

ANNEXES

1. ANNEX 1: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

| Goal | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Agricultural outputs and incomes increased under sustainable production systems and for all groups of farmers, and food security ensured for all the population (See SPAT II) | | | |
| Specific objective | Performance Indicators | Means of verification | Assumptions |
| Improved access to advisory services for crops and livestock and access to and use of high quality planting materials and seed, for men and women | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of household farmers who received advice in the last 12 months disaggregated by gender ▪ % of farmers satisfied regarding access to relevant information and advisory services disaggregated by gender (answers to be very satisfied) ▪ Quantity of pre-basic and basic (quality controlled) seed sold to seed multipliers ▪ % of quantity produced (and certified) compared to operational plan ▪ Quantity of controlled quality seed (CS and QDS) of planting material produced by private sector | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Baseline survey and Mid-Term and End-Term review ▪ Progress reports of Seed Business Development Advisors ▪ Progress reports of Inspectors and Quality control officers ▪ National statistics ▪ Agriculture surveys | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continued technical and financial assistance of BTC ▪ Continued government support for the agricultural sector |

| Results | Performance Indicators | Means of verification | Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Seed production chains of specific groups of food crops with a market value are professionalized | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of quality seed (CS and QDS) inspected fields in compliance with required standards disaggregated by gender ▪ % of certified seed lots in compliance with required national standards ▪ % of certified seed lots that have sufficient germination at planting time (of the former seed lots tested) ▪ Quantity of quality seed (CS and QDS) purchased by farmers ▪ % of quality seed (CS and QDS) of new released varieties sold to farmers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Certified and quality declared seed production and sales figures Minagri ▪ Baseline survey and Mid-Term and End-Term review ▪ Progress reports of Inspectors and Quality control officers ▪ Progress reports of National Seed Laboratory ▪ Progress reports of Seed Business Development Advisors | |
| 2. Increased private sector involvement in the seed sector | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of active registered seed multipliers disaggregated by gender (for CS and QDS) ▪ % of active registered seed multipliers satisfied with service delivery from RAB ▪ % of Agro dealers/wholesalers selling small packages of CS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Certified and quality declared seed production and sales figures Minagri ▪ Baseline survey and Mid-Term and End-Term review ▪ Progress reports of Seed Business Development Advisors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Entrepreneurs of the sector willing to invest for the long term |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>to farmers and outlets (true seed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of Rwanda seed traders/seed companies selling CS ▪ % of active registered seed multipliers in CS who used credit for new investments disaggregated by gender | | |
| <p>3. Sustainable mechanisms for demand articulation and responsiveness of market-oriented advisory services</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of FFS Facilitators being member of a Facilitators' cooperative/company disaggregated by gender ▪ % of Facilitators' cooperatives/companies being paid for the advisory services they provide ▪ % of FFS Facilitators providing paid services in agriculture disaggregated by gender ▪ % of FFS groups paying for the advisory services received from qualified trainers (from 2nd season) ▪ % of FFS groups selling more than 50% of the production to the market ▪ % of FFS groups that are registered as cooperative (at | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Baseline survey and Mid-Term and End-Term review ▪ Progress reports of Zonal FFS coordinators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District agricultural platforms taking responsibility in execution ▪ District administration has the capacity to effectively channel programme funds to service providers ▪ Joint Action development Forums functioning well |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>4. Proximity agricultural advisors capable of delivering responses to the demands of farmers, livestock keepers and their organizations</p> | <p>least at district level)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of FFS groups that report an increase in production of the priority commodities through the use of ICM-FFS practices ▪ Number of trained farmers through FFS and CMC disaggregated by gender ▪ % of trained farmers who adopted the appropriate production practices disaggregated by gender ▪ Number of identified varieties (genetic resources) maintained and appropriately used through FFS ▪ % increase in crop income for farmers organized in FFS groups disaggregated by gender ▪ % of district and sector agronomists trained and really involved in FFS monitoring ▪ % of projects/ programmes which adopted and use the FFS approach in RAB ▪ Number of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Baseline survey and Mid-Term and End-Term review ▪ Progress reports of Zonal FFS coordinators ▪ Economic surveys | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Newly trained proximity service providers obtain contracts and do not stop operating |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>projects/programmes who received FFS technical advice from RAB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hectare of land with banana rehabilitation (and BXW control) through CMC-FFS practices ▪ Hectare of land under control for striga through Integrated Control Methods | | |
| <p>5. Lessons learned on agricultural advisory services and seed documented and used in policy and decision making</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of documented programme lessons referred to in policies, strategies and action plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Published agricultural policies, strategies and action plans ▪ M&E system of programme ▪ Mid-Term and End-Term review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New policies are adopted by decision makers ▪ Programme management allows itself time for reflection ▪ Implementation pressure does not lead to management for quick results rather than system building |