Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken

Food Security

Organisation	Date	Reporting Period
Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Bujumbura (Burundi)	August 2014	2013

Activity		2013	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
25157	Energy supply study	3,510,000	Regideso	Government	Mitigation	Principal	Not applicable
25233	Contribution to fertiliser subsidy	5,000,000	Agriculture Ministry	Government	Not applicable	...	Significant
25672	Locally sourced school feeding	1,766,400	WFP	Multilateral organization	Not applicable	...	Not applicable
25799	Land registration Makamba	938,870	ZOA	NGO	Not applicable	...	Significant
24720 KIG regional	Catalist	for Burundi:	IFDC	NGO	Not applicable	...	Not applicable

Activity		2013	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
20415	Land registration	348,250	Swiss Development Cooperation SDC	...	Not applicable	...	Significant
20900	FORCE Microfinance	551,854	Finance Ministry	Government	Not applicable	...	Not applicable
24122	FARN Nutrition	463,982	GVC	NGO	Not applicable	...	Not applicable
24712	Enquete Agricole Nationale	308,725	BTC	...	Not applicable	...	Not applicable
24759	Fertiliser subsidy support project	1,254,031	IFDC	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
25030	Mtabila Refugee integration	192,000	UNDP	Multilateral organization	Not applicable	...	Significant
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...

More activities

Result Area 1	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.1a: How large has the increase in food production been?	No significantly increased production in 2013 nation wide and no significantly increased production in the focus area for food security interventions of the Netherlands (being the provinces Bujumbura rural, Bubanza and Cibitoke). According to the national investment plan for the agricultural sector PNIA, agricultural production should grow by 6% per year from 2012, but in reality far too few programs have been put in place to achieve this. From 2013 onwards, it is expected that 6% growth is realistic, especially because of the new fertiliser subsidy program started up in 2013 with mainly NL funded assistance. This program leads to additional production from 2014 onwards (first harvest in January 2014). In the focus area, a 10% increase of annual production is targeted.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Production in metric tons cereal equivalents, country	1,700,000	1,910,000	1,700,000	1,700,000		ENAB
Indicator 2: number of farmers with increased production, country	0	600,000	0	0		IFDC - PANPNSEB project report
Indicator 3: Production in metric tons cereal equivalents, focus area	290,000	351,000	290,000	290,000		ENAB
Indicator 4: number of farmers with increased production, focus area	0	120,000	0	0		NI funded project reports

Result Question 1.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	No contribution of NL program to results in 2013. Assistance to the new fertiliser subsidy program which will bear its fruits from the January 2014 harvest onwards. Other activities contributing directly to production were not yet started up in 2013. Since soil fertility is the most limiting factor in Burundi for increasing agricultural production, and since improved availability of fertiliser will trigger the demand for other productivity increasing technologies to become available in the course of several years, the investment in the fertiliser subsidy program is taken as a valuable proxi for the NL contribution to agricultural growth between 2013 and 2015.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: percentage of the new national fertiliser subsidy program funded by the NL embassy multiplied by production increase as measured by indicator 1.1a - 1, for country (tons)	0	100,000	0	0		ENAB + project reports
Indicator 2: percentage of the new national fertiliser subsidy program funded by the NL embassy multiplied by number of farmers as measured by indicator 1.1a - 2, for country	0	200,000	0	0		IFDC - PANPNSEB project report
Indicator 3: percentage of aid to agricultural sector projects provided by the NL embassy multiplied by production increase as measured by indicator 1.1a - 3, for focus area (3 provinces) (tons)	0	20,000	0	0		ENAB + project reports
Indicator 4: percentage of aid to agricultural sector projects provided by the NL embassy multiplied by number of farmers as measured by indicator 1.1a - 4, for focus area (3 provinces)	0	40,000	0	0		Project reports

More indicators

Result Area 1	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.2a: How has the use of land, water, energy and labour developed?	No significant development in recent years. Some projects of IFAD, EU and Wordbank and NGO's have worked on an increase of the area under erosion control measures (water capture terraces/tranches and vegetation strips), valley bottom water management improvement, and on an increase of available livestock at village level, but these contributions have overall been insignificant to measure an increase in land and water management efficiency nation wide. The same is true for energy use efficiency, despite some projects (a.o. IFDC-SEW) introducing improved cooking stoves and improved energy efficiency in char coal and brick production. Nevertheless, these projects are part of the agricultural investment plan of Burundi to which donors adhere, but altogether the level of funding available for this investment plan is insufficient.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: Agricultural productivity in tons (cereal equivalents) per ha per season, country	1.7	2.0	1.7	1.7		ENAB
Indicator 2: Agricultural productivity in tons (cereal equivalents) per ha per season, focus area (3 provinces)	1.9	2.5	1.9	1.9		ENAB
Indicator 3: Area of land with permanent erosion control measures (ha)	not available	to be determined				ENAB
Indicator 4: Area of land under irrigation (ha)	not available	to be determined				

Result Question 1.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	There have ben some results by the regional project IFDC-SEW, which has been evaluated in 2013. Its results indicated good qualitative results, but no measurable large scale impact yet. From 2014 onwards, a positive impact is expected of the NL funded IFDC - PANPNSEB project associated with the fertiliser subsidy program, which includes elements for profitable and sustainable use of mineral fertilser by associating soil and water conservation measures, use of manure and other agronomic measures.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: percentage of the new national fertiliser subsidy program funded by the NL embassy multiplied by productivity increase since 2012 as measured by indicator 1.2a - 1, for country (ton/ha)	0	0.10	0	0		ENAB + project reports
Indicator 2: percentage of aid to agricultural sector projects provided by the NL embassy multiplied by productivity increase since 2012 as measured by indicator 1.2a - 2, for focus area (3 provinces)	0	0.15	0	0		ENAB + project reports
Indicator 3: Area of land with permanent erosion control measures funded by NL Embassy program (ha)	6,000 (SEW)	to be determined	6,000	6,000		project reports
Indicator 4: Area of land under irrigation (ha) funded by NL Embassy program	0	to be determined	0	0		project reports

More indicators

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 1	Increase in sustainable food production
B. Results achieved as planned Reasons for result achieved:	The new activities were not supposed to lead to results in 2013, because they were only started up in 2013. Nevertheless, the new national fertiliser subsidy program, formulated through lobby and investment by the NL Embassy, is very promising for future results. The formulation of this very program has lead to the assessment of the quantitative results to be obtained as presented in this result framework (which were not yet quantified in the MASP 2012-2015). New programs will become more successful in combination with the fertiliser subsidy program.
Implications for planning:	Continue as progammed in new MASP 2014-2017

Result Area 2	Better access to sufficiently nutritious food					
Result Question 2.1a: How large has the increase in availability of sufficiently nutritious food been?	What matters is whether food is available for the targeted local population. On the one hand, food must be produced, but on the other hand, people must have knowledge and money to buy (or grow) good food. Because of this complexity, the NL Embassy has decided to concentrate its efforts for result area 2 on one focus area, being the North-western region: provinces of Bujumbura rural, Bubanza and Cibitoke (= focus area). One activity has been started in 2012 (GVC-FARN) and a second in 2013 (PAM-school feeding). Results in terms of outcomes are not yet measurable in 2013.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: under 5 nutrition status in focus area : % of chronically malnourished children	57	46	57	not yet measurable		project report GVC
Indicator 2: post harvest losses (percentage) in focus area	not measured					special research
indicator 3: average farmer household income in focus area (USD)	930	1,070	930	not measured		ENAB
indicator 4: primary school completion rate (%)	51	75	51	68		Education Ministry and UNICEF

Result Question 2.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	The NL Embassy finances two projects which explicitly focus on nutrition: One project (started in 2012) is executed by an NGO named GVC in collaboration with the Ministry of Health, working on awareness and training on nutrition at community level (FARN approach). The second project (started in 2013) is executed by World Food Program (WFP) supplying school feeding with locally purchased commodities including food fortification. The nation wide fertiliser subsidy program (under result area 1) also contributes to food availability and purchasing power of the local population.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: number of communities having benefited from set up and training of FARNs (100% = 427)	0	427	0	184		project report GVC
Indicator 2: number of farmers with increased income through NL funded activities	0	40,000	0			ENAB+ progress reports
Indicator 3: Number of pupils having benefited from a daily good school meal (full year)	0	85,000	0	0 (no full year)		WFP
Indicator 4:Number of local farmers having benefited from selling produce for school meals	0	15,000	0	0 (starts in 2014)		WFP

More indicators

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 2	Better access to sufficiently nutritious food
B. Results achieved as planned	The projects were started in 2012 and 2013, so no measurable outcome results were expected in 2013, except for regional IFDC-Catalist program
Reasons for result achieved:	
Implications for planning:	Continue execution of program as decribed in MASP 2014-2017.

Result Area 3	More efficient markets and an improved business climate					
Result Question 3.1a: Did business activity and trade increase and was it inclusive?	Progress of economic development is very slow in Burundi, and hardly any new investors are interested to invest in Burundi. One of the reasons is the extreme poverty of its population, causing low purchasing power and also continued low productivity in agriculture. Inverting this trend should be done through the agricultural sector, where 90% of the population still earns its living. .					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: GDP of Burundi (millions USD)	2,588	3,170	2,588 (growth 4%)	2,685		Finance Ministry
Indicator 2: Agricultural GDP of Burundi (millions USD)	1,000	1,200	1,000 (growth 4%)	973		Finance Ministry
indicator 3: Part of Agricultural GDP sold on markets (%)	12	20	12	not included in ENAB		ENAB
indicator 4: Number of farmers having obtained agricultural credit (%)	5	10	5	5		ENAB

Result Question 3.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	The Embassy has programmed to contribute significantly to an improved inclusive business climate focussing on the agriculture sector. The program includes improved access to land, market developement for agricultural inputs (fertiliser and seed) and outputs (value chains), improved access to agricultural finance, and (from 2015) improved infrastructure (land and water management and/or feeder roads). On top of this, a number of PSI investment projects will lead to results in terms of newly created jobs and income improvement.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator 1: increased turn over of enterprises supported by NL: PSI, PUM, DGGF etc. (USD)	0	N / A	0			project reports
Indicator 2: newly created jobs through NL supported businesses (PSI, PUM, DGGF etc)	0	N / A	0			project reports
indicator 3: number of farmers having obtained land certificates through NL financed land registration services	4,724 of which 4% female	36,990	4,724 of which 4% female	14,990 of which 9% female		project reports
Indicator 4: number of farmers with access to rural /agricultural credit due to NL funded support program (compared to 2012)	0	50,000	0	0		project reports

More indicators

Result Area 3	More efficient markets and an improved business climate					
Result Question 3.2a: How large has the increase been in international investments and international trade?	The increase in international trade is low because of slow economic growth, whereas international investment is also low and further depressed by unfavorable prospects for future growth. Therefore values of the indicators are very variable and unpredictable.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
indicator 1: volume of foreign investment (millions USD)	not determined	N/A	0.59	118		Burundi reserve bank (BRB) reports
indicator 2: volume of export of agricultural commodities (millions USD)	not determined	150	121	43		Burundi reserve bank (BRB) reports
indicator 3: volume of export of agricultural commodities to the Netherlands (millions USD)	not determined	N/A	1.2	1.14		Burundi reserve bank (BRB) reports
indicator 4: volume of import of goods from the Netherlands (millions USD)	not determined	N/A	8.2	22.05		Burundi reserve bank (BRB) reports

Result Question 3.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	The centrally funded PSI program is contributing to foreign investments from the Netherland. A qualitative output of the Embassy has been, through lobby and technical assistance, the formulation, by the Burundian Government, of a new fertiliser subsidy program which has become operational in 2013, allowing privatisation of fertiliser supply and higher productivity in agriculture, accessible for all smallholders growing food crops.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
indicator 1: volume of investment by Dutch businesses (millions USD)	not determined	N / A	0	45,64		
Indicator 2: volume of foreign investment that has been co-funded by Dutch instruments such as PSI (USD)	not determined	N / A	t.b.d.			PSI funded projects reports
Indicator 3: volume of agricultural export that has been made possible by NL funded value chain development projects or other support (partnership programs, PUM, etc.). (USD)	not determined	N / A	0	0		

More indicators

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 3	More efficient markets and an improved business climate
B. Results achieved as planned	Not many results were expected in 2013, but the fact that the IOB mission of october 2013 recommanded additional studies before approving the programmed new projects for agricultural finanace (with ICCO-Terrafina) and value chain development (with ICCO and SPARK), and that the approval of a new seed sector development program (with IFDC) also met with delays, leading to approval of all these activities after July 2014, will lead to fewer results than planned for 2014 and 2015.
Reasons for result achieved:	
Implications for planning:	Review results to be obtained in 2014, 2015 (less ambitious MASP 2014-2017).

Back

Result Area 1 (remaining indicators)	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.1a: How large has the increase in food production been?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 1.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Back to result area 1

Result Area 1 (remaining indicators)	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.2a: How has the use of land, water, energy and labour developed?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 1.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Back to result area 1

Result Area 2 (remaining indicators)	Better access to sufficiently nutritious food					
Result Question 2.1a: How large has the increase in availability of sufficiently nutritious food been?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 2.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Back to result area 2

Result Area 3 (remaining indicators)	More efficient markets and an improved business climate					
Result Question 3.1a: Did business activity and trade increase and was it inclusive?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 3.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Back to result area 3

Result Area 3 (remaining indicators)	More efficient markets and an improved business climate					
Result Question 3.2a: How large has the increase been in international investments and international trade?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 3.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Back to result area 3

Extra Activities		2013	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
	M-BUZ client cert Digitally signed by M-BUZ client cert DN: c=NL, o=M-BUZ, cn=M-BUZ client cert Date: 2014.09.29 08:23:47 +02'00'			…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…
				…	…	…	…

Go to result area 1