

Global Financing Facility

Civil Society and Youth-led Organization Landscape Assessment

April 2023

Country Report: Rwanda

Number of respondents: 6

PAI conducted an open consultation in February and March 2023 inviting civil society organizations (CSOs) and youth-led organizations (YLOs) to share their perspectives about civil society and youth engagement in country-level policy processes as well as global health financing fora, including those related to the Global Financing Facility (GFF). The survey, which was publicly available in both English and French, received a total of 150 responses from 33 GFF focus countries. The survey elicited feedback on the CSO/YLO landscape in each GFF partner country, including strengths, gaps and challenges faced by CSO/YLOs in their work and engagement in GFF processes. The findings from the consultation will be used to define opportunities to strengthen multi-sectoral collaboration, including increasing meaningful CSO/YLO engagement GFF



processes at the country level. The survey is also intended to identify priorities and opportunities to strengthen CSO/YLO networks to ensure they are positioned, resourced, and equipped to act as advocates to advance sexual, reproductive, maternal, newborn, child and adolescent health and nutrition (SRMNCAH-N).

Overview

Six respondents to the 2023 CSO/YLO Community Survey reported working in Rwanda. Of these organizations, two identified themselves as CSOs, one as an INGO, one as a research institute, one as a social enterprise, and one as a community-based organization (CBO). Five respondents reported that they have not received funding from PAI, and one was unsure whether it has received funding from PAI.

Survey respondents were asked to select all the geographic levels at which they work (e.g., subnational, national, regional, and global). Of the respondents who work in Rwanda, their geographical focus was as follows: two work at the subnational, national, regional, and global levels, two at the national level, one at the national and regional levels, and one at the regional level. Though all six organizations reported working in

Rwanda, four of them work in different countries including Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Malawi, and others. As a result, some of the findings presented in this country report may also reflect these respondents' experience working regionally and globally.

Most of the respondents that work in Rwanda reported working in health and nutrition (including SRMNCAH-N), as well as climate change and gender equality. Of those that work in health and nutrition, the organizations that responded to the survey focus on the following areas: adolescent health, nutrition, and maternal health. Respondents also predominately conduct the following activities: advocacy, youth engagement, and research.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 below provide additional information about the respondents' work by sector, areas of focus in health and nutrition, and specific activities. Please note that the respondents selected all answer choices that were relevant.

Table 1. Sectors in which respondents work in Rwanda, 2023 CSO/YLO Community Survey

Sectors	Number of respondents
Health and nutrition, including SRMNCAH-N	6
Climate change	5
Education	1
Human rights	1
Gender equality	4
Governance	2
Farmer Institutional Development (FID), Community Livelihoods	1

Table 2. Health and nutrition focus areas of respondents in Rwanda, 2023 CSO/YLO Community Survey

Health and Nutrition Focus Area	Number of respondents
Sexual and reproductive health	3
Maternal health	4
Newborn and child health	3
Adolescent health	5
Nutrition	5
Neglected tropical diseases (NTDs), including malaria	1
Universal health coverage (UHC)	1
Global Health innovation, including vaccines, medicines, devices, diagnostics and digital tools	1
Environmental health	1

Table 3. Activities that responding organizations implement in Rwanda, 2023 CSO/YLO Community Survey

Organizational Activity	Number of respondents
Advocacy	6
Research	4
Accountability and monitoring	2
Civic engagement	3
Youth engagement	5
Health financing	3
Policy development	3
Technical assistance	2
Coalition building	3
Service delivery	5
Health R&D and regulatory strengthening	1
Digital health	1
Capacity building	1

As indicated in Table 4 below, most of the respondents in Rwanda categorized their significant accomplishments or “wins” as the following: mobilized multilateral or bilateral resources for health and/or nutrition; mobilized domestic resources for health and/or nutrition; implemented high-impact programs; and effectively carried out youth engagement.

Table 4. Respondents’ accomplishments and “wins” in Rwanda, 2023 CSO/YLO Community Survey

Organizational Accomplishment or “Win”	Number of respondents
Mobilized multilateral or bilateral resources for health and/or nutrition	5
Mobilized domestic resources for health and/or nutrition	5
Supported policy development	4
Supported a specific policy win	3
Implemented high-impact programs	5
Effectively carried out civic engagement	4
Effectively carried out youth engagement	5
Conducted impactful research	4
Convened or assumed a leadership role in coalitions	4
Community mobilization	1
Advisory and technical assistance to country governments and policy makers, and NGOs/CSOs; Thought partnership to technical multilateral agencies.	1

CSO/YLO Capacity Gaps and Opportunities

The respondents that work in Rwanda ranked the activity of the broader CSO/YLO community in Rwanda as a 7.7 out of 10 where 1 indicates that the CSO/YLO community is not active; 5 indicates that it is moderately active including dynamic coalitions and partnerships; and 10 indicates that it is highly active in a manner that leads to impact. These organizations provided the following additional information about their categorization of the CSO/YLO landscape as follows:

- “We are moderately active in a way that we implement short term projects that end when a project is gaining momentum. At times we do not have funding.”
- Partnership and complementarity between international NGOs would support CSO/YLOs engaged in advocacy in a much more beneficial way.

These responding organizations listed the top two areas in which they need the most support related to organizational development:

- Financial management (e.g., Fundraising, Business development, procurement, donor relations, grants management) -- *67% of respondents*
- Partnerships and Coalitions (e.g., Coalition creation, coordination, management) -- *50% of respondents*

The survey respondents listed the top two areas that their organization needs the most support related to technical capacity as follows:

- Research -- *50% of respondents*
- Domestic resource mobilization -- *50% of respondents*

To address the areas where respondents would need support related to organizational development and technical capacity, the respondents listed the following interventions:

- Funding (e.g., grants) -- *67% of respondents*
- Working session or technical consultation with a technical expert (1:1) -- *50% of respondents*

The majority (67% respondents) preferred that these interventions be offered in a hybrid format with both virtual and in-person components.

SRMNCAH-N Policies and Health Financing Priorities and Challenges

Four respondents that work in Rwanda reported being somewhat familiar with the country's government priorities related to SRMNCAH-N and four reported that they engage in work related to the development of policies that are supportive of SRMNCAH-N in their country context. Of the respondents that reported engaging in policy development and health financing in the past, they listed the key entry points for their engagement:

- Participation in CSO/YLO networks
- Direct advocacy toward country government representatives
- GFF processes

The respondents reported that the following are the most pressing opportunities and/or needs to advance or sustain SRMNCAH-N in their country contexts:

- Supporting SRHR and UHC
- Increasing youth Engagement and community-based participatory approaches (CBPA)
- Strengthening multi-stakeholder engagement and platforms
- Building skills of CSOs/YLOs in advocacy, budget advocacy and tracking, and accountability for health

They also reported the following as the greatest challenges to advancing these opportunities:

- Lack of funding for civil society and youth engagement
- Limited coordination among SRMNCAH-N stakeholders
- Lack of funding for SRMNCAH-N issues
- Limited civic space for civil society and youth engagement
- Restrictive policy environment

Global Financing Facility (GFF)

Before receiving this survey, three respondents that work in Rwanda reported that they were engaged in GFF processes. Another respondent reported learning about the GFF through LinkedIn and the remaining two respondents declined to answer this question. According to respondents that were at least somewhat aware of the GFF, they described the greatest value add of the GFF as follows:

- “Increases [the amount of] dedicated resources for SRMNCAH-N”
- Multi-stakeholder approach
- “Opportunity to build up a strong advocacy movement for SRMNCAH-N”
- Allows for information sharing and is “grassroot-based”

Respondents also reported being engaged in other health-focused platforms, financing mechanisms, and networks globally, regionally, and nationally, including PMNCH, UHC2030's CSEM, ENAP+EPMM, and AlignMNH. Generally, respondents reported that CSO/YLOs in their networks learn about engagement opportunities or health and development mechanisms through the following avenues:

- WhatsApp and/or e-mail groups or listservs
- Multilateral institutions or mechanisms (i.e., UN agencies, World Bank, and other regional banks, PMNCH, SUN, etc.)
- Bilateral institutions or mechanisms (i.e., USAID, FCDO, etc.)

Out of the total of six respondents that work in Rwanda, two were aware of GFF-related activities that were underway in their country at the time of the survey. One was not aware of GFF-related activities and three declined to respond. Respondents reported that the following GFF activities are active in Rwanda:

- GFF Multi-stakeholder Country Platform
- CSO/YLO Country GFF Coalition
- Consultations related to the country's Investment Case
- Other GFF meetings / stakeholder consultations
- Consultations with GFF Liaison Officer

One respondent reported being very familiar with their country's Investment Case implementation status, while one was somewhat familiar, and one was not familiar at all. The other three respondents declined to answer this question.

Two respondents that work in Rwanda reported that CSO/YLOs have been invited to engage in GFF processes in their country, including:

- GFF Multi-stakeholder Country Platform
- CSO/YLO Country GFF Coalition
- Contributions to the country's Investment Case
- GFF meetings / stakeholder consultations
- Engagement with GFF Liaison Officer
- Joint Learning Agenda by the GFF Secretariat

One respondent was unsure whether CSO/YLOs had been invited to engage in GFF processes in Rwanda. Only two respondents reported that there is a CSO/YLO Country GFF Coalition in their country, while one was unsure and the other three declined to answer. These respondents also ranked their relationship with the GFF Liaison Officer a 4.9 out of 10, where 1 indicates no relationship between CSO/YLOs and the GFF Liaison Officer, 5 indicates some engagement and communication between the two, and 10 indicates active engagement and collaboration between CSO/YLOs and the GFF Liaison Officer. One respondent said that "supportive and accessible GFF Liaison Officers that also support CSOs/YLOs especially with information on the GFF processes in-country" are vital to meaningful CSO/YLO engagement.

Two respondents working in Rwanda reported that their organization has engaged in GFF processes, while one said they had not. Organizations reported engaging in the following GFF processes in their country:

- GFF Multi-stakeholder Country Platform
- CSO/YLO Country GFF Coalition
- Civil Society Coordinating Group (CSCG)
- Development efforts related to the country's Investment Case
- GFF meetings / stakeholder consultations
- Capacity building of CSOs/YLOs

One described their engagement in GFF processes as very impactful, one said it has been somewhat impactful, and four declined to answer. When asked to describe their organization's contributions to these GFF processes that led to impact, they said, one respondent reported they supported community engagement in GFF processes.

Respondents working in Rwanda reported that the following top five factors enable meaningful CSO/YLO participation in GFF processes:

- Open communication with GFF stakeholders (e.g., GFF Liaison Officer, GFF NGO Host)
- Opportunities to engage in the GFF Multi-stakeholder Country Platform
- Invitations to attend GFF meetings and stakeholder consultations.
- Strong CSO/YLO Country GFF Coalition
- Opportunities to engage in the development of the Investment Case

According to the respondents, the top two barriers that hinder meaningful CSO/YLO engagement in GFF processes in Rwanda are:

- Lack of communication from GFF stakeholders (e.g., GFF Liaison Officer, GFF NGO Host)
- Lack of coordination among CSO/YLO stakeholders

Respondents also said that CSO/YLOs need the following information to engage effectively in GFF processes in their country:

- Basic information about the GFF
- How to apply for grant funding through the GFF NGO host
- Regular information about health financing mechanisms (e.g., country, multilateral, and bilateral)
- Country government targets related to SRMNCAH-N
- Data resources for SRMNCAH-N advocacy and accountability
- Capacity building for domestic resource mobilization
- Best practices on civil and youth engagement in GFF processes

Respondents in Rwanda listed the following future opportunities to strengthen CSO/YLO engagement with GFF processes at the global, regional, and country levels:

- CSO/YLO engagement in accountability processes, as well as joint learning and cross-country learning processes.
- Future capacity building events on key issues such as advocacy and accountability as well as understanding government policy making and budgeting processes.