
# Food Security

| Organisation | Date | Reporting Period |
|---|---|---|
| Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Kigali (Rwanda) | August 2014 | 2013 |

| Activity | | 2013 | Implemented by | | Rio marker | | Gender marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number | Name | Actual expenditure | Name Organisation | channel | mitigation/adaptation | significant/principal | significant/principal |
| KIG 16806 | HIMO feeder roads (PDED II consolidation) | 83.832 | Helpage | NGO | Adaptation | Significant | Significant |
| KIG 25491 | Improving market access program (feeder roads) | 611.728 | Ministry of Agriculture | Government | Adaptation | Significant | Significant |
| KIG 25059 | Consolidation phase marshlands | 570.000 | WHH | NGO | Adaptation | Significant | Significant |
| KIG 25542 | Local Demand Driven Investment Projects | 8.118.000 | RLDSF | Government | Adaptation | Significant | Not applicable |
| KIG 16806 | Second Phase HIMO programme Marshlands | 179.483 | WHH | NGO | Adaptation | Significant | Significant |

| Activity | | 2013 | Implemented by | | Rio marker | | Gender marker |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number | Name | Actual expenditure | Name Organisation | channel | mitigation/adaptation | significant/principal | significant/principal |
| KIG 23214 | Land Tenure Program (LTR) | 279.104 | Private Organisation through DFID | Research institute and comp | Adaptation | Significant | Significant |
| KIG 19940 | Electricity Access Program | 2.800.000 | Ministry of Infrastructure | Government | Adaptation | Significant | Not applicable |
| KIG 25195 | Support to Participatory Forest Management | 26.814 | RNRA | Government | Mitigation and Adaptation | Significant | Not applicable |
| KIG 24730 | Linking Farmers to Markets | 924.000 | PSF | PPP or network | Adaptation | Significant | Not applicable |
| KIG 25673 | Agri-Sector Development Facility | 245.000 | ICCO | NGO | Adaptation | Significant | Significant |
| KIG 25454 | Cooperatives Support Program | 334.330 | SPARK | NGO | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable |
| KIG 24871 | Capacity Buildikng for Food Security in Rwanda | 0 | NCBS | Government | Adaptation | Significant | Not applicable |
| KIG 23039 | Support to umbrella organization for communities | 364.320 | Ralga | PPP or network | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable |
| KIG 20817 | Support to Joint Action Development Forum | 264.513 | JADF | Government | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable |
| KIG 25978 | Electricity Access Program | 2.927.882 | Ministry of Infrastructure | Government | Adaptation | Significant | Not applicable |
| KIG 25812 | Support to Participatory Forest Management | 1.804.611 | RNRA | Government | Mitigation and Adaptation | Significant | Not applicable |
| KIG 25457 | Access to food for young children | 2.444.404 | UNICEF | Multilateral organization | Not applicable | Not applicable | Significant |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | CATALIST 2 | 1.900.000 (40% of total regional budget) | IFDC | NGO | Adaptation | Significant | Not applicable |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |

More activities

| Result Area 1 | Increase in sustainable food production | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Result Question 1.1a:** How large has the increase in food production been? | The Food Security program of EKN Kigali doesn't focus on result area 1 for the moment. However, the centrally funded Catalist-2 project targets food production and provides us with information on progress in several result areas, including area 1. | | | | | |
| | **Baseline** | **Target 2015** | **Result 2012** | **Result 2013** | **Result 2014** | **Source** |
| Indicator 1 Production of cereals in metric tons | | | 572.000 | 880.000 | | FAO/GIEWS |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |

| **Result Question 1.1b:** To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved? | Food production in the Catalist project area has increased by 145%, equivalent to 269 349 metric tons of Cereal Equivalent in 2013. The increase in food production is due to the increase in number of farmers involved in agricultural activities in clusters and in the Crop Intensification Program.<br><br>(the below figure for Result 2012 should be 185.671, the fiche however automatically copies the figure under Result 2013..)<br><br>A Result fiche is currently being developed for the Regional Great Lakes program, which will provide for monitoring on each of the priority areas, including Food Security, at regional level in the near future. More indicators on result area one are being developed under that fiche. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Baseline** | **Target 2015** | **Result 2012** | **Result 2013** | **Result 2014** | **Source** |
| Indicator 1 Production of cereals in metric tons in project area | 185.671 (2012) | 1.400.000 | 455.020 | 455.020 | | IFDC |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |

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? | EKN does not, as yet, intervene in this result area directly. The upcoming IWRM program will include a focus on the efficient use of water for agriculture and the ongoing regional Catalist-2 program focuses on improved soil fertility management to increase yields.<br><br>More detailed reporting will be included in the upcoming Regional Result fiche and as soon as the IWRM program is up an running, as part of our support to Decentralisation. | | | | | |
| | **Baseline** | **Target 2015** | **Result 2012** | **Result 2013** | **Result 2014** | **Source** |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |
| Indicator... | | | | | | |

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

More indicators

| Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 1 | Increase in sustainable food production |
| --- | --- |
| Select results (A/B/C/D)... | n/a |
| Reasons for result achieved: | |
| Implications for planning: | n/a |

| 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? | While Rwanda has done very well in the field of acute malnutrition, chronic malnutrition is still a huge challenge, with a stunting prevalence of 44%. Since 2011, stunting prevalence in the rural area of Rwanda varied between 42 and 45%, however, observed changes are not statistically significant. In other words, there has been little change so far in the availability of sufficiently nutritious food and other factors that influence chronic malnutrition (stunting), but the '1000 days campaigns' are now in full swing and changes are expected in future. | | | | | |
| | **Baseline** | **Target 2015** | **Result 2012** | **Result 2013** | **Result 2014** | **Source** |
| (Reduction of) stunting prevalence under five | 45% (2011) | 33% | 43% | 44% | | CFSVA, FSNMS (March figures) |
| (Reduction of) number of undernourished children under five (stunting) | 0.59 mln children (2012, counting 1.3 mln < 5) | 0,43 mln children | 0,56 mln children | 0,57 mln children | | CFSVA, FSNMS ( percentage x total nr of children; as we don't have yearly figures of the nr of children under 5, all total nrs are based upon 1.3 mln children) |
| Reduction of stunting prevalance boys vs girls | 49% vs 42% | Gender equal reduction of prevalence | 48% vs 41% | not mentioned in FSNMS | | CFSVA, FSNMS |
| | | | | | | |

| **Result Question 2.1b:** To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved? | The EKN program through UNICEF has started in November 2013 with an inception phase, and therefore no results over 2013 have been mentioned below.<br><br>The EKN program aims to reduce stunting in ten out of thirty districts in Rwanda. In two out of these ten districts, we work together with the Swiss. Other stakeholders (USAID, Netherlands through DDE department, etc) are working in different districts. All programs work closely with the Government. The EKN program has a focus on children under two, as damage done in the first two years is irreversible. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Baseline** | **Target 2015** | **Result 2012** | **Result 2013** | **Result 2014** | **Source** |
| Reduction of stunting prevalence under five | 45% (2012) | 33% | n/a | n/a | | CFSVA, FSNMS (take the program districts and calculate the average stunting rate) |
| Reduction of number of undernourished children under five (stunting) | not available at this moment | not available at this moment | not available at this moment | not available at this moment | | CFSVA, FSNMS (take the program districts and calculate the nr of children) |
| Reduction of stunting prevalence in children under two | 48.3% (first quarter 2014, provisional) | 41.4% (provisional) | n/a | n/a | | UNICEF reporting. Percentages are provisional, as for these numbers, 80% of all children have been taken into account, final percentages will soon be available. |
| | | | | | | |

More indicators

| Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 2 | Better access to sufficiently nutritious food |
|---|---|
| Select results (A/B/C/D)... | In 2013, no results have been achieved, since this result area comprises one project that started end 2013 with an inception phase. |
| Reasons for result achieved: | |
| Implications for planning: | Planning foreseen as in UNICEF project document. |

| 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? | GDP growth in 2013 was 4.6%, quite a bit lower than the previous year, mainly because of weather conditions (harvest season b was not good) and also partly because the effects of the 'aid crisis' in 2012 could still be felt. GDP per capity increased only slightly. As for inclusiveness, between 2006 and 2011 the Gini index decreased from 53.09 to 50.82 percent, indicating slightly more equality, but we'll have to wait until the next measurement (data are being collected) before we can say something about recent developments. | | | | | |
| | **Baseline** | **Target 2015** | **Result 2012** | **Result 2013** | **Result 2014** | **Source** |
| Number of new jobs created (increased employment in off-farm sector) | 1.4mln (2012/13) | 1.8 mln (20141) | n/a | n/a (see date baseline; nr over 2013/14 in fall '14) | | EDPRS / PSD swg. NB fiscal years |
| % of people above the poverty line | 55% (2010/11) | 70% | n/a | n/a | | EICV, only measured in 2010/11, 2014, 2017. See also EDPRS. There is an indicator in the EDPRS on Ubudehes, but Ubudehes are not very precise. |
| GDP per capita (RWF, constant prices) | 248,074 (2011) | 542,516 | 261,653 | 269,743 | | IMF World Economic Outlook 2013 |
| GDP growth (%) | 8.2% (2011) | Growth of 11.5% p.y. | 8.0% | 4.6% | | Worldbank Rwanda Economic update |

| **Result Question 3.1b:** To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved? | The Embassy program contributed to an increase of business activity and trade by tackling issues that hamper private sector development. Our main focus is on improving infrastructure (feeder roads, electricity, land titles, markets, etc) and on capacity building (of cooperatives, representatives of the private sector and the government). Although gender dis-aggregated data are only in the process of being developed and monitored, preliminary reports show that infrastructure projects implemented across all districts gave temporary employment to 131 women and 814 men workers. In the PAREF project 627 women and 451 men were employed in a labour intensive way for planting and maintenance of trees. Using the year 2014 to elaborate and incorporate gender-specific indicators in project monitoring, the Embassy strives to include more gender dis-aggregated data in next year's Resultfiche.<br><br>A large part of the Embassy program scores 'signifcant' on adaptation to climate change. One example is the creation of off-farm job opportunities for local people through local infrastructure projects, which increases the resilience of people to the negative impact of climate change on farm incomes. In the PAREF project trees are planted in the nine districts that are most affected by negative climate change effects and the capacity of local communities is strengthened with regard | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Baseline** | **Target 2015** | **Result 2012** | **Result 2013** | **Result 2014** | **Source** |
| Number of new jobs created (directly) | 0 | | 11364 | 26278 | | Helpage reporting (nr of people in CFW), WHH reporting |
| # of district infrastructure projects (demand driven) | 291 (2008-2011) | 581 | 391 | 430 | | RLDSF reporting |
| # of km of feeder roads rehabilitated and maintained (maintenance is included as it indicates the sustainability of the investments) | 0 (2011) | 75 (461) | 24 (424) | 72.5 (521,3) | | Helpage project reporting, For now, only Helpage reporting has been used, as the Minagri feeder roads project has started end 2013. |
| Increase in volume of sales for participants of agribusiness clusters in RWF for Rwanda | 138 124 200 RWF (2012) | 207 186 300 RWF | See baseline | 169 892 766 RWF (23% increase) | | IFDC reporting |

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 value of exports in USD decreased due to lower international market prices for the main export commodities (tea, coffee and minerals). Volumes actually increased.<br>Imports were also lower due to lower government funds available for investment.<br><br>There is no information available yet on FDI and private investment in 2013. However, trends do not show large increases over the last years due to continued crowding out of private sector investments by public sector investments. | | | | | |
| | **Baseline** | **Target 2015** | **Result 2012** | **Result 2013** | **Result 2014** | **Source** |
| Volume of FDI (mln USD) | 106 (2011) | 313 | 160 | n/a yet | | EDPRS II for targets, WB for realization |
| Volume of imports (mln USD) | 1,971 (2011) | n/a | 2,491 | 2,263 | | International Trade Centre (UNCTAD, WTO), EDPRS II |
| Volume of exports (mln USD) | 1030 (2012) | 2054 | 1030 | 683 | | EDPRSII, BNR |
| Private investment (mln USD) | 694mln USD (2012/13) | Increased private sector investment | 694mln USD (is baseline) | result 2013/14 available in fall | | EDPRSII, psd swg |

| **Result Question 3.2b:** To what extent has your programme contributed to this results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved? | Trade between Rwanda and the Netherlands is promoted through trade instruments, facilitation by the Agricultural counsellor and the private sector development section of the embassy, as well as through economic diplomacy.<br><br>Dutch investments in Rwanda are expected to grow due to the addition of two PSI projects with Dutch investors.<br>The number of business questions received and answered by EKN remained stable. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Baseline** | **Target 2015** | **Result 2012** | **Result 2013** | **Result 2014** | **Source** |
| Increase of volume (in Euro) of trade with the Netherlands | 26,808,000 EUR (2011), volume of trade | n/a | + 1,903,000 EUR, compared to 2011 | + 6,287,000 EUR, compared to 2012 | | CBS |
| Increase in volume (in Euro) of Dutch investments in Rwanda | 6.812.151 UDS (2010) | n/a | + 7.664.836 USD | not yet available | | RDB |
| Nr of investment projects through Dutch business instruments or through EKN intermediation (measured per year, not cumulative) | n/a | 2 per year | 2 PSI | 4 PSI | | RVO reporting |
| Nr of business questions answered by Embassy (measured per year, not cumulative) | 135 (2011) | n/a | 100 | 101 | | Embassy reporting |

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<br><br>Reasons for result achieved: | The larger programs are on track in terms of achieving their results, which is why we assessed the results achieved by NL across the entire result area 3 as 'B, results achieved as planned'. Some projects started end 2013 and we cannot say much about the results yet. Some projects face delays. Rwanda is a country with high ambitions and this is generally seen as an asset. However, the other side of the picture is that project implementation can be slower than projected, both for projects with government and for projects with other partners. |
| Implications for planning: | EKN Kigali will continue to carefully monitor project implementation and planning. |

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** |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| **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** |
| Nr of electricity connections | 20000 | 60000 | 30000 | 40000 | | EARP reporting |
| Nr of land titles issued | 0,5mln | 10 mln | 4.5 mln | 6,1 mln | | RNRA and LTR project reporting |
| Nr of cooperative members trained | 0 | 300 (S), 190 (H) | 177 (H), Spark programme signed in 2013 | 204 (H), Spark programme signed end 2013 | | Helpage (H) and Spark (S) reporting |
| Nr of local government officials trained | 213 (R), 0 (H) | 550 (RJ), 240 (H) | 320 (RJ), 176 (H) | 308 (R) 248 (H) | | RLDSF and JADF reporting (RJ), Helpage reporting (H) |

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 08:50:25 +02'00' | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| | | | | ... | ... | ... | ... |

Go to result area 1