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ABSTRACT

This study has been undertaken with the purpose to assess the impact of the component 2 of the RSSP II specifically in Gatsibo District of Eastern Region. Despite GoR’s effort, and despite many agriculture projects to improve the living conditions of rural population, the anticipated results and tangible improvements seem not to have been realized in terms of poverty alleviation and economic development of the rural poor. Why is it, for instance, that the rural sector still lags behind compared to other sectors whereas GoR invests a lot in the sector? Could it be because inappropriate projects that do not answer to beneficiaries’ needs are the ones funded, or is it because projects are not well managed, monitored and evaluated? This study, therefore, focused on RSSP II Component 2 (A project under guardianship of the MINAGRI), and the study intended to assess the Socio-economic impact. Overall, the RSSP would have an important positive socioeconomic impact on the beneficiaries as it would increase income earning opportunities, improve food security, improve the possibilities of local people to manage their natural resources, and contribute to capacity building, in particular at the local level. However socio-economic implications and number of risks involved in the project implementation will be identified during this study. The researcher has managed to answer the question: “To what extent have the project’s operations impacted upon its beneficiaries in its endeavour to achieve its set objectives?” and this study will have the implications for interpreting the results to illuminate the three key aspects of the study such as Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness of RSSP. In order to achieve this, a cross-sectional survey design has been used. Data have been gathered using a self-administered structured questionnaires. This research adopted both qualitative and quantitative design. The research strategy used in this research is the case study. The target population is 4,809, and this is constituted by four categories of stakeholders. Sampling Technique; the research used purposive sampling techniques to select respondents. Data collection was composed of both data sources and data collection methods respectively such as; Primary data, secondary data was used. Questionnaires, Individual Interviews, Focus Group Discussion and Revisiting Sites to Validate Findings are the tools that were used for collection of data.
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DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

**Project:** This refers to the organization of people as well as other resources brought together to meet specific objectives within a determined period of time by carrying out a set of planned activities.

**Cooperative:** The term cooperative refers to the association of natural or legal persons operating together in activities aiming at promoting their members in accordance with values of mutual responsibility and self-help, democracy, equity and equal rights to its assets.

**Rural Development:** Rural development is defined as the process of improving the quality of life and economic wellbeing of people living in rural areas.

**Poverty:** This is the inability to attain a minimal standards of living, refers to forms of economic, social and psychological deprivation occurring among people lacking

**Rural Sector Support Project (RSSP):** The project under guardianship of the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources whose aims were revitalising the rural economy and improving the quality of life of the rural poor through increased transfer of technical and financial resources for sustainable rural development.

**RSSP Phases:** The RSSP, designed as a 14 years Adaptable Program Loan (APL) to be implemented nationally in three phases.

**Component 2 of RSSP II:** is to support commercialization of smallholder agriculture in targeted marshland and hillside areas by intensifying production, expanding access to markets, and promoting agricultural value addition. There are six sub-components that are supported under Component 2 to achieve these levels of performance: Strengthening
farmer organizations and cooperatives; improving production technologies for sustainable intensification; agribusiness investment; local infrastructure investment; applied research in support of production and marketing activities; and lastly, support of information-sharing and alliances.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

In this chapter the researcher discussed the study based on the following subheadings; Background of the study, statement of the problem, research objectives, research questions, significance of the study, scope of the study and its limitations.

1.1 Background of the Study

Rwanda is a landlocked country with few natural resources and minerals and it is predominantly rural with about 92% of the population engaged in agriculture (Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning [MINECOFIN], 2004). Having had a bad history of segregate and discriminative government in the past, Rwanda’s fragile economy was further destroyed by the civil war and then worsened by the 1994 Genocide that eroded the country’s stability.

Soon after 1994, the new government was faced with four major challenges namely Reconciliation, Reform, Rehabilitation and Religious stability in order to return peace and economic revival to the confused people and economy of Rwanda. Between 1994 and 1998, emergency humanitarian relief and aid was largely directed to refugee camps and reconciliation programs as well as was targeted at resettlement. In June 1998, Rwanda signed an enhanced Structural Adjustment facility with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and also received support from the World Bank and other aid groups. Reforms and reconstruction programs were then directed towards the expansion and rehabilitation of government infrastructures including the construction and rehabilitation of roads, drainage, social, education, health and collective facilities such as district buildings.
Prior to 1994, Agricultural growth in Rwanda had slowed down significantly over the preceding two decades, leading to a continuous increase in the level of poverty. The annual growth rate of aggregate production had dropped to 2.0 percent by the early 1990s and it was 0.8 percent in the early 1980s (World Bank, 2001).

The 1994 genocide tragedy contributed to a sharp deterioration of the situation, having caused a significant decline in agriculture production. Rwanda’s population, 92% of which is rural, expanded rapidly, resulting in increasing pressure to raise agricultural output and employment to an expanding labour force.

The post genocide Government of Rwanda (GoR) strived to pursue a comprehensive poverty reduction programme. In support of this, the government, through the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal resources embarked on a Rural Sector Support Project (RSSP), whose aims were revitalizing the rural economy and improving the quality of life of the rural poor through increased transfer of technical and financial resources for sustainable rural development. It was designed in 2001 for a period of 14 years and financed as an Adaptable Program Loan (APL) that had three phases: phase one was from year 2001 to 2005, phase two was from 2006 to 2011 and phase three 2012 to 2017 (Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources [MINAGRI], 2012). Project Appraisal Document [PAD], Publication No. 21048-RW). Each phase had its designed development objectives which shall be discussed later on. According to the MINAGRI (2001) as reflected in the RSSP Project Implementation Manual the focus of the project is sustained poverty reduction through capacity building to facilitate efficient application of resources to development and management of investments. For this purpose GoR received a credit from the International Development Association (IDA) towards the cost of financing the following components of RSSP: the rehabilitation of marshland and hillside farming;
promotion of commercial and export crops; support to the agriculture services delivery system; small scale rural infrastructure development and maintenance; promotion of productive activities in the off-farm sector of the rural areas; and project coordination and support.

A portion of credit was to be used to finance the recruitment of a firm that specialises in communication and public relations to bridge the communication gap between RSSP in particular, and Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) in general and all their stakeholders, that is, Government, Projects, business community, community based farmers’ organisations and individual farmers.

The long-term programmatic objective of the RSSP is to help the GoR to achieve its strategic goals of unlocking rural growth in order to increase incomes and reduce poverty (World Bank, 2007). Rural growth—specifically agricultural growth—has been shown to be four times as efficient in reducing poverty as growth in other sectors. RSSP is also guided by the recognition that the most effective way to achieve agricultural growth is to raise productivity and expand the employment of resources that the rural poor own or depend on for their livelihoods, primarily land and labour.

The goal of GoR is to foster a rapid transition from subsistence-based agriculture, in which the majority of Rwandan farmers are currently involved, to market-oriented commercial agriculture. This will require profound changes at all levels of the rural economy, as well as significant adjustment of production and consumption patterns. As productivity rises and production increases and rural households move from production mainly of food staples destined for home consumption to production of food and non-food cash crops destined for the market, productive opportunities will be created for economic agents within and outside of the agricultural sector.
Phase I and II of the RSSP has already been completed and the achievements of Phase I documented. The achievements of Phase II are yet to be determined; hence the objective of this study is to assess its impact on socio-economic development. The objective of RSSP II is to increase agricultural production and marketing in marshland and hillside areas targeted for development under the Project in an environmentally sustainable manner (MINAGRI, 2012). This is to be achieved by assisting rural households to expand and intensify sustainable crop production systems and to increase their participation in agricultural markets. It has three components.

Component I deals with Marshlands and hillsides rehabilitation and development. It is sub-divided into three sub components, namely, marshlands irrigation infrastructure rehabilitation and development, sustainable development of hillsides, and lastly, stakeholder mobilization and capacity strengthening.

Component 2, which is the unit of analysis in this project research, targets the strengthening of commodity chains. It has six sub components, namely, strengthening farmer organizations and cooperatives, improving production technologies for sustainable intensification, agribusiness investment, local infrastructure investment, applied research in support of production and marketing activities, and lastly, supporting of information-sharing and alliances.

Component 3 of RSSP II deals with project coordination and support. It seeks to ensure efficient execution of administrative, financial management, and procurement functions; coordination of Project activities among the various stakeholders; timely implementation and monitoring of environmental and land-use management frameworks mandated by World Bank safeguards policies; and lastly, establishment and operation of an effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system.
According to MINAGRI (2012), as contained in Project Appraisal Document, each of the RSSP rural development activities are implemented through three financing mechanisms, namely, Local Infrastructure Facility (LIF), Rural Technology Facility (RTF), and Rural Investment Facility (RIF).

However, subprojects assessed directly by RSSP for financial or technical support are channelled as matching grants through LIF and RTF whereas RIF’s projects are channelled through Banks Co-operatives and Micro-Finances thus providing financial incentives through investment cost subsidy to qualified private sector operators, including farmer groups willing to invest activities with substantial economic or environmental externalities.

The subprojects submitted to RSSP cover eligible activities under LIF including the construction and maintenance of Small-scale drainage and irrigation infrastructure on farmed marshlands and hillside Soil and water resources conservation infrastructure, and Post-harvest and other marketing/export cost – reducing infrastructure.

The eligible activities under RTF sub-projects include the generation, adaptation, dissemination, and/or acquisition of technologies that are used in the Production of crops and livestock, fishery and forestry products and derives, Processing of crops, livestock, fishery forestry products, Conservation of crops, livestock, fishery and forestry products, Export of crops, livestock, fishery and forestry products, Distribution of seeds and planting materials, Manufacturing and distribution of farms’ inputs and veterinary products, and Provision of agricultural technical advisory services.

1.2 Problem Statement

Government of Rwanda has initiated various projects to enhance the living conditions of
the rural population. These initiatives include, inter alia, Vision 2020, Umurenge Project (VUP) and RSSP. These initiatives or projects have been implemented all over the country in each province and district, including Eastern province and Gatsibo district. Despite these efforts the anticipated results and tangible improvements seem not to have been realized in terms of poverty alleviation and economic development of the rural poor in many districts. Why is it, for instance, that the rural sector still lags behind compared to urban sectors whereas GoR invests a lot in the sector? Could it be because inappropriate projects that do not answer to beneficiaries’ needs are the ones funded, or is it because projects are not well managed, monitored and evaluated?

This study, therefore, by focusing on RSSP II Component 2 (A project under guardianship of the MINAGRI), was seeking to answer the underlying question of how effective are the agriculture projects in Rwanda funded under the RSSP, in attempting to uplift the living standards of the majority of the rural population in Eastern province, Gatsibo district.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objective of this study was, to link project goals with expected outcomes, and used selected number of indicators, which allowed a reliable estimate on the effectiveness and efficiency with which the project is implemented, to determine its impact and the sustainability of the operation.

1.3.1 General Objectives

The general objective of this study was to examine the implications of RSSP II Component 2 in reducing poverty by improving the living standards of the majority population as well as increasing agricultural productivity.
1.3.2 Specific Objectives

(i) To identify RSSP II activities related to component 2

(ii) To determine the socioeconomic indicators that were affected by the activities of phase two of RSSP.

(iii) To assess the extent to which the project objectives have been achieved during phase two of RSSP Gatsibo district.

(iv) To evaluate the perceptions of the beneficiaries of phase two of RSSP on the socioeconomic development of Gatsibo district.

1.4 Research Questions

(i) What are the activities performed through RSSP II and who are the targeted beneficiaries?

(ii) What are the socioeconomic indicators that were affected of RSSP II activities in Gatsibo district?

(iii) To what extent were the project objectives of phase two of RSSP achieved in Gatsibo district.

(iv) What are the perceptions of the beneficiaries about the socioeconomic development impact of phase two of RSSP in Gatsibo district?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The study intends to assess the Socio-economic impact. Overall, the RSSP would have an important positive socioeconomic impact on the beneficiaries as it would increase income earning opportunities, improve food security, improve the possibilities of local people to manage their natural resources, and contribute to capacity building, in particular at the local level. However socio-economic implications and number of risks involved in the
project implementation was identified during this study. The researcher answered the question: “To what extent have the project’s operations impacted upon its beneficiaries in its endeavour to achieve its set objectives?” and this study had the implications for interpreting the results to illuminate the three key aspects of the study such as Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness of RSSP. The study therefore, impacted on the following stakeholders:

**The Researcher**

The study is significant to the researcher firstly as a demonstration of his ability to conduct a scientific research in Project analysis and evaluation and contributes towards an academic qualification in Business Management.

**The Project Managers**

The study have provided another perspective on how effective the project was in meeting its objectives and thereby inform project managers and teams on the achievement as well as challenges that need to be attended to in view of maximizing gains from the projects as well as provide inputs for improving implementation of phase III of the RSSP.

**The Government of Rwanda**

The study is significant to officials of MINAGRI and MINECOFIN as it serves as a complement to other GoR official analysis of the impact of RSSP II on economic development as enshrined in Vision 2020 as well as the EDPRS.

**Financers of RSSP**

The findings of this study may provide additional input for IDA, the World Bank and
related development partners in assessing the impact of their contribution to the GoR in its
development efforts.

**Project Beneficiaries**

The study provided a mechanism through which actual beneficiaries in Gatsibo district
expressed their perceptions as well as their satisfaction, or lack thereof, with the RSSP
activities.

**Mount Kenya University**

The study has provided information on project management and evaluation techniques and
issues as applied in real world case of an actual project. This is one of the additional
materials for students’ further analysis and research in the same field.

**1.6 Limitations of the Study**

A number of limitations were encountered during the course of the research notably:
relevant information was denied in some cases; here the researcher faced problems with
individuals from management who were unwilling to answer some of the questions.
However, the researcher labored to explain to them that the study is for academic purpose
and finally the requested data were provided.

Negative attitude of some respondents was another significant limitation that the
researcher faced during the data collection. As this could result in collection of biased
data, the researcher kept explaining to them that information provided will be for
academic purpose only and will be treated with a high degree of confidentiality and
reported in aggregate which made them comfortable to respond to the questionnaires.
1.7 Scope of the Study

**Content Scope**

The study particularly focused on the impact of RSSP II Component 2 on Socio-Economic transformation of rural population in Eastern Region. The study attempted to evaluate the extent to which objectives of the various project activities were realized in the district. It was also seeking to examine more specifically the socioeconomic impact of the Components 2 activities on the level of poverty, agricultural productivity, average level of income, ease of access to health, education, employment, social relations and general well-being of the project beneficiaries in Gatsibo district.

**Geographical Scope**

The study focused on activities of Component 2 of RSSP II implemented in Gatsibo district. It was seeking to study all the 14 sectors in the district, namely, Kabarole, Rwimbogo, Rugarama, Gitoki, Gatsibo, Ngarama, Remera, Kageyo, Nyagihanga, Muhura, Gasange, Kiramuruzi, Kiziguro and Murambi.

**Time Scope**

The study also examined the impact of the project in improving people’s living conditions for the entire RSSP II period, that is, the years 2006 to 2011.

1.8 Organization of the Study

This research project has five chapters which are general introduction as chapter one where there are background of the study, problem statement, objectives of the study, research questions, significance and limitations of the study, finally scope and
organization of the study. The second chapter is titled review of related literature where the researcher says about theoretical and empirical literature, and conceptual framework where there independent and dependent variables. The third chapter is titled research methodology where the researcher says about the research design, total population and sample size, finally data collection and data processing and analysis. The fourth titled chapter is research findings and discussion where the researcher said about demographic characteristics of respondents and presented the findings in line with stated objectives. The last and fifth chapter is titled summary, conclusions and recommendations where the researcher presented the summary of findings in line with the objectives of the study, made conclusions in line with the research questions, made recommendations for improvement and finally the researcher proposed the suggestions for further study.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This section examines the views of various scholars on socioeconomic development of Rwanda as well as the documents or literature that forms the basis of the RSSP II. It also discusses both the theoretical & Conceptual framework that underpins a research project.

2.1 Theoretical Literature

2.1.1 Rwanda Economic Profile

2.1.1.1 Economic Overview

According to Mundi (2013), Rwanda is a poor rural country with about 90% of the population engaged in (mainly subsistence) agriculture and some mineral and agro-processing. Tourism, minerals, coffee and tea are Rwanda's main sources of foreign exchange (MINECOFIN, 2007). Minerals exports declined 40% in 2009-10 due to the global economic downturn. The 1994 genocide decimated Rwanda's fragile economic base, severely impoverished the population, particularly women, and temporarily stalled the country's ability to attract private and external investment. However, Rwanda has made substantial progress in stabilizing and rehabilitating its economy to pre-1994 levels. GDP has rebounded with an average annual growth of 7%-8% since 2003 and inflation has been reduced to single digits (GoR, 2007).

Rwanda National Institute of Statistics and Research [NISR] (2012) indicates that the percentage of people living under poverty has dropped by almost 12% from 56.7% in 2006 to 44.9% in 2011. Rwanda’s economy is increasingly experiencing the predominance of the service sector as it gained importance relative to agriculture over the recent years. The country experienced an 8.2% real GDP Growth in 2010-2011 and GDP
per capita of US$540 (NISR, 2012). The annual average inflation was at 8.3% for 2011. Foreign exchange controls have been liberalized and the banking system is sound and thriving (Mundi, 2012), statistics on Rwanda indicate that Rwanda Gross Domestic Product (GDP) computed as purchasing power parity estimates rose to $13.46 billion in 2011 from $11.73 billion in 2009. GDP per capita is estimated to have grown from $1,200 in 2009 to $1,300 in 2011. The GDP composition by sector stood at 33% in agriculture, 13.9% in industry and 53.1% in services.

Rwanda has made tremendous progress in improving the health status of the general population. For instance, between 2000 and 2005 the infant mortality rate (IMR) declined by 19.6%, the under-five mortality rate (U5MR) fell by 22.4% and the maternal mortality rate (MMR) decreased by 29.9% (Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy [EDPRS], 2008). However, the IMR and U5MR are now at 1992 levels (NISR, 2012).

2.1.1.2 Economic Challenges

Despite the achievements, a significant percent of the Rwandan population still live below the official poverty line (International Monetary Fund [IMF], 2011). Poverty level has fallen, but needs to fall faster to meet the MDG and Vision 2020 targets MINECOFIN (2008) as reflect in (EDPRS, 2008-2012). The incidence of consumption poverty has fallen in both rural and urban areas since 2000/01. The extreme poverty line represents the level of expenditure needed to provide minimum food requirements of 2,100 kcal per adult per day. More than one-third of the population is still unable to achieve this level and consequently go hungry. Rates of poverty reduction since 2000 have been modest and are not fast enough to meet either the targets set in Vision 2020 or the MDGs. The total
number of poor people has now increased to five million and over 90% of the poor people still live in rural areas (UNDP, 2013).

Despite Rwanda's fertile ecosystem, food production often does not keep pace with demand, requiring food imports (MINECOFIN, 2008) as reflected in Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy 2008-2012. Rwanda continues to receive substantial aid money and obtained IMF-World Bank Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) initiative debt relief in 2005-2006. Rwanda remains highly dependent on grants from its Development Partners. About 40% of the budget is financed by grants, adding up to 11.0% of GDP in 2010/11. This can easily turn into vulnerability if donors were to reduce their foreign assistance to Rwanda in the context of the fiscal consolidation exercises being implemented by many of them, including in connection to the sovereign debt crisis in the Euro zone.

According to the World Bank (2012), as reflected in the Country Brief, GoR revenues are still among the lowest in the East African Region. Although revenues over-performed during 2010/11 reaching 14.0% of GDP owing to higher direct taxes and excise duties these higher revenues were offset by higher than projected expenditures in all categories except externally financed capital expenditures, resulting in a widening of the fiscal deficit to 3.8 percent of GDP, compared to 0.5 percent in 2009/10. Finally, as trade shifts increasingly to the EAC partners, losses in the collection of international trade taxes are expected to become permanent with such permanent shifts in the revenue structure needing to be addressed in further consolidation efforts.

According to World Bank (2013), as depicted in the Country Overview, the role of the private sector in the economy and its contribution to development and sustained growth is still relatively low. The private sector is still overwhelmingly informal and plays a limited
role in contributing to economic activity. Despite Rwanda’s success in having established a sound investment climate, foreign direct investments remain low. Private sector investment is estimated at 10.9% of GDP, compared to 14.4% in the region in 2010. The private sector is still nascent and would profit much from access to technological know-how and established distribution channels abroad. Rwanda’s urbanization is slowing down, despite high population density. The major binding constraints to accelerated growth, investments and exports are the lack of economic infrastructure and the limited skills base.

Although the health situation improved significantly (MINECOFIN, 2008) in its EDPRS document identifies the challenge to reduce Infant mortality (deaths per 1,000 live births) from 86 in 2006 to 70 by 2012; Maternal mortality (deaths per 100,000 live births) from 750 in 2006 to 600 in 2012. There is also need to increase the population covered by health insurance schemes from 70% in 2006 to 95% by 2012; Access to safe drinking water as a percentage of the population from 64% in 2006 to 86% in 2012.

According to the Enquête Intégrale sur les Conditions de Vie des Ménages [EICV](2012), Survey results (transliterated as Households Living Conditions Survey Results) levels of declared unemployment are very low in Rwanda, but under-employment is high. It is particularly evident in farming jobs, with independent farm workers and their families spending only three or four hours a day on their work and those working in waged farm jobs working four to five hours per day on average. This indicates scope for increasing labour productivity in the Farming Sector. Evidence from the EICV survey shows that the incidence of poverty is highest in households whose main source of income is agricultural wage labour.
2.1.1.3 The Centrality of the Agricultural Sector in the Economy

According to Kanyarukiga (2004), the consultant who drafted the Rwanda Strategic Plan of Agriculture Transformation, the agricultural sector remains the economic backbone of Rwanda, employing about 87% of the working population, producing around 46% of GDP and generating about 80% of the total export revenues. In order to achieve the objectives of the agricultural sector, as formulated in the Vision 2020 and in the PRSP, the Government has adopted the agricultural policy, whose main goal is to contribute to the national economic growth, improved food security and increase incomes of the rural households Institute of Public Administration and Research [IPAR], 2009). Successful implementation of the agricultural policy requires adequate financing, effective coordination of all stakeholders and efficient mechanisms for Monitoring and Evaluation of the progress in implementation of the different agricultural programmes.

The critical role of agriculture may be illustrated using the trends in GDP growth in 2002 to 2003. The peak GDP growth of 9% achieved in 2002 was largely contributed to by a bumper harvest following good rains MINECOFIN (2003). Real GDP growth rate slowed down from 9% in 2002 to 1% in 2003, a slowdown shared both by agriculture and industry sectors, which saw their growth decline from 15% and 6% in 2002 to 1% and 5% respectively in 2003, while the services sector strengthened its growth from 4% to 7% during the same period. The major driver for the drastic decline in GDP growth rate in 2003 was very poor rains that led to substantial fall in the agricultural output. It is within this context that RSSP was conceptualized and implemented to maximize on the contribution of agriculture in the economy.
2.1.2 The Rwanda Rural Sector Support Programme

2.1.2.1 General Overview of RSSP

Against the backdrop of the centrality of agriculture the GoR initiated and implemented the RSSP project. According to MINAGRI (2008) as contained in the Public Disclosure Document the RSSP was designed as a 14 years Adaptable Program Loan (APL), to be implemented nationally in three phases, aims at revitalizing the rural economy and improving the quality of life of the rural poor through increased transfer of technical and financial resources for sustainable rural development.

**Phase 1** of the project (RSSP I), launched on October 24, 2001 and restructured in 2005, includes two primary main components. The first is the marshland/hillside development and export agriculture component which focuses on building institutional and technical capacities for efficient cropping and post-harvest technologies, and the second component which deals with implementation, coordination, as well as monitoring and evaluation of program activities and impact.

**Phase 2** of the RSSP (herein abbreviated RSSP II) aims to accelerate agricultural intensification and promote the emergence of a vibrant, commercially-oriented rural economy by (i) scaling up successful activities of phase I; (ii) broadening the scope and range of interventions to support small scale commercial enterprises; (iii) involving local communities in decision making processes that impact their livelihoods; and (iv) supporting government decentralization strategy by building capacity within the public institutions at the district levelWorld Bank Project Appraisal Document, Rwanda, Second Rural Sector Support.
**Phase 3** which is just launched picks from the stimulus resulting from faster growth in agricultural production in Phase I and II and uses it as a basis for promoting diversification of economic activities in rural areas as a way of increasing and stabilizing rural incomes.

The aim of RSSP II was to ensure that key lessons learned of RSSP I were adequately captured and built into design for RSSP II. The sub-project investments that the RSSP II will be financing give rise to environmental and social concern. Some investments were confirmed during the preparation of the phase II of the project, while others are known in general but not their exact locations.

Therefore, in compliance with the Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA) and the World Bank’s Safeguards Policies, the GoR represented by MINAGRI, prepared the *Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)*. The ESMF is an instrument through which the subproject environmental and social impacts are identified, assessed, evaluated and have appropriate mitigation, management and monitoring measures, designed and incorporated within the sub-project itself (MINAGRI, 2008).

The ESMF is complemented by two other safeguards instruments. A *Pest Management Plan (PMP)* has been prepared to ensure that RSSP II-supported investments in strengthening agricultural productivity pay adequate attention to the need to promote integrated pest management, and to ensure that pesticides are used appropriately (MINAGRI, 2008). As well, a *Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF)* was prepared that provided standards and procedures for compensation for any land acquisition or restriction of access to resources that RSSP II investments may require.
2.1.2.2 Component 2 of RSSP II

According to MINAGRI (2008), as reflected in RSSP II public disclosure document the objective of Component 2 is to support commercialization of smallholder agriculture in targeted marshland and hillside areas by intensifying production, expanding access to markets, and promoting agricultural value addition. Building on the improved primary production capacity achieved under RSSP1, RSSP II supports the development of modern commodity chains for selected commodities. Using a holistic approach, the Project simultaneously addresses constraints in the upper (production), middle (processing), and lower (marketing) stages of the commodity chain. The Project focuses mainly on strengthening commodity chains for leading food staples, including rice, potatoes, and maize, but remains responsive to the broader needs of marshlands and hillsides users and responds to requests to provide support for other commodities.

Performance indicators include increased production, increased professionalism of farmers’ associations and cooperatives, increased value adding activity, and increased market participation of Project beneficiaries (MINAGRI, 2008). There are six sub-components that are supported under Component 2 to achieve these levels of performance: Strengthening farmer organizations and cooperatives; improving production technologies for sustainable intensification; agribusiness investment; local infrastructure investment; applied research in support of production and marketing activities; and lastly, support of information-sharing and alliances.

Sub Component 2.1: Strengthening Farmers’ Organizations and Cooperatives

As reflected in the Public Disclosure Document (MINAGRI, 2008), RSSP II aimed at strengthening farmer organizations and cooperatives, both the existing farmer
organizations and cooperatives with which the Project has engaged during RSSP1, as well as new farmer organizations and cooperatives. Two sets of activities were scheduled to realize this objective, namely, development of farmer organizations and cooperative and supporting business planning and management in farmers’ organizations and cooperatives.

Development of farmer organizations and cooperatives: The Project aimed at dedicating significant resources to developing farmer organizations and cooperatives, with an eye to rationalizing organizational structures and functions, strengthening member commitment, and increasing participation (MINAGRI, 2008). The Project was to continue using the farmer-based extension (FBE) approach to stimulate the formation of new farmer organizations and cooperatives, but other approaches were to be used as well to guide engagement with more mature organizations that merit additional assistance. Especially for the more mature organizations, a major activity would be the development of action plans, formulated through a participatory process that builds capacity within the organizations to better plan and implement their activities. Successful completion of an action plan, which forms the basis for each organization’s future development, constitutes a condition for continuing to receive support from the Project.

Support to business planning and management: Based on the commercial opportunities identified in each action plan, the Project was to provide training and advisory services to support the preparation of business plans. The business plan would specify not only the details of proposed commercial activities, but also the mechanisms to be used for sharing costs and benefits of commercial activities among members. The training and advisory services varies according to the specific business needs. Training topics include budgeting
and financial analysis, capital management, sales management and marketing, risk management, quality management, and personnel management (MINAGRI, 2008).

The activities in this sub-component were to be implemented mainly by NGOs and competitively recruited private firms, contracted directly by the PSCU. Participating farmer organizations and cooperatives will be eligible to receive capacity building grants provided through the RTF.

**Sub-component 2.2: Improving Production Technologies for Sustainable Intensification**

The Project aimed at providing financing to help improve productivity and production in irrigated marshlands developed by the Project and on surrounding hillsides through sustainable intensification of farming systems MINAGRI (2008). This involved a number of activities:

*Improvement of farming practices:* The Project was to support the improvement of farming practices using the farmer based extension (FBE) approach that has been successfully piloted during RSSP1. Under the FBE approach, lead farmers are trained in the use of improved inputs and improved crop management practices, and they then receive support to enable them to transmit their knowledge to other farmers in their communities (MINAGRI, 2008).

*Promoting increased use of improved seed and planting materials:* The Project aimed at increasing the availability and use of improved seed and planting materials in the irrigated marshlands and surrounding hillsides being targeted by the Project. The Project was to finance two main activities: (i) provision of improved seed and planting materials for use
in demonstration plots; and (ii) establishment of selected cooperatives and individual
farmers as certified seed producers (MINAGRI, 2008).

*Promoting increased use of mineral fertilizer:* The Project aimed at promoting profitable
use of mineral fertilizer in irrigated marshlands and surrounding hillsides being targeted
by the Project. The Project was to finance: (i) development of district-level capacity to
carry out soil testing; (ii) custom soil testing services to determine soil nutrient
management needs in farmers’ fields; (iii) establishment of validation / demonstration
trials for fertilizer in the fields of Lead Farmers; and (iv) innovative institutional
arrangements designed to facilitate farmers’ access to fertilizer (e.g., revolving funds to
be managed by cooperatives).

*Promoting increased use of integrated pest management (IPM) practices:* The Project
was to promote increased use of IPM practices in irrigated marshlands and surrounding
hillsides being targeted by the Project. The Project was to finance: (i) production and
distribution of IPM instructional materials developed under Phase 1; (ii) training of Lead
Farmers in IPM practices; and (ii) establishment of validation / demonstration trials for
IPM management practices in the fields of Lead Farmers; and (iv) establishment of pest
monitoring programs in the irrigated marshlands and surrounding hillsides being targeted
by the Project (MINAGRI, 2008).

The activities in Sub-component 2.2 were to be implemented by public agencies (e.g.
RADA, ISAR), NGOs, participating farmer organizations and cooperatives, and private
firms and individuals. Public agencies, NGOs, and participating farmer organizations and
cooperatives were to be supported with capacity-building grants made through the RTF.
Private firms and individuals were to be invited to apply to the RIF for financing and
would be offered assistance in preparing funding proposals to be submitted to the RIF (MINAGRI, 2008).

**Sub Components 2.3: Agribusiness Investment**

The Project was to support investments by cooperative and privately-owned enterprises in goods and services that add value to commodities produced by Project beneficiaries (MINAGRI, 2008). It was anticipated that many of these investments were to involve machinery and equipment used for harvesting, drying, storing, processing, packaging, and marketing agricultural products. The activities in Sub-component 2.3 were to be supported through financing (loans or grants) made available through RIF2 and awarded based on clearly defined criteria.

**Sub Component 2.4: Local Infrastructure Investment**

The Project was to support investments in infrastructure that promotes value addition in areas being served by the Project (e.g., rural markets, drying floors, processing facilities, storage facilities, access roads, bridges, culverts). The activities in Sub-component 2 were to be supported through matching grants provided through the LIF and awarded based on clearly defined criteria (MINAGRI, 2008).

**Sub Component 2.5: Applied research in support of production and marketing activities**

The Project was to commission applied, problem-oriented research in support of production and marketing activities being supported under the Project, (MINAGRI, 2008).
Applied research in support of production and marketing activities: During the course of Project implementation, technical problems are certain to arise relating to (i) *primary production activities* being undertaken by Project beneficiaries (e.g., poor performance of certain crop varieties, emergence of pest and disease problems, emergence of soil nutrient imbalances), and (ii) *processing and marketing activities* being undertaken by Project beneficiaries (e.g., inefficient harvesting, storage, and processing technologies; inefficient packaging technologies; lack of information about marketing opportunities). Where appropriate, the Project was to support applied, problem-oriented research aimed at resolving these problems. The main focus of this investment area was to be applied research that emphasizes empowering the community (farmers and others involved locally in value chains) to identify problems and to contract for applied research with service providers. The research was to be commissioned in two ways: (i) competitively, and (b) non-competitively.

The activities in Sub-component 2.5 were to be implemented by public or private research organizations and supported using grants provided through the RTF and awarded based on clearly defined criteria.

**Sub Component 2.6: Support of information-sharing and alliances**

According to MINAGRI (2008) as contained in the RSSP II Public Disclosure Document sub component 2.6 of the project aimed to support information sharing and knowledge exchange among beneficiaries. The Project was to finance national and international study tours for Lead Farmers, members of farmer organizations and cooperatives, private entrepreneurs, service providers, and government officials to foster learning about commodity chains and their commercial possibilities. The activities in Sub-component
2.6 were to be implemented by the PSCU and supported through grants provided through the RTF and awarded based on clearly defined criteria.

2.1.2.3 Socioeconomic Development Objectives of RSSP II

The World Bank (2008) discusses the socio economic development objective of RSSP II in terms of long term objectives, project approach and project indicators.

The Long Term Objective

The long-term programmatic objective of the RSSP APL series is to help the Government of Rwanda achieve its strategic goal of unlocking rural growth in order to increase incomes and reduce poverty (World Bank, 2008). Rural growth—specifically agricultural growth—has been shown to be up to four times as efficient in reducing poverty as growth in other sectors. The RSSP APL series was guided by the recognition that the most effective way to achieve agricultural growth is to raise the productivity and expand the employment of resources that the rural poor own or depend on for their livelihoods, primarily land and labour.

The Project Approach

The RSSP APL series sought to achieve this objective through the sustained transfer of financial and technical resources to provide the technology, infrastructure, support services, and institutional capacity needed for faster growth in the rural economy (World Bank, 2008). The programmatic approach was appropriate, because a sustained commitment was needed to achieve significant progress toward this long-term objective. The Government had to start almost from scratch in starting to rebuild the institutional capacity needed to support productive activities in rural areas. The process of institutional
reform had commenced, as evidenced by the recent creation of a new set of agricultural and rural development agencies charged with implementing the PSTA, but much remained to be done.

**Project Indicators**

According to the World Bank (2008), the RSSP APL series had three Overall Program Indicators (OPI):

(i) Change in the average level of household incomes among Program direct beneficiary households;

(ii) Change in the percentage of Program direct beneficiary households under the poverty line; and

(iii) Change in the average level of rice/crop yields per hectare in districts having marshlands rehabilitated or developed by the Program. The original Overall Program Indicators as described in the RSSP1 PAD were revised due to imprecise formulation or problematic measurement. A Performance Indicators Update and Impact Assessment Study was commissioned in 2007, prior to the closing of RSSP1, to allow measurement of the Overall Program Indicators at the end of Phase 1 and establish baselines for subsequent phases of the RSSP series. Once the baselines are established, appropriate targets will be decided for the remaining phases. Under RSSP2 and RSSP3, the Overall Program Indicators will be tracked as part of the M&E plan.
2.2 Empirical Review

2.2.1 Trends in Development Theories

The concept of “development” has evolved considerably over the years. As an enterprise and as a scholarly discipline, it could be argued that economic development traces its origin to around the Second World War. Since then it has evolved from purely left-winged state-led (statist) theory, through right-winged neoclassical market-led theories, to the “post development” and more citizen consensual theories (John, 2007). It is within this last model of theorizing that RSSP II may be situated. To clarify this there is need however to trace the evolution of development theorizing since World War II to the present in order to better comprehend how RSSP II fits within contemporary development thought.

2.2.1.1 Statist Theory and Practice of Economic Development

The Statist theory of development holds that the state is the central actor and agent of economic development. It is traced back to the immediate post World War II period when continental Europe was confronted with the challenge of rebuilding countries shattered by war. The institutions that helped manage this process, such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (which soon came to be known as the World Bank), were created for the task, hence the formal birth of development enterprise and theorizing (John, 2007).

Alongside this arose a tradition of theorizing about the special challenges facing backward regions and countries, and the means by which these challenges could be met in such a way as to put these areas on sustainable paths to industrialization, at a time when development was considered synonymous with industrialization. It was viewed that the
ultimate goal of development is to raise incomes and in the process give poor people access to the range of goods and services then widespread in developed societies (Lake, 1994). Development, in short, was about getting richer or more prosperous. Moreover, given the state of the industrial countries at that time, and the lessons their experiences had taught, industrialization was seen as essential (Peter, 1996 & John, 2007).

Another new reality lent force to this push to industrialize: the coming of independence to the former colonial empires of Europe, a process that picked up speed in the wake of the war. By and large, Asian and African countries came to independence poor, and were eager for two reasons to speed up their development. One was the obvious fact that they sought to provide better lives for their citizens. The second was the obvious need to consolidate their independence and to convert newly won nominal political equality with the rich countries into an economic equality. The scholarly literature of the time only reinforced this push: development was about using the state to spearhead the process of modernizing the society and raising its incomes and this constitutes the Statist theory of economic development (Midgley, 1987; Peter, 1996 & John, 2007).

Development theorizing therefore started out in the twentieth century among the more left-wing branches of the social sciences, left wing socialists, communists and modern liberals who generally favored using the state as an agent of social transformation. The state, it was held, could both develop economies and alter societies in such a way as to make them suit human needs. Underlying this was a belief that the state could embody collective will more effectively than the market, which favored privileged interests. Although the old right, from conservatives to fascists, also favored strong states and held an equal suspicion of the market, as a political force it declined throughout the post–World War II period. In its place emerged a new right based on resurgent classical
liberalism that regarded the state as a potential tyrant and venerated the freedom and productive potential of the market.

The then “Third World” Countries like Rwanda were later influenced by this statist conception of development with the emergence of structuralism economics. Aware of the imperfections in the market and the world economy, and confident that the state could overcome them, development theorists proposed models governments interventions in development which were eagerly adopted by the newly independent countries as the highway to the industrial age (John, 2007). And in the beginning this seemed to work well as demand for third-world products rose during the booming postwar world economy. This provided third-world governments with the capital they needed to develop their industry and infrastructure (Midgley, 1987).

However, as time went by, problems in these strategies came to light. It became increasingly clear that many third-world economies were growing more slowly than required to continue improving the standards of living of the world’s poorest citizens (John, 2007). The industrial development that took place consumed more resources than it generated, a waste exacerbated by inefficient states. When the postwar boom came to an end in the 1970s, the shortcomings of state led development became plain. It was around this time that the right began to resurface. Dissident voices belonging to an old-school, neoclassical theory had for decades been firing occasional volleys from the sidelines of development studies. They claimed that the main problem in the third world was the state itself, and that rapid development could only come about if the state was rolled back. At the same time, as earlier development models became compromised, new left-wing schools of thought—in particular, dependency theory—arose to claim that the market
itself was the problem and that if anything was needed, it was a greater role for the state. The development theory was then at across road.

2.2.1.2 Neoclassical Theory of Economic Development

The Neoclassical theory of development arose in the confusion surrounding the evident weakness of the leftist statist theorizing. Dating back to the late 1970s the neoclassical theory argued that the market forces should be left to determine development with less state intervention. This right-winged approach initiated a long attack on the state and the other institutions, such as unions, that were seen to be hindering the operation of the market.

Bugnicourt (1982) argues that the 'mobilization' of people for development projects by government officials is counterproductive because it in fact demobilizes the population negating their capacity to solve their own problems. De Graaf (1986) is equally critical of a 'top-down' style of development in which metaphorical fishing rods are handed down to a passive populace which is exhorted to fend for itself. Authentic social development occurs when ordinary people find answers to their own problems through taking direct political control over their own affairs. The technical expert, who features prominently in the demonology of participation, is often seen as epitomizing the paternalism of the state.

Hollsnteiner (1977) writes about the 'elite specialist' whose professional education engenders an attitude of 'knowing best'. But, by failing to involve the ordinary people, these 'developers' impose external solutions and foster paternalism; they also frequently make mistakes that are monumentally costly and wasteful.

Donor agencies began pressuring third-world governments to make similar changes in their policies. Many third-world governments acceded reluctantly, because the debt crisis
had weakened their bargaining power with their creditors. Others rolled back the state more eagerly, because local constituencies had already started pushing for reform (Midgley, 1987 & John, 2007).

Less state, more market – the neoclassical tenet - was the essential thrust of the strategy known as Structural Adjustment, Programme (SAP) which was applied in much of the third world. The idea seemed sound, but as time would tell, SAP contained its own problems. Its shortcomings, which grew more evident with the passage of time, shed a new and damaging light on neoclassical theory. Structural adjustment yielded some positive gains in some of the more advanced third-world countries. However, in the poorer countries, those most in need of rapid change, it was less effective, and in some places actually did more harm than good. The question left was what the alternatives were for third world countries (Sally, 2004).

2.2.1.3 The Post Development Theory

Whereas neoclassical theory remained dominant in practice, in the academic realm the pendulum began to swing back toward the left—though perhaps not as far as it went in the postwar period, and not even toward the same corner. For if the old left had died, what had arisen to take its place was a new left. Sachs (1992) declares development to be ‘a ruin in the intellectual landscape’; a lighthouse which supposedly inspired nations, but which now ‘shows cracks and is starting to crumble’. Statements such as these reflect the disillusionment with development felt by several scholars collectively referred to as ‘post-development theorists’. This group of theorists feels that the concept of development is obsolete or bankrupt and that the practice of development has done more harm than good (Sally, 2004).
In this movement, by the 1990s, a wholly new critique, the “Post development” theory emerged. Influenced by postmodern currents of thought, and finding its popular voice in the antiglobalization movement that mushroomed in the course of the decade, post development theory begun with skepticism and sometimes outright hostility towards the patronizing effects of both statist and neoclassical theories and practice of development (Escobar, 1988). Twenty-first century postmodernism moved beyond statist and neoclassical theorist by questioning the whole concept of development itself, arguing that it was never intended to better citizens’ lives but rather geared toward establishing external control over citizens’ lives (John, 2007). The theory argued that the so-called development practice was allegedly preoccupied with drawing citizens into the formal networks of circulation, where they could be taxed, thereby consolidating the state’s control over their lives. To reject development was therefore now redefined as a celebration of individual or subaltern emancipation. And the rallying cry of some in the anti-globalization movement was a clarion call to reject the sirens of development and allow a million voices to contend (Escobar, 1988 & John, 2007).

As is often the case with new currents of thought, post development thought has been more heard than implemented. Yet that is not to diminish the impact it has had on the field. If its wholesale repudiation of development has gained little traction, research on the economy has tended to cast a positive light on some of its general ideas. To begin with, its call for a more decentralized and participatory approach to development has actually fit nicely with neoclassical calls for such, since both are animated by a desire to weaken the hold of centralized states over citizens’ lives. Except for China the world over state planning is increasingly seen as the relic of a bygone age, and it seems unlikely it will come back into fashion anytime soon.
Partly as a result, development theory is today less programmatic, and more concerned with flexibility and adaptability. Discussions of the state, particularly the large body of literature that flows from the World Bank and aid community, revolve less around the question of whether more or less state is good for development; rather, there is a widening agreement that “better,” rather than more or less, is what matters when it comes to the public sector, and the literature has turned to the more mundane but all-important matter of how to improve administrative and technical capacity in third-world public sectors. This kind of localized, particularistic, and flexible approach to development is, in the end not that far from what post development thought has advocated (Ferguson, 1990 & John, 2007).

Equally, post development thought has called for a return to the stress on people as both the measures and the determinants of development. In the past, the single-minded determination to rapidly develop economies and strengthen states led to abuses, at times, of individual freedom; ordinary lives could quite readily be sacrificed on the altars of national independence. The call for people to be restored to the front and center of development thought was not peculiar to postdevelopment thought. After all, neoclassical economics, with its call for macroeconomics to be replaced by microeconomics, always placed its faith in the operations of an economy filled with liberated individuals, even if its practices paradoxically sometimes led to the loss of liberty by those same individuals (Kothari, 1990).

Moreover, the very concept that justified national development—the principle of state sovereignty—has come into question in a global age. Sovereignty, the basic principle that there is an ultimate authority in every country—the state—and that it not only enjoys authority over all other authorities in its land, but can also resist the efforts of all foreign
sovereigns to meddle in its affairs, has arguably had a rough ride of late. So out of this seemingly unlikely meeting of postdevelopment thought and neoclassical economics, a new consensus seems to be emerging. Just as the radical left’s call to smash capitalism was in the postwar period subsumed into the moderate left’s campaign to use the state to make capitalism more humane, so too has postdevelopment theory’s call to reject development remained marginal, while its calls for decentralization, participation, and emancipation have gained widespread acceptance. Today, the rich countries came to accept the necessity of putting the concerns of third world countries on the development agenda. Concern at the harsh social effects of structural adjustment, as well as at the iniquity of a global financial system that spreads risk between borrowers and lenders in private markets but compels governments to bear the full risk involved in bond issuance, began to percolate into even the IMF (Öni, & Fikret, 2005).

Finally, the concern with individual well-being also began to work its way into development theory. Sen (2000), in his returned the focus of scholars to the human individuals who were to benefit from the greater freedom that development was to bring. Raising incomes was one way to augment individual liberty, but there were others as well, and repressing those liberties in a blind quest to raise output was exposed as a Pyrrhic victory. Meanwhile, the neoclassical focus on decentralizing administration to make government leaner, more flexible, and better adaptive left room for the sort of participatory development celebrated by postdevelopment theorists. This coalescence of scholarly opinion around the needs of both people and poor countries, away from programmatic commitments to more (or less) government and toward pragmatic commitments to better government, happened to occur at a time when the power balance between the first world and the third world had shifted in important ways.
Still, all is not rosy on this morning horizon. Grave challenges have emerged to confront not only developing countries, but indeed the entire planet. Most significant is the environmental challenge. Two decades ago, environmental issues were still fairly marginal in development thought. Now they are front and center. And while theorists may generally agree on the problem and its solutions—that rapid economic growth has led to pollution at rates the planet cannot presently absorb, and thus that capping and ideally reversing these emissions are central—practitioners have so far found it difficult to confront the difficult decision involved. Development now must take into consideration environmental sustainability.

Development theory may have gone a long way toward consensus. But its ultimate implementation depends on political leadership, including global leadership. And it remains to be seen if the twenty-first century will produce the kind of leadership required to truly bring an end to the kind of poverty and oppression that so filled the twentieth.

### 2.2.2 Rurality and Rural Development

Central to the twenty-first century development theorizing are the closely interconnected notions of (1) rural development, (2) the ‘web’ that underlies and shapes rural development processes and (3) the diversity of rural regions. Rural regions differ in terms of their ‘webs’; in turn, the specificity of the web helps to explain the particularity of a rural region and its development trajectory (Jan et al., 2008). The ‘web’ refers to the pattern of interrelations, interactions, exchanges and mutual externalities within rural societies. This pattern embodies and describes “the mutual interactions” that take place between agriculture, the socioeconomic context in which it is embedded and the rural development process (es) within which it is a constituting element. In short: the web interlinks activities, processes, people and resources and, simultaneously, it shapes the
ways in which they unfold. The development of such a web, contributes to the performance of regional rural economies.

The rural is the place where the ongoing encounter, interaction and mutual transformation (in short: the co-production) of man and living nature is located. This encounter occurs through a wide range of different practices, which are spatially and temporally bounded. These include, agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, rural tourism, rural sports and living in the countryside (Ploeg et al., 2000). Through co-production living nature is used, reproduced and transformed into a rich variety of often highly contrasting expressions. Particular landscapes, containing specific land-use and settlement patterns, specific levels of biodiversity, but also particular breeds and food products, are among the many outcomes. Co-production equally shapes and transforms the social – the rural has been characterized, from ancient times onwards, by particular institutions (such as the family enterprise, the centrality of crafts), relations (e.g. particular town-countryside relations), identities and subcultures. Within the framework of the rural both the social and the natural co-evolved in a specific, and often mutually reinforcing, way.

Throughout history (and especially in recent decades), there have been major shifts within the co-production and co-evolution of man and living nature. On the one hand, the composition of the practices that together make up the rural economy has shifted dramatically. While agriculture is, in many areas, a declining activity (at least in quantitative terms), rural tourism, rural housing and rural sports have become, in many places, important new elements of the regional rural economy. This is reflected in the frequently used statement that the rural has changed from being a “place of production” towards being a “place of consumption” (Ploeg et al., 2000).
Rural development is, essentially, about revitalizing and strengthening the rural. It aims at repositioning the rural within the wider society, by making the rural more attractive, more accessible, more valuable and more useful for society as a whole (including rural dwellers). Rural development is essentially what the concept literally says: it is development of the rural (Ploeg et al., 2000). It is about the further unfolding (or revitalization) of the amenities (or resources) contained in the rural – amenities that are important to society as a whole. Rural development is based on natural resources: it reproduces and further develops these resources. Consequently, co-production is crucial to rural development. Through rural development the rural economy, in as far as it is grounded on sustainable use of natural resources, is strengthened (Chambers, 1983).

Rural development is not to be equated, in a unilinear way, to the growth of the rural economy. Not all forms of economic growth in the countryside can be defined as rural development. More often than not, indiscriminate forms of the former are highly detrimental to the latter. Only when the use and development of rural resources translates, directly or indirectly, into (new) economic activities and the associated production of Value Added, is there an alignment between rural development and rural economic growth (Ploeg et al., 2000). By application rural development is not just about the various activities implemented through Component 2 of RSSP II; but rather the extent to which these activities result in real gains in terms of poverty reduction and quality of life of the rural poor.

2.2.3 Rural Development in Rwanda: An empirical Perspective of EDPRS 2

MINECOFIN (2012) in the Rwanda EDPRS 2 document defines rural development as the process of improving the quality of life and economic wellbeing of people living in rural areas. The primary objective of rural development is to reduce rural poverty. Targeting
rural poverty reduction also means focusing on strengthening social cohesion and reducing inequality. Poverty reduction is a complex process and many factors will determine whether economic growth is associated with poverty reduction, such as the initial level of inequality, the composition of growth (which sectors grow) and how inequality changes over the period of growth. Given Rwanda’s geographical and demographic composition, sustained economic growth requires large gains in poverty reduction and vice versa.

Rural development emphasises the foundations and linkages of rural growth and the coordination between sectors such as land, infrastructure, agriculture and rural finance, while at the same time understanding the need for broader urban and rural linkages. Off-farm job creation and large-scale investment to open up the economy are also essential. These aspects are addressed in the Productivity, Youth and Employment Thematic Strategy and the Economic Transformation Thematic Strategy. The combination and coordination of these focus areas will catalyse rural development in Rwanda.

The analysis of the Rwanda EDPRS 1 experience suggests a number of recent trends and factors at play in Rwanda (MINECOFIN, 2012). Firstly, agricultural production across households, driven by the Crop Intensification Programme (CIP), has increased despite a decline in the average land size cultivated by households. Secondly, much of this additional production has been marketed, fuelling the commercialisation of agriculture. In 2011, households sold around 25% of their output compared with 18% in 2005. These two factors have meant higher incomes for the average agricultural household. Third, the contribution of off-farm income to rural households has increased, particularly wage and self-employed income. Fourth, there has been a decline in average household size leading to reduced consumption needs. This is consistent observations in numerous countries
that show growth in agriculture which is a predominantly rural activity leads to three times as much poverty reduction than GDP growth outside of agriculture (De Janvry & Sadoulet, 2010).

The Rwanda EDPRS 2 document sees poverty as a predominantly rural phenomenon. As the name implies, rural development focuses on rural areas. In Rwanda, around 9.1 million people, i.e. 85% of the total population live in rural areas. Many of the poor and extreme poor reside in this demographic group. Poverty remains largely a rural and agricultural phenomenon with rural and urban poverty at 48.7% and 22.1%, respectively. Rural households are more than twice as likely to be either poor or in extreme poverty than urban households (MINECOFIN, 2013).

EDPRS 2 also notices that inequality is still high despite decreasing: As measured by the GINI coefficient, inequality has reduced in the last five years to a level lower than in 2000/2001. Thus, poorer households (predominantly rural) have become better off in proportional terms and at a faster rate than less poor households. However, the GINI index remains high and there is a need to ensure that inclusive growth takes place in rural areas.

Similarly, Rwanda is predominantly rural in its landscape with around 1.4 million hectares of arable land. According to Rwanda Natural Resources Authority [RNRA] (2012), land categorised as rural is nearly 98% of total land area, with around 54% classified as arable, and the urban area being only 1.5% of total country surface. Agricultural smallholders dominate the scarce land available in Rwanda. It is also significant that the smaller the land holding, the more likely the land holder to be in poverty, hence the link between poverty and land. Smallholders hold an average of four to five plots that make up a mean land size average of approximately 0.59 hectares, with a median value of 0.33 hectares. However, the average picture does not show how skewed
land distribution is in Rwanda. 36% of households own 6% of the farm land, with an average of only 0.11ha per household. In addition, women provide the bulk of labour in the crop sector, but function mainly at subsistence level with insufficient skills, access to markets and control over land and other agricultural facilities.

EDPRS 2 observes that the prevalence of poverty in Rwanda is associated with low productivity in subsistence agriculture. Poverty is highest by far (76.6%) among households (often landless) who obtain more than half their income from working on other people’s farms. The next poorest group is those with diversified livelihoods who obtain more than 30% or more of their incomes from farm wage work (76.2%). Women are more likely to fall into the category. Given the transition of some men to off-farm employment, there are now more women involved in agricultural subsistence production than before EDPRS 1.

Agriculture can also offer a pathway out of poverty. Improving productivity and increasing sales of produce is an important income earner for smallholders. A study on Rwanda by International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) (2009), supports this: “economy wide growth led by the agriculture sector has a greater effect on poverty reduction than does the same level of growth driven by the non-agricultural sector”

It is also observed by EDPRS that there is a connection between poverty and rural-urban linkages and urbanisation in Rwanda. Economic growth has spurred internal migration and it is estimated that 19% of the population migrated within the country during EDPRS 1. Additionally, the higher the wealth of the family, the more likely the individuals are to move. The size of the poverty differential between urban and rural areas will to some extent explain the level of migration. Urban areas provide markets for rural products. And
centres for processing, distribution and information and concentration and agglomeration of people and activities lead to high levels of social and economic development.

2.3 Critical Review and Research Gap Identification

The Statist, neoclassical and post development theorizing analysed above do not adequately provide for the current trends in state-initiated development projects such as RSSP that do not tightly fit into the three postulated theories. Many development projects in emerging economies like Rwanda find their origin in state policies and decisions. They however take into consideration market forces in terms of productive efficiency and the resulting marketability of outputs of such projects. For instance, the RSSP has as one of its major assumptions the improvement of the capacity of farmers to implement value adding dimensions to their farming practices and along the commodity chains to the extent that they would compete in provision of quality produce as well as processed agricultural products. Such thinking betrays a combination of both statist as well as neoclassical theories of rural development. Similarly, RSSP assumes that farmers are encouraged, not coerced, into engaging in project activities. This would reflect the major tenets of post development theorizing where the freedom and personal dignity of the beneficiary of development undertaking is emphasized.

It may also be noted that the assumptions behind literature surrounding RSSP is based on conceptualization of development as poverty reduction and improvement in income through gainful employment. It is assumed that if these RSSP interventions are successfully implemented then poverty will reduce and hence development. Firstly, it may be argued that this is a limited perspective of development. It is significant to note that contemporary conceptions of development go beyond income to encompass more fundamental issues as freedom (Sen, 2000). Secondly, even if it assumed that poverty
For instance, do entire community benefit from the interventions or it is limited to farmers who are essentially owners of land, leaving the majority landless not catered for.

2.4 Conceptual framework

This part deals with the relationship between variables where there are two variables which are independent variable and dependent variable. Independent variable influences dependent variable or increase or decrease of dependent variable is influenced by independent variable. There are also other different factors that affect socioeconomic development of Rwanda like political factors, economic factors, social factors, technological factors, ecological factors and legal factors. The socioeconomic development is also affected by corporate governance mechanism and organizational structure.

This study focused on the relationship of variables where the socioeconomic development of Rwanda is a variable which is dependent on rural sector support project. The researcher wanted to show how household income, poverty reduction, agriculture productivity per hectare, access to health, access to education, social relations, and perception of level of wellbeing are affected or influenced by farmers’ organizations and cooperatives, production technologies, rural infrastructures and knowledge generation and dissemination. A dependent variable therefore varies as a function of the independent variable (Researcher, 2013).
The conceptual framework showed how rural sector support project (independent variable) affects socioeconomic development of Rwanda (dependent variable). The rural sector support project which is the component 2 of RSSP II activities affect socioeconomic development of Rwanda in terms of household income, poverty reduction, agriculture productivity per hectare, access to health, access to education, social relations, and perception of level of wellbeing.

Source: Researcher (2013)
The socioeconomic development is also influenced by intervening factors like political factors (government attitude, economic system, platform of political parts and changes in international trade), economic factors (gross national product, gross domestic product, interest rate, inflation rate, tax rate, exchange rate, economic boom or recession, debt and expenditure, availability of credit, oil and commodity prices), social factors (customs, educational level, age, lifestyles, mobility of people and population distribution), technological factors (analogy to digital, new techniques and methods in technology, creativity and innovation), ecological factors (carbon emission restrictions/taxes, more stringent laws governing air and water solution) and legal factors (health and safety legislation, equality legislation, regulation of companies and international protocols).

2.5 Summary

With the ending chapter the researcher tried to go through different documentations (books, internet, articles, etc.) related to the research field. It was seen the details about socioeconomic development indicators, development theory and cooperatives purpose. It means that the researcher reviewed literature related to rural projects and socioeconomic development.

The past studies showed that development projects have a considerable impact on socioeconomic development of people. For instance, the RSSP has as one of its major assumptions the improvement of the capacity of farmers to implement value adding dimensions to their farming practices and along the commodity chains to the extent that they would compete in provision of quality produce as well as processed agricultural products. Such thinking betrays a combination of both statist as well as neoclassical theories of rural development. Similarly, RSSP assumes that farmers are encouraged, not coerced, into engaging in project activities. This would reflect the major tenets of post
development theorizing where the freedom and personal dignity of the beneficiary of development undertaking is emphasized.

There are also other different factors that affect socioeconomic development of people like political factors, economic factors, social factors, technological factors, ecological factors and legal factors. The socioeconomic development is also affected by corporate governance mechanism and organizational structure.

Finally, based on the deep critical analysis made, the researcher identified the gap in the literature review. The gap identified needs a critical study that justifies present research.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presented the study design, the target population, sample design, data collection procedures and instruments, data processing and analysis procedures.

3.1 Research Design

This research adopted both qualitative and quantitative design. It was a qualitative research whose aim was an intensive analysis of the perceptions of stakeholders and beneficiaries. It was quantitative because numerical techniques were used to determine trends in actual changes brought about by the project. Literature was reviewed from project and ministry documents, books, journal articles, and the Internet.

The research strategy used in this research was the case study. The strategy was chosen for its potential for providing in-depth information on the impacts of RSSP project on the lives of the rural population and the economy in general. RSSP is a countrywide programme and it is by focusing on a district in a province that a more in depth analysis may reveal the trend in impact of the project.

3.2 Target Population

The study population was 4,809. This was constituted by four categories of stakeholders. The first category consisted of 4793 members of farmers’ organizations and cooperatives organized in 164 groups under three cooperatives, namely, CORIMAX (A Rice Cooperative), COPRORIZ (a Rice Cooperative) and KAURE (A banana Cooperative). In this category there were 159 Lead Farmers. The second category consisted of the 3 district level representatives of RSSP and 3 district level subject matter experts or farmers
extension officers. The third category consisted of the 5 top national executives of the PSCU. The fourth category comprised of the 5 executives of the participating private investors organizations in the district.

3.3 Sample Design

3.3.1 Sample Size

According to Grinnell (1990), a sample size is the number of people or objects in the sample. The sample size opted was 235 consisting of 80 Lead farmers, 132 members of farmers’ organizations, 15 executives of the three cooperatives (five from each cooperative), 2 district level representatives of RSSP and 2 district level subject matter experts or farmers extension officers, 2 top national executives of the PSCU and lastly, 2 executives of the participating private investors organizations in the district.

3.3.2 Sample Size Determination

The opted Sample size above was determined using the two successive formulas posited by Glenn (1992):

Formula 1 = \( n_o = \frac{Z^2 pq}{e^2} \)  
Formula 2 = \( n = \frac{n_o}{1 + \frac{(n_o - 1)}{N}} \)

Where \( n_o = \) the sample size for an infinite population size

\( n = \) the sample size for determined or finite population size

\( Z = \) the Z scores determining the confidence level the expected responses during the Research.
\[ p = \text{is the estimated proportion of variability of the tendency of targeted farmers to adopt the activities initiated by RSSP II Component 2.} \]

\[ q = 1 - p \text{ or the level of precision or sampling error} \]

\[ e = \text{the desired level of precision} \]

\[ N = \text{the size of the population} \]

In the study the calculations were thus:

Formula 1: By substitution at 95% confidence level (or 1.96 on the Z score table) and 80% level of non-variability since the target group of farmers are similar in relation to their access to the RSSP programmes and at 5% margin of error (level of precision) the calculations are as follows:

\[ n_o = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times 0.8 \times 0.2}{(0.05)^2} = \frac{3.8416 \times 0.8 \times 0.2}{0.0025} = \frac{0.614656}{0.0025} = 246 \]

Formula 2: By substitution of the value of \( n_o = 246 \)

\[ n = \frac{246}{1 + \frac{(246 - 1)}{4.809}} = \frac{246}{1 + 0.05} = \frac{246}{1.05} = 235 \]

The calculated sample size was therefore 235 respondents

3.3.3 Sampling Technique

The research used stratified random sampling technique to select respondents. The strata was consisted of farmers, executives of cooperatives, district representatives of RSSP, district level subject matter experts or farmers extension officers, national executives of the PSCU and lastly, executives of the participating private investors organizations in the
Members of farmers groups were further stratified into three levels: the extremely poor, the average income earner and the very rich. They were identified using simple indicators of material well-being such as quality of housing, possession of property such as land and livestock. The researcher randomly selected respondents from each stratum. Representatives of Private investment organizations were selected on the basis of their participation and ability to offer analysis of the projects they participated in during the implementation of the RSSP.

3.4 Data Collection Methods

3.4.1 Data Sources

Primary Data

The researcher collected primary data regarding respondents’ perceptions of the achievements, gaps and challenges encountered during the implementation of the project. The principal tools used were in depth interviews, questionnaires and focus group discussions.

Secondary Data

The researcher gathered secondary data from records and project documents that were available with the farmers’ organizations and cooperatives, PSCU, participating Private investors and research organizations involved in the project.

3.4.2 Data Collection Instruments

3.4.2.1 Questionnaire

Self-administered questionnaires were designed and administered to the different categories of purposively sampled respondents.
3.4.2.2 Individual Interviews

In depth interviews with members of cooperatives and farmers’ organizations, private investors’ representatives, agriculture extension officers and members of the PSCU was conducted. A checklist was used to stimulate the discussions on the implementation, gains and challenges of the RSSP II. Because in depth interviews were more detailed and required more time and concentration, respondents were interviewed according to their convenience.

3.4.2.3 Focus Group Discussion

The Researcher organized meetings with lead farmers and farmers groups to assess their perception of the implementation and impacts of the project

3.4.2.4 Content Analysis

With transcribed notes from the interviews and analysis of questionnaires, and secondary data obtained from PSCU the researcher revisited the respondents/ research participants for validation and approval of his notes and secondary data sources so as to ensure the accuracy of data collected.

3.4.3 Administration of Data Collection Instruments

The researcher designed the questionnaire and interview guide according to the research objectives and questions. These instruments were edited and confirmed by the supervisor of this study. Primary data as original information was collected using questionnaire, interview guide and focus group discussion.
The data collection process was organized and conducted as follows: after that the research proposal was approved, a research authorization letter to introduce the researcher was obtained.

The introductory letter was followed by the reproduction of the questionnaires and their distribution. During the administration of the questionnaires, the respondents were explained about the research purpose and were requested to answer completely the questionnaires; on retrieval, all returned questionnaires were checked and were found all filled in. The researcher made interview with concerned people and organized meetings as mentioned in focus group discussion.

3.4.4 Reliability and Validity

3.4.4.1 Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency, accuracy, or dependability of the instrument (Lill&Visser, 1998). The researcher tested the reliability of the instrument using the Split-half method based on the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula:

$$r_a = \frac{2(r_o)}{1 + r_o}$$

Where $r_a$ is the reliability Coefficient and $r_o$ is the product-moment correlation that was obtained between the two halves of scores obtained after testing the instrument once. The interview guide and questionnaires were tested once on a sample of the population and the reliability coefficient obtained between the odd numbered items and the even numbered items on the instruments obtained was 0.75 on the questionnaires items and 0.8 on the interview guide, thus indicating a high correlation and high level of reliability.
3.4.4.2 Validity

The validity of a research instrument refers to the extent to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Lill&Visser, 1998). The researcher used content validity techniques to verify and ensure that the questions asked are designed to examine the level of participation by farmers in RSSP II component 2 activities and the socio-economic impact their participation has on poverty reduction and employment.

3.5 Data analysis Procedure

Data collected from the field was summarised and edited while preserving the original details and meaning as accurately as possible. Data was summarised and presented in tables, while others in descriptive words. Similar responses and differences were noted. Data collected was compared to the indicators targeted in the project documents and as described in the literature review.

Data related to the objectives of determining the socioeconomic indicators that were affected by the activities of phase two of RSSP was analyzed in terms of actual changes in the average level of household incomes among programme direct Beneficiary households; the percentage of Programme direct beneficiary households under the poverty line; the average level of agricultural productivity per hectare; level of access to health; level of access to education; social relations; general level of well-being of project beneficiaries. These were compared to the same situation for the non-beneficiary households.

Data related to objective of assessing the extent to which the project objectives have been achieved during phase two of RSSP Gatsibo district was analyzed and compared to the targets set by the project designers. The project had set definite minimum targets to be
achieved through each activity of component 2. Actual observed situations after the implementation were compared to these targets.

The data sets related the objective of evaluating the perceptions of the beneficiaries of phase two of RSSP on the socioeconomic development of Gatsibo district wasanalysed in terms of the percentage of beneficiaries who think they gained positively or not from the project activities in terms of income, productivity levels, access to health, education, social relations and socioeconomic and general well-being.

3.6 Ethical Consideration

During the research, the researcher will keep the honesty, openness and integrity, in data collection and analysis, to serve effectively the institution and the country. The researcher will avoid any kind of bias to provide relevant and reliable information. The information from respondents will be confidential. Finally, the researcher will make the respect for intellectual property.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered from the different stakeholders of rural sector support project. The findings were presented in the view of the stated research objectives and research questions that intended to analyze “the impact of rural sector support project on socioeconomic development of Rwanda”.

Preliminary Remarks

This chapter presents the findings of this study in relation to the objectives and research questions posited in the first chapter. It analyses empirical and secondary data in view of determining the type of socioeconomic impact that Component 2 of RSSP II had on the targeted rural population. The Chapter begins with an expose of the Component 2 project objectives and how their indicators were designed to be measured. It then presents the profile of respondents. It concludes with an in-depth analysis of the impact of the various project activities related to each project sub components. The achievement of Project objectives is analysed using the present indicators and thereafter the socioeconomic impact of each activity assessed.

The Objectives and Performance Indicators of Component 2 of RSSP II

The Project Public Disclosure Document (2008) shows the objective of Component 2 of RSSP II which was to support the commercialization of smallholder agriculture in targeted marshland and hillside areas by intensifying production, promoting agricultural value addition, and expanding access to markets. The project supported rural entrepreneurs and assist beneficiary cooperatives to acquire sound business practices by
applying the commodity chain approach. The Project used a holistic approach in addressing constraints along the entire commodity chain, including the upper (production), middle (processing), and lower (marketing) stages.

In the case of Gatsibo District the Project focused on strengthening commodity chains for rice and bananas which are among the national priority crops identified by MINAGRI. The project, however, remained open and responsive to the broader proposals of farmers in marshlands and hillsides, including niche commodities, provided tangible marketing opportunities exist. Performance indicators included: increased production, increased professionalism of farmers’ associations and cooperatives, increased value adding activity, and increased market participation of Project beneficiaries.

Component 2 had four sub-components addressing different aspects of the commodity chain, namely: (i) strengthening farmer organizations and cooperatives; (ii) improving production technologies, notably by fostering increased adoption of new practices and the use of inputs; (iii) financing productive rural investments; and (iv) knowledge generation and dissemination.

This Section therefore examines the achievements, gaps and challenges in meeting these objectives as well as the socioeconomic impact of the project activities as perceived and verified by the profiled respondents.

4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

4.1.1 Response Rate

Only 201 out of 236 respondents returned questionnaires and this constituted a response rate of about 86.2%. This consisted of 80 lead farmers (61 in rice and 19 in banana
cultivation), 104 ordinary farmers (82 in rice and 22 in banana cultivation), 11 leaders of the three cooperatives (4 each from CORIMAK AND COPRORIZ and 3 from KAURE), 2 members of the RSSP district coordination unit, 2 from SPIU commodity chain department, and 1 each member from ERGECO and ECAN, the two construction companies engaged on construction of infrastructures in Ntende-Rwagitima marshland.

4.1.2 Gender of Respondents

Table 4.1: Distribution of Respondents According to Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013

4.1.3 Age of Respondents

Table 4.2: Distribution of Respondents According to Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 35</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013
4.1.4 Education of Respondents

Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents According to Formal Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education Attained</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Formal Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Leavers</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Leavers</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters and Above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Education Only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013

4.1.5 Major Farming Activity of Respondents

Table 4.4: Distribution of Respondents According to Major Farming Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013
4.1.6 Distribution of Respondents According to Position in Cooperatives

Table 4.5: Type of Position held in Cooperative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in Cooperative</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager or Executive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lead Farmer</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a Member</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*

4.2 Presentations of Findings

4.2.1 The Activities Implemented in Component 2 of RSSP Phase 2

The following were the activities implemented in Gatsibo district through Component 2 of RSSP II: strengthening of farmers’ organization and cooperatives, training of farmers, improving agricultural production and related technologies, development of agricultural infrastructures and promotion and dissemination of research and related knowledge.

4.2.1.1 Strengthening Farmers Organization and Cooperatives

The activity of strengthening farmers’ organization and cooperatives was designed as sub component 2.1 in the project documents.

**Objectives**

In a bid to strengthen farmers organizations and Cooperatives Component 2 of RSSP II sought to (i) improve the governance mechanisms by instilling in them sound business practices; (ii) support capacity building activities; (iii) provide training, technical
assistance, and advisory services to build basic operating capacity in all of the farmer organizations and cooperatives with which it engages; and (iv) provide training, technical assistance, and advisory services to improve business planning and management capacity in a selected number of more commercially oriented cooperatives.

The performance indicator for Sub-component 2.1 was the number of cooperatives supported by the Project that have quality business plans under implementation.

The Approach to Strengthening Cooperatives and Farmers Organizations

Interviews with district leaders and executives of farmers’ organizations indicate that the project supported two main target groups: (i) farmer organizations working in marshlands rehabilitated or developed by the RSSP1 and RSSP II and (ii) cooperatives having strong organizational capacity and exhibiting a clear business vision. The cooperatives in the second category were selected based on two main criteria: (a) the record of good organization and management, and (b) the good proposal that is likely to lead to a successful business development. Following the selection criteria provided by the project and the Gatsibo district priority areas defined in the District Development Plans, cooperatives were invited to submit proposals to the district. The first selection was done by the district based on the above criteria and together with verification of existence and number of cooperatives members and beneficiaries. Selected proposals were sent to the project selection committee to ensure that the criteria were followed and cooperatives were eligible for project support.

Three cooperatives that qualified in Gatsibo district were CORIMAK and COPRORIZ for Rice Cultivation and KAURE for banana. Together they comprised 4793 ordinary farmers, and 159 lead farmers organized in 164 groups. The three umbrella cooperatives
signed agreement with RSSP II PSCU thereby confirming the commitment that their proposals would be funded either in cash or in kind. They were given support in the areas of capacity building that included training and study tours, technical assistance in production and the building of agribusiness infrastructure. The support focused primarily on training and advisory services to enable each cooperative improve in its general functioning, technical ways of farming and material support designated to accelerate consolidation of the existing Farmer-Based Extension (FBE) system, and technical assistance and material support designed to promote commodity marketing activities.

4.2.1.2 Training of Farmers

The second major activity implemented in the district, but which is closely related to the objective of strengthening farmers’ organization, was training and capacity building of farmers in various areas. This section discusses the training in terms of number of farmers trained and types of training conducted.

**Number of Farmers Trained**

The table 4.6 below highlights the number and profile of farmers in Gatsibo district trained through activities of sub-component 2.1.
Table 4.6: Profile of Farmers Trained in the Three Cooperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>No. of Groups</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Total No. of Lead Farmers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIMAK</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPRORIZ-Ntende</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAURE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Banana</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>2,289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Training Data, SPIU (MINAGRI, 2012)

As highlighted in Table 4.6 a total of 3 cooperatives were supported through training in Gatsibo district representing, 100% of targeted cooperatives in the district. In total 4793 farmers out of targeted 5200 were supported, constituting 92% of targets. Women constituted about 47.8% of farmers supported. A total of 159 Lead Farmers out of the targeted 165 were trained to offer additional training to lower level farmers groups, constituting a success rate of 96.4%. It is significant at this level, however, that female lead farmers constituted only 25.8% of the total number thereby highlighting the fact that although women continue to play a critical role in agriculture in Rwanda their position in the rural areas as leaders and role models in agriculture is still limited.

Types of Training or Capacity building Activities Supported

In line with nationwide diagnostic study conducted by Idea Consult, a Tunisian company contracted by the Project and as adopted by MINAGRI, four critical areas of training activities were identified and implemented in Gatsibo district through Component 2 of RSSP II, namely, training in (i) cooperative governance, organization, and bookkeeping, (ii) crop intensification, (iii) small enterprise management and (iv) business planning. In
total 159 Lead farmers were trained in these activities. Table 4.7 below highlights the statistics of those trained using the various focus areas.

**Table 4.7: Number of Lead Farmers who attended Various Types of Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>Governance, organization and Book Keeping</th>
<th>Crop Intensification Techniques</th>
<th>Small Enterprise Management</th>
<th>Business Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIMAK</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPRORIZ</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAURE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Training Data, SPIU (MINAGRI, 2012)*

From Table 4.7 one hundred and fifty nine lead farmers were trained in the four major areas of Governance and Book Keeping, Crop Intensification, Small Enterprise Management and Business Planning. The latter two trainings were, however, attended by only 90 of the 159 lead farmers. In addition to key areas trainings identified by the study, the project supported farmers to form small farmers groups, development of M&E groups to help in the monitoring, creation of a procurement committee to learn and help in public procurement procedures, and provided training for cooperative accountant on financial reporting and training for marketing committee. The small groups were effective in increasing participation and met weekly to discuss and find solutions to their problems. For example, all the three supported Cooperatives in Gatsibo district mobilized their members who have formed saving groups.
The training approach adopted was the cascade approach where Training of Trainers (ToT) sessions were conducted for Local Services Providers (LSP) who in turn trained lead farmers representing each small farmers group and the latter in turn trained the members of their small group.

**Use of Study Tours and Field Schools for Training**

A total of 39 farmers in Gatsibo district participated in study tours to more experienced cooperatives and to the Agricultural Shows. The Project also conducted Field Schools where farmers were instructed on how to practically apply specific farming techniques. See Table 4.8 Below.

**Table 4.8: Participation in Study Tours and Field School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>No. of Groups</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Participants in Study Tours</th>
<th>Participants in Field Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIMAK</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPRORIZ-Ntende</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAURE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Banana</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Training Data, SPIU (MINAGRI, 2012)*

According to interviews with SPIU and leaders of cooperatives the study tours visits created demand in different agricultural services and technologies. The Field Schools centred around demonstration plots where the learning-by-doing approach enabled farmers to gain practical training on improved agricultural technologies. Different
techniques were treated in the demonstrations plots including fertilizer uses, seed selection, plot-spacing and erosion control.

4.2.1.3 Activities Aimed at Improving Agricultural Production Technologies for Sustainable Intensification

According to the RSSP II (2008), interviews with respondents the activities directed at improving agricultural productivity included: promotion of use of improved seeds, fertilizers, IPM, terracing and modern farming equipment.

Objective

According to PAD as validated through interviews with respondents the objective of improving agricultural production technologies was an increase in percentage of farmers using improved seeds, fertilizers, IPM and modern farming equipment among supported households that have adopted sustainable marshland or hillside intensification technologies.

The Approach to Improving Production Technologies for Sustainable Intensification

The production technologies emphasized by Component 2.2 were in the areas of soil fertility management, Integrated Pest Management (IPM), conservation tillage, contour bounding, and construction of erosion control structures including terraces, vegetative strips, and agro-forestry practices. The approach used was to first train the farmers in the use of the various production technologies and then monitor their application and impact.

Soil Fertility Management and Usage of Fertilizers
The first step was to train 159 farmers in Gatsibo in the use of soil fertility management and fertilizers usage. According to Table 4.12 an overwhelming 60% of the respondents who are farmers indicate that they were satisfied with the training received and that their level of productivity and revenue improved thereafter.

Table 4.9: Level of Satisfaction with Training on Soil Fertility Management and Fertilizers Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Satisfaction with Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied and Productivity improved</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied and Productivity improved</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied but Productivity not improved</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*

Supplementary to responses in Table 4.9 statistics available at the SPIU offices regarding fertility management in Gatsibo district indicate that 86% of farmers households in marshlands and 69% in hillsides that benefited from RSSP II buy chemical fertilizers. This is substantially more than among those farmers’ households who did not benefit directly from RSSP II activities in the district. In the latter case only 30% of farmers use chemical fertilizers.

**Usage of Integrated Pest Management Practices**

According to SPIU documents and interviews with cooperative leaders RSSP II trained members of farmers’ organizations in the use of the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) technology so that members may improve agricultural productivity and Revenue. IPM
was introduced through use of demonstration plots. Seven lead farmers from Gatsibo district were trained on IPM for the rice crop in partnership with FAO and RADA. They in turn worked with more members of their farmers groups to train them in the same. Table 4.10 below shows the perception of respondents.

**Table 4.10: Respondents Perception on Use of IPM and its Impact on Productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of IPM and Impact on productivity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES and it has improved productivity</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*

Table 4.10 above shows that an overwhelming 73% of respondents indicate that they have productively used the IPM technologies to improve their productivity. This is significant since statistics available with SPIU indicate that the average use of pesticides by farmers in Gatsibo district stands at only 32%. The executives of the Cooperatives indicate that the demand for more training in IPM has increased but this may only be implemented in the new phase of RSSP 3. In general the use of IPM has impacted positively on farmers’ revenue per hectare.

**Usage of Improved and Certified Seeds**

The project introduced better seed and a method of ensuring that cooperatives continued to produce and certify seeds for transmissions to their members. CORIMAK and COPRORIZ become centres for distribution of the certified rice seeds. Responses regarding the use of improved certified and seeds are summarized in Table 4.11.
Table 4.11: Respondents Perception on Use of Improved certified Seeds and its Impact on Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use and Availability of Certified Seeds</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeds are Available and used by Farmers</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeds are not Available to Farmers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013

Table 4.11 indicates that all respondents (100%) in Gatsibo district agree that they easily access and use the improved and certified seeds. This is above the Eastern province statistics reported by SPIU which shows that an average of 70% of farmers in the cooperatives utilize improved seeds (RSSP ICR Report, 2011). Interviews also indicate that KAURE cooperative benefited from best practice in establishment of a new banana and banana plantation and pest and disease recognition and management. Interviews with stakeholders indicate that as a result of increased use of the improved seeds RSSP-supported farmers use their land more productively than the average non-beneficiary household.

Radical Terracing

The project encouraged farmers to practice radical terracing. According to Table 4.11 only 11% of farmers interrogated indicated they practiced some form of terracing.
Table 4.12: Respondents’ Views on Use of Radical Terracing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Terracing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013

Radical terracing was the least popular production intensive technology proposed to farmers. Farmers felt it was very costly to practice and their meagre resources could not allow them to extensively practice it.

4.2.1.4 Activities Aimed at Building Agricultural Infrastructures

According to SPIU documents (PAD) as validated by interviews with cooperative leaders RSSP II was to support investments in infrastructure that promotes value addition in areas being served by the Project (e.g., rural markets, drying floors, processing facilities, storage facilities, access roads, bridges, culverts).

Objective

The main goal of this sub-component is to support productive rural investments by community-based organizations and occasionally districts. Activities under this subcomponent were funded through LDF (Local development Fund).

Approaches

In response to the demands and priorities from the community, LDF provided funding to farmer organizations, cooperatives, NGOs, and occasionally Districts, for strategic
investments in public goods and services (e.g., community grain drying and storage facilities, rural roads) to activities specifically linked to others projects key areas.

**Infrastructures Constructed**

RSSP2 support to rural investments for economic infrastructure has been implemented successfully and benefited the rice cooperatives (COPRORIZ and CORIMAK), allowing them to remain relevant along the value chain. Respondents were asked to indicate the type of infrastructures they benefited from. Table 4.16 below shows that all respondents agree that dry bays, silos and rice mills were constructed in Gatsibo district.

**Table 4.13: Respondents’ Views on the Types of Infrastructures Constructed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Infrastructures</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Bays</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Storage Facility/Silos</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Mills</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*

The information in Table 4.13 was supplemented with interviews with farmers, COOPs and district leaders to affirm that the project constructed one rice mill, two big Grain Storage Facilities or silos and ten drying bays for Kanyonyomba-Rwagitima reclaimed marshlands. Respondents also indicate that the demand of drying Bays and storages remains high in the district, but the project budget was a constraint to respond to the increasing needs.

As indicated in Table 4.14 below all respondents’ stakeholders in rice farming
(constituting 77% of respondents) agree that the supply of infrastructure is relevant but inadequate. Respondents interviewed pointed out that production had gone up to the point of outstripping the provision of facilities to handle postharvest activities in terms of size, number, and distance from farmers.

Table 4.14: Respondents’ Views on Adequacy of Infrastructures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Terracing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013

However, the 4.14 members banana farmers cooperatives and executives sampled in KAURE cooperative (constituting 23% of total respondents) complaint that there is no infrastructure provided for them to aid processing and value addition to the crop. There is need therefore for more to be done in this regard.

4.2.1.5 Activities Aimed at Promotion of Research and Information Dissemination

According to the RSSP II Public Disclosure Document (January 28, 2008) and interviews with SPIU officials the project sought to implement three areas of research namely, conduct a diagnostic study whose results would be used in implementing the project, carry out a market research related to the output of the project and lastly conduct a problem based research whose findings would form a basis for future projects. The Diagnostic study result was used to organize training for farmers and cooperatives. The
market survey was conducted to determine the marketability of rice based on quality considerations.

**Objective**

The objective of this category of activities was to generate and disseminate scientific knowledge and information to guide the decision making to address key identified project issues.

**4.2.2 The Socioeconomic Indicators Affected by Activities of Component 2 RSSP II and the extent to which Objectives were achieved**

This section examines the Indicators that measures the effectiveness of activities implemented through component 2 of RSSP II. The indicators were divided into intermediate and final. Intermediate outcome indicators are the measurable outcomes related to the activity itself in terms of numbers or percentage of targeted beneficiaries, production levels, and projects to be implemented. The Final Outcome indicators on the other hand measure the socioeconomic benefits due to the beneficiaries in terms of change in beneficiaries’ levels of income and poverty.

**Intermediate Outcome Indicators**

Table 4.15 below summarizes the Intermediate outcome indicators related to each project activity in component 2. The table shows the indicators as at baseline and what was to be achieved as targets. It also indicates the level to which the indicators or objectives were achieved by the project.

The data in Table 4.18 shows that to a great extent RSSP II Component 2 achieved all its major objectives. The targeted three cooperatives in Gatsibo were all supported in terms
of development of good business plans, high quality accounting systems and management or governance structures thereby constituting 100% success rate. The project targeted to train 80% of the 5200 farmers identified in the district in crop intensification techniques (that is 4,160 farmers) but by end of 2012 a total of 4793 farmers were trained, constituting a success rate of 92.2%. Similarly, the project targeted 5% of farmers (260) farmers in the district to be trained through field schools and study tour but by the end of the project 7% or 381 farmers were trained.

According to Table 4.18 the entire project’s targeted cooperatives in the district are able to market certified seeds and seedlings, constituting a 100% success rate. By the end of RSSP I the percentage of farmers using fertilizers and Erosion management stood at 10 percent and RSSP II targeted an increase to 60%. By the end of RSSP II however, data from SPIU secretariat validate through interviews with leaders of cooperatives show that fertilizer usage and soil erosion management had increased to 89% of farmers, 29% higher than the target. It is also significant to note, according to data provided by RSSP and validated through interviews, that the project increased the use of IPM by farmers in the district to 32%, far above the targeted 20% and the baseline of 5%.

Table 4.18 shows that the use of certified seeds and seedlings by farmers increased to 76% of farmers against the baseline of 10% and target of 50%. The adoption of radical terracing was the least liked by farmers but also showed an improvement increasing to 10% against a baseline of non-use and a target of 5%. In terms of development of agricultural infrastructure the Project targeted to build one silos and two drying bays in the district. By the end of RSSP II the project had constructed two silos and ten drying bays, indicating an increase by 100% and 500% for silos and bays respectively. Similarly, RSSP data validated through interviews with SPIU indicates that the targets for research
and knowledge dissemination were all realized: one diagnostic research was conducted by Idea Consult and became a basis for the training to farmers country wide; market survey was conducted which enabled implementers to ban the use of rice hullers that break rice seeds making them less marketable; and the use of applied research in agriculture for promotion of higher levels of productivity.
## Table 4.15: Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline by End of RSSP I</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Targets for RSSP II</th>
<th>Achievement at End of RSSP II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Strengthening of farmers’ Organizations and Cooperatives</td>
<td>No. of Cooperatives that have quality business plans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Cooperatives that have quality accounting systems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Cooperatives that have quality management structures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with and COOPs leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Capacity Building and training of farmers and cooperatives</td>
<td>Percentage of targeted farmers trained in Crop Intensification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders</td>
<td>80% of targeted 5200</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of targeted farmers trained thru’ field &amp; study tours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders</td>
<td>5% of targeted 5200</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Improving Production Technologies</td>
<td>No. of Cooperatives marketing certified Seeds and seedlings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving Production Technologies (continued)</td>
<td>Percentage increase in fertilizers usage &amp; Erosion Management</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage increase in the use of IPM</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage increase in demand for certified Seeds and seedlings</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage Usage of Radical Terracing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Development of Agricultural Infrastructure</td>
<td>No. of Storage /Silos built</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with District and COOPs leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of drying bays constructed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with District and COOPs leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Research and Knowledge Dissemination</td>
<td>No. of Diagnostic Studies conducted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with District and COOPs leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Market Surveys conducted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with SPIU staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Applied Research Conducted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with SPIU staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPIU: PAD, 2012 and Primary Data from Interviews, 2013
In terms of intermediate outcome, therefore, RSSP II component 2 seems to have met most of its objectives, often performing much better than expected.

**Final Outcome Indicator**

Table 4.16 below summarizes the Final outcome indicators related to each project activity in component 2. The table shows the indicators as at baseline and what was to be achieved as targets as well as what were actually achieved by the end of phase II of RSSP. These then becomes the triggers and baseline for phase 3 of RSSP.

In summary the performance indicators include: increased production, increased professionalism of farmers’ associations and cooperatives, increased value adding activity and market participation of Project beneficiaries resulting in better revenues.

**Table 4.16 Final Outcome Indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Targets for RSSP II</th>
<th>Target Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of RSSP II, average crop yields on beneficiary farms supported under the Project are 100% higher relative to the beginning-of-Phase-1 baseline.</td>
<td>Rice: 3 tonnes/hectares (from 2008 IA survey)</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data, validated through interviews with lead farmers and COOPs leaders.</td>
<td>Rice: 6.4 tonnes/hectares,</td>
<td>Rice 113%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the end of RSSP II, crop-derived monthly incomes of beneficiary farmers supported under the Project are 50 percent higher relative to the end-of-phase-1 baseline.</td>
<td>Rwf 46,207 (from 2008 Impact Assessment Survey No. 1)</td>
<td>Source: Impact Assessment data validated through interviews and focus group discussions with lead farmers and COOPs leaders.</td>
<td>Rwf 157,121</td>
<td>Rice 340%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the end of RSSP II the three cooperatives with business plans and supported by RSSP II have increased their revenues from sales by 50% relative to the baseline.</td>
<td>Baseline revenue available for the 3 Cooperatives</td>
<td>Source: RSSP data validated through interviews with COOPs leaders.</td>
<td>All 3 COOPs have increased revenue in 2011 &amp; 2012 over the baseline by more than 50%.</td>
<td>Rice 205%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SPIU: PIUIA, 2012 and Primary Data from Interviews and Focus Group Discussion, 2013*
Table 4.1 shows the RSSP II data obtained from SPIU and was validated using interviews with leaders of cooperatives and districts.

4.2.3 The Perceptions of the Beneficiaries on the Impact of RSSP II on the Socioeconomic Development of Gatsibo district

The study sought to establish the socioeconomic impacts of RSSP II component 2 in Gatsibo district. It sought to establish the said impact through analysis of respondents’ perceptions. This section, therefore, analyzes the perceived socioeconomic impacts of each of the project activities on the project beneficiaries.

4.2.3.1 The Socioeconomic Impact of Activities of Strengthening Cooperatives and Farmers’ Organizations

(a) Impact on Governance and Management of Cooperatives

Although it is still too early to estimate the full impact of the interventions, the impact of Component 2 of RSSP II initiatives is already felt in terms of the governance and management structure and accountability of the three supported cooperatives. The leaders of the three beneficiary cooperatives in Gatsibo who were interviewed indicate that the cooperatives now have better bookkeeping procedures and records in place and have set up new committees with specific mandates such as marketing or post-harvest management and better management teams. The implication is that the cooperatives are now better positioned to obtained additional resources from financial institutions to bolster their performance. Nevertheless, the cooperatives are still hampered by the scarcity of competent accounting officers. The few trained often leave employment for higher paying jobs in urban centres. There is need therefore to develop mechanisms for retaining trained cooperative staff. Moreover, the three cooperatives in the district have
not fully exploited their improved governance and accountability positions by soliciting for additional financing from finance institutions.

(b) Impact on Revenues

An analysis of the cooperatives shows that revenue has increased significantly by an average of 50% in comparison to what it was at the beginning of the implementation of RSSP II. Table 4.17 shows the improvement in revenue of each of the three cooperatives over the last three years.

**Table 4.17: Trends in Revenue of Cooperatives in Gatsibo District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperatives</th>
<th>Annual Revenue (RWF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIMAK</td>
<td>106,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPRORIZ</td>
<td>74,657,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAURE</td>
<td>57,645,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>238,302,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Secondary Source: Financial Statements of the Three Cooperatives, 2009-2012*

(c) Impact of Trainings

Interactions with sampled farmers through interviews and questionnaires indicate that an overwhelming majority of participating farmers found the support given to cooperatives through training to be very useful and one of the main factors in improving their standard of living. See Table 4.18.
The perception in Table 4.18 is impressive given the fact that for the two rice cooperatives (COPRORIZ and CORIMAK) there has been only one harvest since the completion of rehabilitation and construction of rice related infrastructure. The trainings also had positive impact on local employment as only Local Services Providers (LSP) in the district were contracted and trained in a ToT workshop to provide trainings to lead farmers in each cooperative.

(d) Impact on Membership

The membership to cooperatives improved significantly during the period RSSP II was being implemented with an improvement of 60% over the four years.

### Table 4.18: Respondents Perception of Impact of Training on Poverty Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating farmers have better yields and better income</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating farmers have better skills but have not yet implemented them for improved income.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing has changed in relation to income and poverty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*
### Table 4.19: Trends in Membership to Cooperatives in Gatsibo District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperative</th>
<th>Membership 2009</th>
<th>Membership 2010</th>
<th>Membership 2011</th>
<th>Membership 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIMAK</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>2088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPRORIZ</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAURE</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2683</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>3504</td>
<td>2804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Secondary Data: Cooperatives Documents, 2013*

Members to cooperatives in Gatsibo district sampled cited a number of advantages that made them join the cooperatives which included improved access to finance and innovative ideas, improved standard of living, and access to land and farming infrastructures especially since access to land in marshland was only possible for members.

It is worth noting however that despite the increased membership there were a number of farmers who did not join cooperatives for a number of reasons. The major reasons expressed by respondents include mistrust, lack of understanding of the purpose and benefits of cooperative membership, as well as financial barriers to membership. With the support received from RSSP, beneficiary cooperatives develop fast in terms of asset accumulation and this thereby constitutes an entry barrier.

The most prominent reason expressed by respondents for the sub-optimal membership was the membership fee which was perceived to be too high for many to afford. Moreover the more financially successful a cooperative became the higher the membership fee since the latter was calculated as percentage of the total assets the
cooperative had accumulated. The average cost per farmer was RWF 5,000 for hillsides farming groups and RWF 2,700 for the rice groups in the marshlands.

It is, therefore, important that alternative mechanisms are found to ensure that poorer households are not excluded from joining and becoming beneficiaries of cooperatives in the future. It worth noting for instance, that COPRORIZ already allows the payment of membership fees in instalments, or after the harvest. Such initiatives should be encouraged and further developed in RSSPIII.

4.2.3.2 The Socioeconomic Impact of Production Technologies Implemented in Gatsibo

Farmers were asked to indicate whether the use of improved agricultural production technologies positively impacted on poverty reduction. The results of their perceptions are summarized in Table 4.23 below.

Table 4.20: Respondents’ Views on Impact of Improved production Technologies on Poverty Reduction in Gatsibo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>True Frequency</th>
<th>True Total</th>
<th>True %</th>
<th>False Frequency</th>
<th>False Total</th>
<th>False %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased employment of local people</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased productivity and revenue of farmers</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Revenue of Cooperatives selling improved seeds</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little or no Impact on Poverty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*
Only 14% of respondents indicate that the new production technologies introduced had impact on employment. In general majority of respondents (82%) agree that as a result of the production technology initiatives of RSSP2 there has been increased productivity and improved revenue of beneficiary farmers. Similarly all cooperatives gained from sales of improved seeds variety. Only a small number of respondents indicate that the project intervention did not have any impact on poverty.

4.2.3.4 Socioeconomic Impact of Infrastructures Development

Respondents were interrogated about the impact of the agricultural infrastructures on poverty reduction. Their responses are reflected in Table 4.21.

Table 4.21: Respondents’ Views on Impact of Infrastructures on Poverty Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Poverty Reduction</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructures provided</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment to local population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructures stabilized</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prices and Revenues of farmers throughout the year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructures had little or no positive impact on the district</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013

Table 4.21 shows that respondents overwhelmingly acknowledge that agricultural infrastructures developed through RSSP II benefited farmers by creating employment
(affirmed by 97.5% of respondents) and contributing towards price and revenue stability (affirmed by 98.5% of respondents).

4.2.3.5 Socioeconomic Impact of Knowledge Generation and Dissemination

According to Table 4.25 at least 20% of respondents agree that they were consulted about farmers needs in an initial research conducted countrywide by Idea Consult Ltd.

Table 22: Respondents Perception of Needs Assessment before Implementation of Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was need Assessment conducted?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013

According to interviews with district leaders the perceived ignorance about the conduct of needs assessment by 80% of respondents in Table 4.25 is due to the fact that only a few lead farmers were interviewed in the district in a countrywide study by Idea Consult Ltd.

RSSP II data with SPIU shows that a market survey for the rice commodity chain was commissioned by the project. The goal of the study was to generate empirical knowledge about the performance of the rice commodity chain in Rwanda and help to design more efficient and profitable rice marketing approaches for all actors along the commodity chain. One of the key consultant recommendations was to improve the milling for better quality rice to produce enough gains at a low cost and ban use of rice mills that break rice
seeds. This data was validated by interrogating respondents about how this intervention improved the marketability and thereby revenue of farmers. Table 4.26 shows the responses in regard to the factors that improved marketability of produce.

Table 4.23: Respondents Perception of Produce Marketability Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketability Factors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Quality of Produce and productivity &amp; Income</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Price of Produce</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of Produce</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Market Survey</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*

Table 4.23 shows that majority of respondents (76%) rate improved quality of produce as the greatest contributing factor to the marketability of their produce. This is also corroborated by data from SPIU records which shows that the banning of rice breaking hullers improved quality. It is also significant that respondents rate the introduction of new variety rice as a second most important contributing factor, a fact also validated by reports with SPIU which shows that a new rice variety was introduced in Kanyonyomba-Rwagitima reclaimed marshlands in Gatsibo district leading to better productivity per hectare and higher revenue for farmers.
4.2.4 The Impact of Component 2 of RSSP II on Socioeconomic Development Indices in Gatsibo District

The ultimate goal of RSSP II project was to improve the situation of the poor in terms of poverty reduction and economic development of the districts. This section therefore examines the socioeconomic impact of RSSP II, component two on perceived poverty using the indices of income or persons living below the poverty levels (Finance), employment, access to education, health and sanitation and general sense of well-being.

4.2.4.1 Impact on Income of Beneficiaries

Respondents were interrogated on whether RSSP II component 2 activities improved their incomes and revenue. Table 4.24 summarizes respondents’ perceptions about how the different RSSP II activities in component 2 affected their income. The Table synthesizes data already available in Tables 4.20, 4.21, 4.23, 4.25 and 4.26.

Table 4.24 Respondents’ Perceptions of Impact of RSSP II Activities on Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity and its Impact on Income</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supported COOPs have Improved Revenue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers who participated in Training had better yields and better income (See Table 4.21)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Soil Fertility Management and Use of Fertilizers was satisfactory and</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
led to better productivity and increased income (See Table 4.12)

Improved Agricultural Production technologies increased productivity and revenue of farmers (See Table 4.23)

Improved Agricultural Production technologies increased Revenue of Cooperatives selling improved seeds (See Table 4.23)

Infrastructures stabilized prices, Revenues and Incomes of farmers throughout the year (See Table 4.24)

Market Research improved quality, variety and productivity and thereby marketability and income

Source: Primary Data, 2013

Table 4.24 shows that the project benefited the respondent beneficiaries in terms of income that improved due to greater levels of productivity. This was further validated by farmers’ responses to the assets they acquired because of increased productivity and income. Table 4.28 highlights the types of assets acquired by beneficiaries using the improved income.
Table 4.25 Assets acquired Due to Income from RSSP II Component 2 Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Assets Acquired</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics (TVs, Radios, Computers, Etc.)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Equipment (Hoes, Rakes, Wheelbarrows, Scythes, etc.)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013

It is significant to note that according to Table 4.25 majority of respondents used the improved income to purchase furniture, electronics and agricultural equipment. Note that more successful farmers with large farms were also able to construct new land, houses and motor vehicles, especially pickups trucks to aid transportation of their produce. Others used the transport facilities provided by their cooperatives.

4.2.4.2 Impact on Employment in the District

Respondents were also interrogated about the impact of the project on level of employment in the district. Their response is reflected in Table 4.24 where 196 respondents, constituting 97.5%, agreed that the project provided employment. Statistics with SPIU department of Commodity Chains shows that over 10% of the construction
budget was allocated to local community employment especially on dam’s construction, irrigation systems and levelling. In Gatsibo district the agricultural infrastructure projects employed 800 workers on the Ntende-Rwagitima marshland where the hiring construction companies ERGECO, SAM and ECAN paid a total of RWF 166,400,000 in terms of wages. EGECOR also employed 125 workers on the Ntende dam paying a total of RWF 26,000,000 in wages.

In interviews with respondents it is indicated that the employment created by the project as well as commercial activities that thrived near the construction sites highly contributed to improvement of livelihoods in terms of education, health, better standards of living of the community nearby. Hence job creation is a social positive impact created by the project in the district.

4.2.4.3 Impact on Education

Respondents were interrogated about the impact of the project on their ability to access education services for their families. Table 4.26 depicts their responses.

**Table 4.26 Project Impact on Access to Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Children Can access Primary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Children Can access Secondary</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Children Can access University</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*
Table 4.26 shows that the project seems not to have had little impact on access to primary education. This could be explained by the fact that the then 9-year basic education programme of GoR ensured free primary education for all Rwandan children. Although 90% of respondents indicate that the increased income due to the project enabled their families to access secondary education this statistics should be interpreted carefully since the introduction of the 12-year free basic education by GoR may have also contributed to the perception of respondents. It is, however, significant that 46% of respondents affirm that the incomes derived from the project enabled them to access university education for members of their families.

4.2.4.4 Impact on Health and Sanitation

Respondents were also interrogated regarding the impact of the project based incomes on their household’s ability to access health and sanitation services. Table 4.25 shows their responses.

**Table 4.27 Project Impact on Access to Health and Sanitation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household can now pay for health Insurance</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household can now access quality water and Sanitation</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household can now easily pay for medical bills</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*
The data in Table 4.26 shows that majority of respondents affirm that the project enabled them to pay for health insurance (56% of respondents), access quality water and sanitation (89% of respondents) and pay their medical bills (93% of respondents). Note, however, that these responses should be interpreted with care since these perceptions may be affected by the entire RSSP II activities rather than only activities related to component 2, although responses by 6 out of the 10 lead farmers interviewed seems to indicate that component 2 activities played a major role in this ability to access health and sanitation services.

4.2.4.5 Impact of Agricultural Infrastructures on Household Settlement

Respondents were interrogated to determine whether they were displaced by the agricultural infrastructures created by the project. Table 4.26 shows the statistics of those who felt they were displaced by the project activities.

Table 4.28 Impact of Agricultural Infrastructures on Household Settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household was displaced but compensated with new and better Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household was displaced to new but not compensated with new and better Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household was not Displaced</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2013
According to table 4.28 the agricultural infrastructure projects under component 2 of RSSP II did not substantially affect respondent farmers. Only 3 respondents were displaced and even here they were compensated with better housing. Note that the concern here was only with projects implemented under component 2. In component 1, which is not the subject of this research, there were a number of farmers displaced by the Ntende dam construction as well as by the Ntende-Rwagitima marshland reclamation activities.

4.2.4.6 Impact of RSSP II Component 2 on General Well being

Respondents were also interviewed and interrogated about how they felt the project affected their general sense of wellbeing in term of whether as result of the project interventions they were better or worse of than before. The results are presented in table 4.28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My General wellbeing improved</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My General Wellbeing did not improve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure if my wellbeing is better or worse</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary Data, 2013*

It is significant in Table 4.29 that 95% of respondents affirm that the project improved their general sense of wellbeing. The ten lead farmers interviewed indicate that they are more optimistic and feel that although the full impact of the project is yet to be realized
this is a positive project that should be expanded to non-beneficiary farmers in the district. Interviewed beneficiaries had a general impression that life had improved over recent years as reflected in the ability to buy new clothes and shoes, renovate houses, own household durables and livestock, and eat different and better types of food. On nutrition in particular, some areas had previously experienced famine and respondents felt quite strongly that they would not experience such famine again, and a greater sense of self-confidence and overall wellbeing.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter summarizes the findings in Chapter four in terms of the study objectives and makes definitive conclusions regarding the achievement of the objectives. It also makes relevant recommendations to maximize on the gains of Component 2 of RSSP phase II in Gatsibo district.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The study findings are summarized in terms of the objectives, namely, identifying RSSP II activities related to Component 2, determining the socioeconomic indicators that were affected by the activities of phase two of RSSP, assessing the extent to which the project objectives have been achieved during phase two of RSSP Gatsibo district and lastly evaluating the perceptions of the beneficiaries of phase two of RSSP on the socioeconomic development of Gatsibo district.

5.1.1 Findings on Types of Activities Implemented through Component 2 of RSSP II in Gatsibo District

The study indicates that four major activities of component 2 of RSSP phase 2 were implemented in Gatsibo district. Firstly, farmers groups and the three cooperatives of CORIMAK, COPRORIZ and KAURE and were strengthened through training and enabled to develop high quality business plans, high quality accounting systems, better management and governance structures and ability to market improved and high quality seeds and seedlings, thereby increasing their revenue. The 4793 farmers organized in 164
groups were trained in crop intensification techniques, small enterprise management, business planning, IPM, fertilizer and soil erosion management using both direct training and indirect training involving field trips and demonstration plots. The training involved the cascade approach where 159 lead farmers were first trained then they in turn trained members of their groups in the same techniques.

The second major activity involved the development of the capacity of farmers for more scientific agricultural practice (crop intensification) through the use of best practices in soil erosion and fertility management, development and use of new seed variety and fertilizers, promotion of use of IPM and radical terracing. The study indicates that the use of modern soil fertility management and fertilizers increased to 86% from 10%; use of improved seeds increased from 12% to 70%; the use of IPM increased from 32% to 73; and lastly use of radical terracing increased from 5% to 10%.

The third activity implemented was the construction of agricultural infrastructures, namely, one rice mill, 2 storage silos and 10 drying bays in Gatsibo district. Fourthly, RSSP II in Gatsibo implemented research activities directed towards establishing farmers training needs by Idea Consult Ltd and the resulting training as well as implementation of research on improved rice variety suitable for the Rwandan climate and eastern province.

5.1.2 Findings on the Socioeconomic Indicators Affected by Activities of Component 2 of RSSP II in Gatsibo district

The study identified three major socioeconomic indicators that were considered important for the success of component 2 of RSSP II. These indicators are divided into intermediate and final. The intermediate are the direct indicates arising from the nature of each activity implemented; the final outcome indicators are the ultimate productivity measures that
were to be realized by the end of RSSP II. The intermediate outcome indicators were: the number of Cooperatives that have quality business plans, quality accounting systems, quality management structures, and are marketing certified Seeds and seedlings; percentage of targeted farmers trained in Crop Intensification techniques; percentage of targeted farmers trained thru’ field & study tours; percentage increase in use of fertilizers & Erosion Management and IPM; demand for improved and certified seeds, and radical terracing; number of Storage facilities or Silos built, rice mill and drying bays constructed; and lastly the number of diagnostic studies, market surveys and applied research conducted.

Basing itself on secondary data by SPIU contained in the ICR (2012) and validation through primary data obtained through interview and focus group discussion with respondents the study established three Final Outcome indicators. The first is an increase in average crop yields on beneficiary farms by 100% relative to RSSP I baseline. The second is an increase in crop derived monthly incomes of beneficiary farmers by 50% relative to RSSP I baseline. The last final indicator is that the revenue of the three cooperatives with business plans supported by RSSP II should increase by at least 50% relative to the RSSP II baseline.

5.1.3 Findings Related to the extent to which Project Objectives were achieved in Gatsibo district

According to data obtained from SPIU in its PIUIA document (2012) as validated through interviews and focus group discussions with respondents and summarized in Table 4.19, all the major objectives of the project were realized. The first final outcome indicator and objective targeted an increment in average crop yields on beneficiary farms by 100% from the baseline of 3 tonnes per hectare at the end of RSSP I. The project surpasses the
target by increasing average crop yield per hectare to 6.4 tonnes, constituting performance of 113% relative to baseline.

The second final outcome indicator or objective was to increase the crop-derived monthly incomes of beneficiary farmers supported under the Project by 50% percent higher relative to the end of RSSP I baseline. On a positive note the project outperformed this target by 340% from monthly income of RWF 46,207 in the baseline period (end of RSSP I) to RWF of 157,121 by the end of RSSP II. Lastly, the project sought to increase the revenues from sales of the three cooperatives with business plans supported by RSSP II by 50% relative to the baseline. The findings show that once again RSSP II outperformed its target by increasing revenue by over 500% from a total of RWF 238,302,702 in 2009 to RWF 1,198,000,000 in 2012 (See Table 4.20).

In a nutshell, RSSP II achieved all the objectives it was targeted to meet. It is for this reason the, according to staff at SPIU interviewed the phase was wound up months earlier than scheduled so that phase three may commence.

5.1.4 Findings on Perception of Beneficiaries about Impact of the RSSP II on Socioeconomic Development of Gatsibo District

Component 2 of phase II of RSSP had significant impact on the socioeconomic development of Gatsibo in terms of changes in the areas of income, employment, access to education, health and sanitation, household settlements and general wellbeing of beneficiaries.

Respondents’ perceptions in Tables 4.20, 4.21, 4.23, 4.25 and 4.26 show that component 2 of RSSP II improved beneficiaries’ incomes and revenue and this was reflected in the property beneficiaries acquired with the additional income, such as land, houses, motor
vehicles, furniture, agricultural equipment and electronics. Similarly, in addition to the fact that beneficiary farmers’ households were fully employed in their farms, the project provided wage employment to over 900 workers who were hired by the companies procured to construct the agricultural infrastructures in the district.

Using the additional incomes gained from the project activities beneficiaries’ dependants were able to access secondary and university level education and health services in terms of ability to pay for insurance, meet medical bills and clean water. The project also provided better housing for the few households that were displaced by the construction of agricultural infrastructures such as dams and the reclamation of marshlands. Respondents felt that their general sense of wellbeing improved as a result of the project.

5.2 Conclusions

Component 2 of phase two of RSSP which begun in 2009 was successfully implemented in Gatsibo district. The project supported three cooperatives and 4793 farmers to improve their levels of productivity and increase value addition to their commodities. The targeted outcome of each activity planned as well as the longer term final outcome of phase 2 of RSSP II were achieved, despite challenges expressed by SPIU that the budget for infrastructures was strained. The intermediate socioeconomic indicators provide the baseline for launching RSSP phase III. In terms of socioeconomic development RSSP II improved their incomes with which they were able to access education, health care and for some employment.

It is true poverty is still a rural phenomenon in spite of various development projects implemented in rural areas, but given the success of RSSP II in improving productivity and incomes of farmers there hope that if the same success is replicated in phase 3 of
RSSP then the percentage of farmers living below the poverty line will be drastically reduced.

5.3 Recommendations

The recommendations include some of the suggestions highlighted by respondents and those offered by the researcher. Therefore, the researcher recommended that:

(a) Rwanda cooperative agency should conduct a research about cooperatives’ policies implementation with regard of beneficiaries;
(b) Gatsibo district should increase the number of beneficiaries in district so that the impact of RSSP activities is replicates among more farmers;
(c) Cooperatives management should reduce the membership fee which is high and limits new members who cultivate the concerned crop because the more successful a cooperative becomes the more expensive it becomes to join it;
(d) Rwanda cooperative agency in collaboration with Gatsibo district management and cooperatives management should provide for mechanisms through which poorer farmers are allowed to join richer cooperatives but progressively pay for their membership as their productivity improves;
(e) The Government of Rwanda through Rwanda cooperative agency and Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme should implement rural support projects at cell level not only at sector level.

5.4 Suggestions for further study

Making an analytical investigation concerning rural sector support project and socioeconomic development of stakeholders is too wide and complex. Therefore one
cannot exhaust it extensively under a single study; consequently further researches can be conducted on topics like:

(a) Comparative study of rural sector support project and socioeconomic development of population at provincial level;
(b) Cooperatives financing strategies and sustainable development of cooperatives members;
(c) A comparative study of regional cooperatives industry producing and promotional strategies and their impact on the economies of the respective countries.
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A. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

1. Gender
   Male [ ] Female [ ]

2. Age
   (a) 18 -25 [ ]
   (b) 26-35 [ ]
   (c) Above 35 [ ]

3. Education
   (a) No Formal schooling [ ]
   (b) Primary School Leaver [ ]
   (c) Secondary school Leaver [ ]
   (d) Graduate [ ]
   (e) Masters and Above [ ]

4. Position of Respondent in the Cooperative
   (a) C.E.O [ ]
   (b) Top level manager [ ]
   (c) Middle level Manager [ ]
   (d) Operational Manager [ ]
   (e) Employee [ ]
   (f) Board Member [ ]

5. Name of the Cooperative ...........................................
6. Farming Activity of the Cooperative/Farmers Group

(a) Rice Farming [ ]

(b) Banana Farming [ ]

(c) Others (Specify) ……………………………………

B. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO STRENGTHENING OF FARMERS GROUPS/COOPERATIVES

5. Which types of training did your cooperative attend

(a) Governance, Organization and Book Keeping [ ]

(b) Crop intensification [ ]

(c) Small Enterprise Management [ ]

(d) Business Planning [ ]

6. How did the members of your cooperative gain from the training in crop intensification?

(a) Productivity of their farms increased [ ]

(b) Productivity remained the same [ ]

(c) Productivity declined [ ]

Explain your answer

……………………………………………………………………………………

After attending training on how to manage and govern Small enterprises the managers in my cooperative are more accountable and more efficient than before.
(a) Strongly agree  [  ]
(b) Agree  [  ]
(c) Not agree  [  ]

Explain your answer

What impact did the training and support on Business Planning have on your organization? (Tick TRUE or NOT TRUE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The business plan has been funded
(b) Productivity Revenue has increased

7. What impact did the training in Marketing have on your organization? (Tick TRUE or NOT TRUE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) More goods reach the market
(b) Sales Revenue has increased

8. Does your cooperative keep Good Books of Accounts? YES [ ] NO [ ]

If YES which of the following books do you keep?

(a) Day Books: Sales Book [ ] Purchase Book [ ] Credit Book [ ] Cash Book [ ]
(b) Journals [ ]
(c) Ledgers  [  ]

Others (Specify)

..............................................................................................................

Has the Book keeping practices improved in your cooperative/farmers’ organization?

YES  [  ] NO  [  ]

9. How has the training contributed to poverty reduction in your cooperatives/farmers organization?

(a) Participating farmers have better yields and better income  [  ]

(b) Participating farmers have better skills but have not yet implemented them for improved income.  [  ]

(c) Nothing has changed in relation to poverty  [  ]

10. How has the training contributed to employment in your cooperative/farmers organization?

(a) Only local companies were employed to provide training  [  ]

(b) Both local companies and those from other districts were employed to offer training to farmers and cooperatives  [  ]

C. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO IMPROVING PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES

11. How many demonstration plots were utilized by members of your cooperative?
Farmers gained from demonstration plots by practicing what they learnt in their own fields:

(a) All member farmers practiced skills learnt in their own farms
(b) Most member farmers practiced skills learnt in their own farms
(c) Farmers did not practice skills learnt in their own farms

If (c) explain why

What challenges were faced in the use of demonstration plots to teach farmers better farming technologies?

The members of your cooperative/group have increased their use of fertilizers and productivity per hectare has increased.

(a) Strongly agree [ ]
(b) Agree [ ]
(c) Do not Agree [ ]

Explain your answer

Improved seeds are supplied and are available for farmers’ use YES [ ] NO [ ]

12. Does your cooperative produce and supply improved seeds to farmers? YES [ ] NO [ ]

13. The use of improved seeds and planting materials has increased YES [ ] NO [ ]
14. Did your cooperatives organize Farmers Field School where farmers walked in filed to learn how to manage pests in their fields? YES [ ] NO [ ]

15. How many Farmers were trained in the Integrated Pest Management techniques? ………

16. Has Pest Management practices improved productivity of farmers in your cooperatives?

YES [ ] NO [ ]

Explain your answer
........................................................................................................................

The improved production technologies (of improved seeds and planting materials, better pests’ management) have positively impacted on poverty reduction by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Increasing employment of local people</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Increasing productivity and revenue of farmers</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Increasing Revenue of Cooperatives selling improved seeds</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Very little or no Impact on Poverty</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO RURAL INVESTMENTS FOR ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

1. Did your cooperative/group benefit from Infrastructure investments? YES [ ] NO []
If YES what types of Projects were funded?

(a) Drying Bays

(b) Grain Storage Facilities or silos

(c) Rice Mills

(d) Maize Transformation facilities

2. The infrastructures and facilities constructed are:

(a) Adequate for all farmers

(b) Inadequate

(c) Irrelevant

3. The infrastructures provided have helped reduce poverty by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Increasing employment of local people</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Stabilizing Prices &amp; Revenue of farmers throughout the year</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Very little or no Impact on Poverty</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO KNOWLEDGE GENERATION & DISSEMINATION

32. Did the project implementation unit and its agents consult your cooperative/group on the various needs of your cooperative and its members before the Project begun?
33. List some of the needs of members of Cooperative/group that were not catered for by the Project

(a) .......................................................... ........................................

(b) .......................................................... ........................................

(c) .......................................................... ........................................

34. Are the produce of your cooperative now marketable in Rwanda?

YES [ ] NO [ ]

35. Which of the following factors that have contributed to better marketability of your produce? Rate accordingly, where 1=greatest contributing factor and 4= least contributing factor and others (2-3) fall in between.

(a) Improved Quality of Produce [ ]

(b) Lower Price of Produce [ ]

(c) Variety of Produce [ ]

(d) Better market Survey [ ]

F. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT IN RSSP III

36. Based on the challenges your Cooperative/Group encountered during the implementation of RSSP II what suggestion do you make in view of improving the implementation and performance of RSSP III which is the next phase of RSSP? List them below:

(a) .......................................................... ........................................
(b) .............................................................................................
(c) .............................................................................................
(d) .............................................................................................
Appendix 4: Questionnaire to Individual Farmer Members of Cooperatives

A. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

1. Gender
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

2. Age
   - (a) 18-25 [ ]
   - (b) 26-35 [ ]
   - (c) Above 35 [ ]

3. Education
   - (a) No Formal schooling [ ]
   - (b) Primary School Leaver [ ]
   - (c) Secondary school Leaver [ ]
   - (d) Graduate [ ]
   - (e) Masters and Above [ ]

4. Name of the Cooperative ………………………………………

5. Farming Activity you are engaged in:
   - (a) Rice Farming [ ]
   - (b) Banana Farming [ ]
   - (c) Others (Specify) ………………………………………

B. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO STRENGTHENING OF FARMERS GROUPS/COOPERATIVES

7. Do you think that your cooperative / group is better managed than before because of RSSP 2 in relation to the following?(Tick accordingly)
   - YES
   - NO
8. How did you gain from the training in crop intensification?

(a) Productivity of my farm increased [ ]
(b) Productivity remained the same [ ]
(c) Productivity declined [ ]
(d) I did not participate in any training [ ]

Explain your answer

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

9. What impact did the training and support on Business Planning have on you as a farmer?

(a) The business plan was funded and I also benefited from it [ ]
(b) Productivity of my farm increased because I was included in the business plan [ ]
(c) I did not benefit directly from the Business Plan of the Cooperative [ ]

10. What impact did the training in Marketing have on you as a farmer (Tick TRUE or NOT TRUE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) More of my produce reached the market</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Sales of my produce increased</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) It has no impact on my farming</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How has the various trainings held contributed to poverty reduction for your household?

(a) I have better yields and better income [ ]

(b) I have better skills but I have not yet implemented them for proved income. [ ]

(c) Nothing has changed in relation to poverty [ ]

12. How has the training contributed to employment in your Household?

(a) Members of my household were employed to provide training [ ]

(b) People in the community were employed and my household benefited from the employment income they obtained.[ ]

C. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO IMPROVING PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES

13. Did you participate in demonstration plots activities? YES [ ] NO [ ]

If YES, did you gain from demonstration plots by practicing what you learnt in your own fields: YES [ ] NO [ ]

If NO briefly explain why

........................................................................................................
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14. Has your use of fertilizers and productivity per hectare has increased as a result of RSSP2

YES [ ] NO [ ]

Explain your answer

-----------------------------------------------

15. Have you been able to access improved seeds and planting materials supplied by your cooperative or farmers group? YES [ ] NO [ ]

16. Have you participated in Farmers Field School where farmers walked in filed to learn how to manage pests in the fields? YES [ ] NO [ ]

17. Were you trained in the Integrated Pest Management techniques? YES [ ] NO [ ]

If YES, has Pest Management practices improved productivity of your farm?

YES [ ] NO [ ] Explain your answer

-----------------------------------------------

18. The improved production technologies (of improved seeds and planting materials, better pests management) have positively impacted on poverty reduction by:

True Not True

(a) Increasing employment for your household [ ] [ ]

(b) Increasing productivity and revenue of your farm [ ] [ ]

(c) Very little or no Impact on Poverty [ ] [ ]
D. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO RURAL INVESTMENTS FOR ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

19. Have you benefited from the Infrastructure investments/facilities provided by RSSP 2?

YES [ ] NO [ ]. If YES what types of facilities have you benefited from? (Tick as below)

- (a) Drying Bays [ ]
- (b) Grain Storage Facilities or silos [ ]
- (c) Rice Mills [ ]
- (d) Maize Transformation facilities [ ]

20. The infrastructures and facilities constructed are:

- (a) Adequate for all farmers [ ]
- (b) Inadequate [ ]
- (c) Irrelevant [ ]

21. The infrastructures provided have helped reduce poverty for my household by:

True Not True

- (a) Providing employment of local people/my household [ ] [ ]
- (b) Stabilizing Prices & Revenue of farmers throughout the year [ ] [ ]
- (c) Very little or no Impact on Poverty [ ] [ ]
E. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO KNOWLEDGE GENERATION & DISSEMINATION

22. Did the project implementation unit and its agents consult you or your cooperative /group on the various needs of farmers before the Project begun?

YES [ ]  NO [ ]

23. List some of your needs as a farmer that the RSSP II Project did not attend to

(a) ……………………………………………………………………………

(b) ……………………………………………………………………………

(c) ……………………………………………………………………………

24. Are your produce now marketable in Rwanda? YES [ ]  NO [ ]

25. Which of the following factors that have contributed to better marketability of your produce? Rate accordingly, where 1=greatest contributing factor and 4= least contributing factor and others (2-3) fall in between.

(a) Improved Quality of Produce [ ]

(b) Lower Price of Produce [ ]

(c) Variety of Produce [ ]

(d) Better market Survey [ ]

F. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT IN RSSP III

26. Based on the challenges you as a farmer faced during the implementation of RSSP II what suggestion do you make in view of improving the implementation and performance of RSSP III which is the next phase of RSSP? List them below:
(a) ………………………………………………………………………

(b) ………………………………………………………………………

(c) ………………………………………………………………………

(d) ………………………………………………………………………
Appendix 5: Questionnaire to District Project Coordination Representatives

A. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

1. Gender
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

2. Age
   - (a) 18-25 [ ]
   - (b) 26-35 [ ]
   - (c) Above 35 [ ]

3. Education
   - (a) No Formal schooling [ ]
   - (b) Primary School Leaver [ ]
   - (c) Secondary school Leaver [ ]
   - (d) Graduate [ ]
   - (e) Masters and Above [ ]

4. Farming Activities in the district funded under RSSP II
   - (a) Rice Farming [ ]
   - (b) Banana Farming [ ]
   - (c) Maize Farming [ ]
   - (d) Pineapples Farming [ ]
   - (e) Others (Specify) ………………………………………
B. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO STRENGTHENING OF FARMERS GROUPS/COOPERATIVES

6. How many Cooperatives were supported by RSSP II in your district?

....................

7. What is the total number of membership of cooperatives in your district?

............... 

8. Which types of training were provided for cooperatives and farmers in your district?

(a) Governance, Organization and Book Keeping [   ]
(b) Crop intensification [   ]
(c) Small Enterprise Management [   ]
(d) Business Planning [   ]

9. How have farmers and cooperatives in your district gained from the training in crop intensification?

(a) Productivity of their farms increased [   ]
(b) Productivity remained the same [   ]
(c) Productivity declined [   ]

Explain your answer

........................................................................................................

After attending training on how to manage and govern Small enterprises the management of cooperatives in the district has become more accountable and more efficient than before due to RSSP II interventions.

(a) Strongly agree [   ]
How many cooperative’s business plans have been approved and supported in your district?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. What impact did the training and support on Business Planning have on your district? (Tick TRUE or NOT TRUE)

   (a) Individual farmers have benefited from funded plans [ ] [ ]
   (b) Productivity and Revenue has increased [ ] [ ]

11. What impact did the training in Marketing have on your district? (Tick TRUE or NOT TRUE)

   True
   Not True

   (a) More goods reach the market [ ] [ ]
   (b) Sales Revenue has increased [ ] [ ]

12. Has the Book keeping practices improved in your district’s cooperative/farmers’ organization? YES [ ] NO [ ]

13. How have the various farmers training contributed to poverty reduction in your district?
(a) Participating farmers have better yields and better income [ ]
(b) Participating farmers have better skills but have not yet implemented them for improved income. [ ]
(c) Nothing has changed in relation to poverty [ ]

14. How have the RSSP II trainings contributed to employment in your District?

(a) Only local companies were employed to provide training [ ]
(b) Both local companies and those from other districts were employed to offer training to farmers and cooperatives [ ]

C. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO IMPROVING PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES

15. How many demonstration plots were established in your district?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

16. Farmers gained from demonstration plots by practicing what they learnt in their own fields:

(a) All member farmers practiced skills learnt in their own farms
(b) Most member farmers practiced skills learnt in their own farms
(c) Farmers did not practice skills learnt in their own farms

If (c) explain why

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

What challenges were faced in the use of demonstration plots to teach farmers better farming technologies?
The beneficiary farmers and members of cooperatives/groups in the district have increased their use of fertilizers and productivity per hectare has increased.

(a) Strongly agree [  ]
(b) Agree [  ]
(c) Do not Agree [  ]

Explain your answer

Improved seeds are supplied and available for farmers’ use in the district. YES [  ] NO [  ]

17. Are there cooperatives that produce and supply improved seeds to farmers in the district? YES [  ] NO [  ]

18. The use of improved seeds and planting materials has increased in the district.

YES [  ] NO [  ]

19. Did your district organize Farmers Field School where farmers walked in filed to learn how to manage pests in their fields? YES [  ] NO [  ]

20. How many Farmers were trained in the Integrated Pest Management techniques in your district? .................................................................

21. Has Pest Management practices improved productivity of farmers in your district?

YES [  ] NO [  ] Explain your answer

...........................................................................................................
improved production technologies (of improved seeds and planting materials, better pests management) have positively impacted on poverty reduction in the district by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Increasing employment of local people [ ] [ ]
(b) Increasing productivity and revenue of farmers [ ] [ ]
(c) Increasing Revenue of Cooperatives selling improved seeds [ ] [ ]
(d) Very little or no Impact on Poverty [ ] [ ]

D. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO RURAL INVESTMENTS FOR ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

22. Did your district benefit from Infrastructure investments? YES [ ] NO [ ]

If YES what types of Projects were funded?

(a) Drying Bays [ ]
(b) Grain Storage Facilities or silos [ ]
(c) Rice Mills [ ]
(d) Maize Transformation facilities [ ]

23. The infrastructures and facilities constructed are:

(a) Adequate for all farmers [ ]
(b) Inadequate [ ]
(c) Irrelevant [ ]
24. The infrastructures provided have helped reduce poverty in the district by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>Not True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Increasing employment of local people</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Stabilizing Prices &amp; Revenue of farmers throughout the year</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Very little or no Impact on Poverty</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO KNOWLEDGE GENERATION & DISSEMINATION

25. Did the project implementation unit and its agents consult you on the various needs of your cooperative and its members before the Project begun?

YES [ ] NO [ ]

26. List some of the needs of the farmers in the district that were not catered for by RSSP II

   (a) …………………………………………………………………………………
   (b) …………………………………………………………………………………
   (c) …………………………………………………………………………………

27. Are the produce of your district now marketable in Rwanda? YES [ ] NO [ ]

28. Which of the following factors that have contributed to better marketability of your district’s produce in Rwanda? Rate accordingly, where 1=greatest contributing factor and 4= least contributing factor and others (2-3) fall in between.
F. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPROVEMENT IN RSSP III

29. Based on the challenges your Cooperative/Group in your district encountered during the implementation of RSSP II what suggestion do you make in view of improving the implementation and performance of RSSP III which is the next phase of RSSP? List them below:

(a) ..............................................................

(b) ..............................................................

(c) ..............................................................