. 
```
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………...
```

2. 
```
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………...
```

b. Challenges:

```
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………...
```

1) 
```
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………...
```


27. What should you recommend to national civil society organizations to play an effective role in public policy processes in Rwanda? Give only two.

Thank you.
Appendix 2: Interview guide with key informants

(INGO: TROCAIRE, NPA, GIZ, ARC, CHF-International, CARE International, Representatives of RCSP, Public institutions: MINALOC, RGB,....)

1. In your opinion what is/should be the main role of CSOs in PP processes?
2. How do CSOs fulfill this above mentioned role?
3. What is your particular appreciation about the role played by RCSP in the PP (laws, strategies, programs, action plans both at central and local government?)
4. In your experience, what are the major strengths and weaknesses of Rwanda CSOs in this particular area?
5. In your experience, what are the major strengths and weaknesses of RCSP in this particular area?
6. What are the existing potential factors and actors that can be benefic and supportive to CSOs to fulfill their mandate?
7. What are the existing potential factors and actors that can be benefic and supportive to RCSP to fulfill their mandate?
8. What should you suggest to CSOs in general and RCSP in particular for them to improve their role in PP in Rwanda?