

SAVING
LIVES
CHANGING
LIVES



World Food
Programme

Decentralized Evaluation

Evaluation of USDA's Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program (Rwanda 2017-2019)

Endline – Final Report

May, 2020

WFP Rwanda

Evaluation Manager: Sameera Ashraf

Prepared by

Muriel Visser, team leader

Laure Steer, Agricultural Value Chain and Farmer Organization Specialist

Ernest Midega, Statistician and data analyst

Moses Mwangi, Lead statistician and quantitative quality assurance expert

Raphael Rurangwa, Agriculture expert

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team gratefully acknowledges the contributions of cooperative leaders and members as well as other stakeholders in Rwanda for this report. The team also thanks the WFP Country Office in Rwanda for its assistance in planning and implementing the baseline and endline data collection.

Disclaimer

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the Evaluation Team, and do not necessarily reflect those of the World Food Programme. Responsibility for the opinions expressed in this report rest solely with the authors. Publication of this document does not imply endorsement by WFP of the opinions expressed.

The designation employed and the presentation of material in maps do no imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WFP concerning the legal or constitutional status of any country, territory or sea area, or concerning the delimitation of frontiers.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Disclaimer	i
Figures	iv
Tables	v
Executive Summary	vii
Methodology	viii
Key Findings	viii
Operational Recommendations	xi
Strategic Recommendations	xi
1. Introduction	13
1.1. Overview of the Evaluation Subject	13
1.2. Context	15
1.3. Evaluation Methodology and Limitations	18
1.4. Overview of the characteristics of survey respondents	21
1.5. Ethics and gender	22
1.6. Limitations	23
2. Evaluation Findings	24
2.1. Evaluation Question 1 - How relevant is the design of the intervention in terms of the context; needs of the most vulnerable groups; needs of male and female beneficiaries; and priorities of the government and WFP partners?	24
2.2. Evaluation Question 2 - How has cooperative ability ‘to be’, ‘to organize’, ‘to relate’ and ‘to do’ evolved from baseline to endline?	27
2.3. Evaluation Question 3 - Have the LRP project interventions affected male and female SHF knowledge, capacity and choices/behaviour from baseline to endline?	37
2.4. Evaluation Question 4 - Has the LRP contributed to creating new market opportunities for male and female SHF?	42
2.5. Evaluation Question 5 - To what extent do producers market food products that meet quality standards and that are nutritious and culturally accepted?	46
2.6. Evaluation Question 6 - Has the LRP programme affected male and female SHF income, and in what way?	47
2.7. Evaluation Question 7 - Is there evidence that the LRP programme affected male and female SHF differently?	50

2.8.	Evaluation Question 8 – What internal and external factors affected results?	54
3.	Conclusions and Recommendations	57
3.1.	Overall Assessment/Conclusions	57
3.2.	Lessons learnt	60
3.3.	Recommendations	60
Annexes		64
Annex 1.	Terms of Reference	64
Annex 2.	LRP Project activities and targets	80
Annex 3.	Detailed Theory of Change for the LRP Project	81
Annex 4.	Evaluation Matrix	82
Annex 5.	List of persons met at endline	92
Annex 6.	Survey tool	93
Annex 7.	How has cooperatives ability ‘to be’, ‘to organize’, ‘to relate’ and ‘to do’ evolved from baseline to endline?	96
Annex 8.	Have the LRP project interventions affected male and female SHF knowledge, capacity and choices/behaviour from baseline to endline?	108
Annex 9.	Additional information on the question: Has the LRP contributed to creating new market opportunities for male and female SHF? (including from schools)	115
Annex 10.	Additional information on the question: To what extent do producers market food products that meet quality standards and are nutritious and culturally accepted?	118
Annex 11.	Has the LRP programme affected male and female SHF income and in what way?	120
Annex 12.	Assessment of the project’s performance looking at the monitoring indicators..	121
Annex 13.	Bibliography	123
	List of Acronyms	135

Figures – Main report

Figure 1: Representation of cooperative abilities (scoring based on qualitative data collection during the endline)..	28
Figure 2: Farmers reasons for being interested in cooperative activity (qualitative data collection based on 12 cooperatives, multiple option choice)	30
Figure 3: Level of payment of shares in cooperatives (qualitative data collection)	31
Figure 4: Cooperative resource mobilisation systems (qualitative data collection).....	31
Figure 5 - Percentage of SHF with excellent score on training on GAP and PHHS (quantitative survey).....	36
Figure 6 - Percentage of SHFs that have heard of GAP and PHHS (quantitative survey).....	36
Figure 7: Evolution of the amount spent on fertilizers in RWF (quantitative data collection).....	38
Figure 8 (left): LRP cooperative contract achievement rate for (RWARRI)	43
Figure 9 (right): Factors that influence cooperative choice by clients (multiple options possible, qualitative data collection, N=12 cooperatives)	43
Figure 10: Quantity of maize kept for household consumption during the last planting season (survey results)	46
Figure 11: Percentage of farmers who purchased maize and beans for family consumption in seasons A and B	48
Figure 12: Quantity of maize sold in kg by season from baseline to endline (quantitative survey).....	48
Figure 13: Amount of money from the sales of maize from baseline to endline (quantitative survey)	48
Figure 14: Percentage of farmers who purchased maize and beans for family consumption in seasons A and B (survey results)	49
Figure 15 - Percentage of farmers who purchased maize and beans for family consumption in seasons A and B (survey results).....	50

Figures – Annexes

Figure 14: location of FTMA cooperatives in the four targeted districts (WFP):.....	80
Figure 15: Basic information on LRP cooperatives (qualitative data collection and WFP documents)	96
Figure 16: Representation of the abilities of high potential cooperatives (scoring based on qualitative data collection during baseline)	97
Figure 17: Representation of the abilities of cooperatives that are losing momentum (scoring based on qualitative data collection at baseline).....	98
Figure 18: Representation of the abilities of nascent cooperatives (scoring based on qualitative data collection during baseline)	98
Figure 19: Importance of support received from LRP (open choice question to 12 cooperatives, qualitative data collection)	100
Figure 20: Cooperative 'common vision (qualitative data collection, to 12 cooperatives, multiple option choice) ..	101
Figure 21: Cooperative financial resources (qualitative data collection)	102
Figure 22: Use of cooperatives resources (multiple option choice, qualitative data collection, 12 cooperatives).....	102

Figure 23 : Risks of credit for cooperatives (multiple choice option, qualitative data collection based on 12 cooperatives)	103
Figure 24 : Percentage of the marshland dedicated to maize (qualitative data collection and data from WFP)	104
Figure 25: Crops grown by season (qualitative data collection).....	104
Figure 26: Maize production estimation (qualitative data collection and data from WFP)	105
Figure 27: Evolution of cooperatives sale and buyers (qualitative data collection).....	105
Figure 28: Evolution of cooperative post-harvest handling and storage capacities (qualitative data collection)	105
Figure 29 : Analysis of the evolution of services received by cooperative members (quantitative data collection) ..	107
Figure 30 : Percentage of farmers planting maize, comparing baseline and endline for season A and B (quantitative survey)	111
Figure 31- Percentage of farmers planting beans, comparing baseline and final for season A and season B (quantitative survey).....	110
Figure 32 : SHFs source of fertilizers (quantitative data collection).....	113
Figure 33: Evolution of maize production in Rwanda (NISR annual surveys).....	115
Figure 34 : Delivery of produce from LRP cooperatives to the formal market (RWARRI)	116
Figure 35: Percentage of farmers by household preference on characteristics of the maize and beans (quantitative survey)	118
Figure 36 - Nutrition analysis of a daily meal consisting of 120g maize meal, 30g beans and 15g vegetable oil.....	119
Figure 37: Net margin/ha for maize cultivation based on different cropping systems, price and buyers (qualitative data collection)	120

Tables – main report

Table 1 : Overview of evaluation questions	vii
Table 2: Actors working in agriculture and rural development in Rwanda (documentary review)	18
Table 3: Agreed evaluation questions and their coverage at baseline and end-line	19
Table 4 : Background characteristics of the small holder farmers (SHF)	21
Table 5 : Relevance of LRP interventions to the priorities of the GoR	25
Table 6: Women’s participation in LRP's activities (WFP reports).....	51

Tables – Annexes

Table 7: Cooperative capacity to document their activities and resources (qualitative data collection)	101
Table 8: Evaluation team assessment of cooperative document and record keeping system (qualitative data collection)	101
Table 9: Analysis of extension services received by SHFs (quantitative survey)	108

Table 10 : Number of SHFs trained on GAP and PHHS (WFP/RWARRI).....	108
Table 11: Analysis of the training received by SHFs (quantitative survey).....	109
Table 12 : Adoption of GAP practices (mVAM results).....	110
Table 13: Mean hectares for maize and beans planting (quantitative survey).....	112
Table 14 : PHE received by cooperatives (WFP).....	113
Table 15 : how SHFs are using the profit generated my maize (FGDs)	120

Executive Summary

This endline report was commissioned by the Rwanda World Food Programme (WFP) Country Office and has been prepared as part of the activity evaluation of the Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement (LRP) project funded by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The baseline took place in October-November 2017, and the endline data was collected in June 2019. The purpose of the endline was to compare the situation of the LRP intervention at the time the project was ending with the starting point in September 2017. The evaluation combined accountability and learning objectives. At endline, the evaluation focused on providing a comprehensive assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, and lessons learned from the intervention. The expected users for this report are USDA and the WFP Rwanda Country Office, as well as the Government of Rwanda and its partners.

Agriculture is a key element of Rwanda's development policy (Vision 2020 and 2050). It contributes 33 percent of the Gross Domestic Product and employs 80 percent of the population. However, farmers still face many challenges including poor capacity, access to inputs, and access to markets. These factors were taken into account when designing the LRP project. The objective of the LRP project has been to strengthen farmer cooperatives to promote increased use of locally purchased food. Expected outcomes include improving access to loans and markets and enhancing cooperative capacity to be reflected in increased sales, improved quality of produce, and reduced commodity losses.

The LRP covered five key project activities: purchasing of maize and beans from small holder farmers (SHF), building capacities of SHFs, connecting farmers to the Patient Procurement Platform, connecting SHFs to new markets and collaborating with the Government of Rwanda. The LRP has been implemented by WFP in four districts (Huye, Gisagara, Nyaruguru and Nyamagabe), with a total budget of USD two million, of which USD 1.36 million was assigned to the procurement of food from SHF. The total number of beneficiaries of the LRP over two years was 5,617 farmers and respectively 43,855 and 41,521 primary school pupils in 2018 and 2019. The evaluation covered the LRP cooperative activities and outcomes. Data on the

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_3575

