Annex XVII: Evaluation questions and hypotheses impact evaluation Rwanda

This annex presents the extended evaluation questions and hypotheses that were add to the original four evaluation questions by IOB in November 2015.

Contents

1.1 Evaluation questions 1

1.2 Hypotheses 2

1.1 Evaluation questions

1. Composition and motivation of the Dutch FS programme 2012-2015 (paragraph 3.3):
    a. What is the link between the Dutch strategy and the (broader) analysis of food insecurity in the country?
    b. Overview of projects in the FS portfolio (working on availability? access? income? nutrition? markets? etc.)
    c. What is the synthesis of the followed impact pathways and underlying assumptions?
2. Instruments, coherence and synergy (paragraph 3.4):
    a. What instruments and channels are used (central-decentral, bilateral, multilateral; government, NGO, private sector)?
    b. What is the coherence and synergy of the Dutch food security programme?
        i. Between Dutch FS projects (delegated and central)
        ii. Between Dutch programme and programmes of the national government and other donors
        iii. Between Dutch FS programme and other Dutch policies and programmes? Has the programme also resulted in increased involvement of (Dutch) private sector, (Dutch) trade and (Dutch) investment? What are the conditions for a win-win situation in a public private partnership?
        iv. What has the Dutch embassy done in terms of 'food diplomacy' or economic diplomacy related to food security? Descriptive analysis, few examples, not necessarily related to one activity.
3. Effectiveness (paragraph 3.5):
    a. To what extent is the anticipated pathway followed / have results been achieved?
    b. To what extent can changes be contributed to the project pathway, alternative pathways, or other factors?
    c. Up to what level (institutional outcome; hh outcome / proxy impact (food production, income, food prices, buffers), impact (food consumption, nutritional status) has the food security of targeted households improved?
    d. What is the evidence that food insecure people have been reached, directly or indirectly? How have women (female headed households, women in the households) benefited?
4. Costs and efficiency (paragraph 3.6):
    a. How many direct and indirect beneficiaries have been reached?

b. How does project expenditure compare to the number of beneficiaries?
c. What can be concluded on the value of effects per beneficiary, and about their cost-effectiveness?

Next to the above mentioned evaluation questions we were asked by IOB to describe:

5. Sustainability of the programme (institutional; environmental: especially climate change proof; political, financial; socio-economic) (paragraph 3.7):
6. Unplanned, positive of negative, effects of the programme. (paragraph 3.8):
7. Approach for portfolio evaluation (paragraph 3.2):

1.2 Hypotheses

In the end line phase IOB requested the evaluation teams of all the country evaluations[1] to formulate impact and approach hypotheses. During a workshop organized by IOB on 24 November 2015 a set of hypotheses was proposed and is further elaborated in this section.

Impact hypotheses

For the Rwanda country evaluation two major assumptions are made in the food security programme. The first one is that agriculture is a very important component of the Rwandan economy and employs many people, and as such, secondly, focusing on any activity dealing with farmers will have an impact on food security. The third assumption is that an increase in households' revenues (e.g. through the HIMO approach or better access to markets) would result in improved food. Summarizing, these headline programme assumptions are:

1. Projects that contribute to a rural enabling environment (agro-processing, infrastructure etc.), also contribute to improved food security.
2. Focusing on any activity dealing with farmers will have an impact on food security.
3. Increased income improves food consumption in terms of both quantity and nutritional quality.

Approach hypotheses

This hypotheses are related to the approach the embassy used to execute the food security strategy. In the conclusions of the workshop (24 November 2015), IOB described the following hypotheses, which are related to the ToR and should be covered in the evaluation:

1. The embassy assures synergy between the Dutch FS programme and the programmes of other actors (Government of Rwanda, main other donors).
2. There is synergy between FS and other Dutch policy objectives: involvement of Dutch expertise and private sector results in win-win situations.

[1] See chapter 1 for a brief discussion of the other country evaluations.

The information gathered to answer the evaluation questions, forms the basis to address the hypotheses. In chapter 5 we will present the conclusions of our analysis for the hypotheses.