FEED THE FUTURE
The U.S. Government's Global Hunger & Food Security Initiative

AGLC SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT

PERIOD: OCTOBER 1, 2016 TO MARCH 31, 2017

FEED THE FUTURE AFRICA GREAT LAKES REGION COFFEE SUPPORT PROGRAM
AWARD NUMBER: AID-OAA-LA-15-00006

SUBMITTED APRIL 14, 2017

CONTENTS (Ctrl + Click to follow link)

1. Executive Summary: Key Accomplishments Challenges

During the 6-month reporting period October 1, 2016 to March 31, 2017 the AGLC project succeeded in achieving nearly all of its planned outputs and deliverables. The midline survey of 512 households in Rwanda and 511 households in Burundi were successfully implemented. Data were collected seamlessly through the use of computer assisted personal interviewing software. These data have been coded, cleaned and initial analysis has yielded results that inform several key policy issues facing the coffee sector. The implementation of field-based experimental research for this second year has begun in both countries, and field assistants have begun collecting data on plant parameters and Antestia counts. AGLC placed special emphasis in harmonizing the data collection instruments across the different partners in both countries to ensure comparability. In Rwanda, AGLC has encountered some challenges/delays with the implementation of farmer training in the capacity building component of the project, but has been successful in the implementation of radio broadcasting and SMS messaging activities in that domain. Two advocacy and policy roundtables were conducted with coffee sector decision makers; these included the presentation of results, followed by discussions of policy issues and policy recommendations. Five key informant interviews were conducted during this reporting period that provided important insights into issues related to zoning policy, farmers' investments, and inputs provision.

2. Program Description and Introduction

The long-term viability of the coffee sector in the Africa Great Lakes region, the main source of cash income for millions of smallholder farmers and families in the region, is threatened first by increasingly prevalent antestia bug infestation (and associated potato taste defect—PTD), and second by coffee yields that are among the world's very lowest. AGLC is a three-year, USAID Feed the Future initiative led by Michigan State University that meets these combined challenges through an integrated program of applied research, farmer capacity building and policy engagement. The solution requires a public-private sector coordinated response across the entire value chain, including producers, washing stations, dry mills, exporters and the government agencies that support the sector's growth. The goal of the program is to dramatically reduce the effects of antestia/PTD and raise farm-level productivity, two changes that will in turn improve smallholder farmer incomes and help to sustain the Africa Great Lakes region's reputation for producing among the highest quality coffees in the world.

AGLC is designed to meet these challenges through a set of core program components, identified as the following:

- *Applied policy, household, and agronomic (field-level) research* to serve as the basis for smallholder capacity building and policy engagement aimed at reducing potato taste defect and low coffee productivity and profitability in the Africa Great Lakes Region.
- *Capacity building/farmer training & outreach* with project partners in the Africa Great Lakes Region to train coffee producers and processors on potato taste defect/antestia control and other practices that will increase productivity and farmer incomes.
- *Policy engagement* to help create an enabling institutional environment to debate, formulate and adopt policies that will motivate producers and other actors in the coffee value chain to invest their labor, land and capital in ways that will increase smallholder farmer incomes.

The AGLC initiative will fill important gaps in our knowledge base on controlling PTD, improving coffee farm management practices and creating a policy environment that is fully supportive of farmer and other stakeholder investment in the sector.

3. Activity Implementation Progress

This section reports on the various activities of the project in all three of its major components: applied research, capacity building and policy engagement. It closely follows the Year 2 Work Plan, summarizing the implementation status of main activities planned for the project's second year. Special attention is given to reporting on challenges faced during the reporting period. Annex 1 provides a quick reference on the activity updates provided in this section, along with an estimate of the "percentage completed" for each activity. The section concludes with an update on the M&E plan and how AGLC has progressed against the seven core project indicators.

3.1. Implementation Status

Implementation of the AGLC project has progressed well overall, though with a few delays in some of the program's component areas. Summarized below are the steps taken to date in the activities scheduled for implementation during the first six months of the second year of the project.

3.1.1. Applied policy, household, and agronomic (field-level) research

During this six-month period the applied research component received considerable attention aimed mainly at its primary goal of providing an objective, empirical basis for both the capacity building and policy engagement activities of the project. It is designed to inform coffee sector stakeholders in Rwanda, Burundi and elsewhere in the region concerning the most effective practices for controlling antestia/PTD and for establishing a policy environment that will provide the necessary incentives for coffee producers to invest their labor, land and cash resources in these practices.

Two major sets of activities were planned and implemented during this period; they are the midline household survey and the continuation of the experimental field-based data collection system, both of which are summarized below.

Midline household survey

Survey sample. The midline household survey was fielded in December 2016 and January 2017 and it consisted of a random, 50% subsample of households from the baseline sample frame in each CWS. Thus, there were 32 households selected from each of the 16 CWS listings for a total of 512 households. The Year 2 midline survey of coffee growers was successfully implemented in both Rwanda and Burundi. A key feature of the Year 2 midline is that it enables the team to collect panel data, following the subsample over time. This also means that much of the background data on farm size, field characteristics, income levels, household demographics, cost of production and other detailed and time consuming data has already been collected and is available from the Year 1 baseline. The team focused on collecting supplementary information, much of which was identified during the course of the Year 1 policy roundtables, key informant interviews (KIIs) and focus group discussions (FGDs). Data collected through the midline survey include information about: zoning policy, farmer investments, opportunity for quality-based pricing, gender and income, coffee and climate change, and food security.

Survey instruments. The survey instruments were developed at the farm household level and then translated to Kinyarwanda, programmed for Samsung 7" tablets, and pretested in the field in December, 2016. Enumerators were hired from the IPAR roster and were trained just prior to the pretest. Close to 50% of the enumerators had also worked with the project during the baseline survey, which enabled us to move through the training more efficiently and also to reduce enumerator error in the field. Immediately following the pretest a series of debriefing sessions were organized and the survey instruments were revised based on the pretest results. The Rwanda team was able to start fieldwork on December 21. The baseline survey was delayed approximately one month in Burundi as additional time was required to translate the survey to Kirundi, upload it to tablets, train enumerators there and pretest the translated version in the selected communes in Burundi's central and northern coffee regions.

Data collection. The IPAR team led the midline survey data collection effort in Rwanda. Fielding of the survey took approximately 25 working days with a field staff of 10 interviewers and two supervisors

engaged in each country to complete the midline survey data collection, yielding 512 successful interviews. Team members from Burundi report similar results in their implementation of the data collection phase, yielding 511 successful interviews.

Data processing. After the field implementation, the data were uploaded from the tablets to a Dropbox folder for access by the project's IT staff. In both Rwanda and Burundi data were uploaded and backed up regularly through the data collection phase, usually once or twice a week. Next the data were aggregated into a unified (one for each country) Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) file for cleaning, coding and transformation. Data collected in Rwanda and Burundi were cleaned and prepared for analysis by Dan Clay and Aniseh Bro in Michigan with assistance from the country teams on the coding from Kinyarwanda and Kirundi.

Data Analysis. The midline data analysis began late in the reporting period (March) so this phase will be discussed mainly in the next semi-annual reporting period. However, initial data analysis was conducted on the effects of the zoning policy and the incentives for farmer investments; these results were presented at two policy roundtables held with key coffee sector stakeholders in mid-March. Additional analysis will be conducted and presented and discussed at the upcoming (June) series of the policy roundtables with coffee sector stakeholders.

Applied experimental fields research

The applied research on experimental fields is designed to empirically inform coffee sector stakeholders in Rwanda and Burundi concerning the most effective practices for controlling antestia/PTD and for reducing low and fluctuating coffee production. Our approach is to build on current knowledge to isolate the principal causes of the combined problems of antestia/PTD and low coffee productivity/cyclicity and to identify the most effective measures for reversing their detrimental effects.

During this reporting period teams in both countries continued applying the test treatments to the experimental fields, and collecting data on antestia and tree parameters. A summary of steps taken and observations made during this period are listed below.

In Rwanda:

- The experimental fields research has advanced in Rwanda, but not without challenges. All 64 fields have been set up and treatments for the fields have been applied, with the exception of fertilizers which the team in Rwanda has had problem in procuring. The expectation is that by the end of the harvesting period, the fertilizer will be available and application of fertilizer will take place at that time.
- Soil samples have been taken from each field, and analysis of these samples has been completed. In addition, data on antestia counts continued to be collected during this reporting period.
- The University of Rwanda has had delays in recruiting field monitors for these fields, and training of these monitors will not begin until early in the next reporting period (April).
- Some initial summary reports from the work in Rwanda show the following:
    - The antestia aggregation behavior is found on dense canopy with less wind movement, which results in higher humidity in the canopy.

- Fields with lower slopes and less wind movement have recorded more bugs.

In Burundi:

- During the previous reporting period, AGLC was unable to complete the analysis of experimental field data collected during the first year of the project. Issues of data structure and management impeded progress on this front. In March 2017 Aniseh Bro from MSU traveled to Kigali to work with the Gustave Nkurunziza from Université Polytechnique de Gitega and with Bonaventure Minani from the University of Ngozi to organize and prepare the experimental field data for analysis. The main outcomes from this working session are listed below:
  - A unique identifier number was developed and coded for each plot in the study.
  - Data sets for each plot were consolidated and merged.
  - Data from the cupping results were cleaned.
  - Sections of the data with problems were identified and will be resolved after the original hard copies are reviewed.
  - A meeting with Daniel Rukazambuka from the University of Rwanda was held to standardize the instrument of data collection for year two.
  - Results from soil analyses for each field were digitalized and merged with the main database for the experimental fields.
- During Year 2 implementation, each one of the 4 experimental fields at each site is receiving one of the following treatments: GAP (good agronomic practices), pesticides and GAP, pesticides alone, nothing (control). Monitors for data collection have been hired and trained. Data on plant growth parameters, antestia counts, and other physical characteristics of the experimental fields were collected from October to December 2016. Antestia knockdown counts were collected in January and February 2017, followed by new live counts of Antestia in March 2017. At the end of March 2017, harvesting of the experimental fields began, and processing and cupping of these samples will take place during the next reporting period.
- Some Initial summary results from the analyses from year one show the following:
  - Although Confidor kills more antestia, pyrethrum is more effective in decreasing antestia re-occurrence in fields.
  - In Gitega and Karusi, of 256 results, PTD was observed in 44 (17.8%) of the samples.
  - In Ngozi and Kayanza, of 352 cupping results, PTD was observed in 74 (21%) of the samples.

3.1.2. Policy engagement

The principal policy engagement activities implemented during the first half of Year 2 include: 1) preparation of policy background briefs and PowerPoint presentations, 2) conducting a series of high level, targeted presentations and policy roundtables with major stakeholders, and 3) conducting a series of interviews with key stakeholders. Progress in each of these areas is discussed in the following sections.

Policy Roundtables

In March 2017, AGLC project representatives from Michigan State University, the Institute for Policy Analysis and Research-Rwanda, and the University of Rwanda held two policy advocacy roundtable discussions in Kigali, Rwanda. These discussions built on the quantitative and qualitative research conducted by AGLC team members, and brought together stakeholders from across the Rwandan specialty coffee sector (including policymakers, regulators, private sector representatives, cooperative managers, and others).

These individuals gathered to discuss two critical topics in Rwandan specialty coffee. The discussions revolved around policy issues informed by data collected from the baseline and midline surveys and from key informant interviews. The topics discussed in these roundtables were: (1) discussing the long-term sustainability of the coffee sector in the country, and (2) understanding the initial effects of the newly implemented zoning policies.

Roundtable #1. Eleven representatives from the government, cooperatives, and the private sector were present at the first roundtable. In this roundtable participants discussed how to best achieve the long-term sustainability of Rwanda's coffee sector. Following an initial presentation with findings from the AGLC baseline and midline surveys, participants were invited to explore what changes would be required to raise and stabilize producer prices so that coffee farmers will invest in their coffee plantations and, in doing so, increase productivity. Attendees discussed cherry prices as a motivator for farmers. Although all agreed that higher prices motivate farmers, some were concerned about the new price floor of 264 Rwandan francs. Exporters worry about some less efficient CWSs failing because they must pay farmers higher prices. Attendees debated the merits of basing costs on world prices vs. cost of production, or combination of these factors. Participants noted their interest in piloting a multi-tiered pricing approach as a way to incentivize improvements in the quality and quantity of coffee produced. Finally, participants discussed the importance of national investment in coffee and challenges to investment in coffee that may come at the expense of food crops. They noted that this is a political as well as an economic issue. However, there are parts of Rwanda where soils/slopes are better for coffee than for other crops, and this is an opportunity for coffee investment. A full report on these data and points of debate will be completed in the coming months.

Roundtable #2. Twelve representatives from the government (local and national), cooperatives, and the private sector were present at the second roundtable. In this roundtable participants discussed the effectiveness of Rwanda's zoning policy initiated in the previous year. Following an initial presentation with findings from the midline survey, participants were asked to consider what we know about zoning that was not included in the presentation, and what we do not know about zoning that should be explored. Participants generally agreed that it was unclear whether zoning affected prices. They noted, however, that zoning often split up cooperatives and took farmers that had received investments (inputs, training, etc.) from one CWS and put them in the zone of another CWS. In terms of which stakeholder groups benefit the most form zoning, farmers believe that the CWSs are the main beneficiaries and that they see themselves (as producers) as the least advantaged by zoning. This finding contrasts with one of the major goals of the zoning policy, which is to benefit farmers through higher cherry prices and CWS support. They suggested that middleman activity continued in a reduced form, for example through purchasing coffee at night. Participants noted that some district officials used their influence to create zones that favored them or their friends – however NAEB provided guidelines for developing zones and has requested that districts deal with complaints from CWSs/buyers. Relatedly,

implementation differed substantially across the country, with stricter enforcement in some districts. Finally, CWS faced coffee volume issues at CWSs, with some receiving more coffee than they knew what to do with, and others not receiving enough. Participants agreed that additional research would be needed to understand the zoning policy's effects and possible modifications to the policy

Policy Background Briefs

Two policy background briefs were written to provide roundtable participants a set of leading policy questions and findings from the AGLC applied research. The prepared and distributed policy briefs are the following:

- "Promoting the long-term sustainability of Rwanda's coffee sector"
- "Understanding the effectiveness of Rwanda's Zoning Policy in Year 1"

These policy background briefs are publicly available at the AGLC page on the Food Security Policy Innovation Lab FSP/IR website: http://foodsecuritypolicy.msu.edu/countries/aglc_rwanda_burundi.

Key Informant Interviews

A series of five key informant interviews were conducted during this reporting period; the remaining interviews will take place in the coming months. These initial interviews were focused on three main topics.

Farmer Investments. Farmers have a difficult time deciding how much investment to make in coffee due to year to year fluctuations, and many base this decision on past years' prices. Some suggest that the sector is disorganized and that it is unclear whether price differentiation for coffee quality would be feasible or even make a difference. There are disagreements on how to best support farmers. Some of the options that emerged from these interviews are the following: (1) increase floor prices, (2) improve relationships with buyer, (3) provide better on-farm training, (4) provide certification opportunities to get higher export prices, (5) increase government investments in coffee marketing, and (6) government should subsidize coffee as it does with other sectors.

Zoning Policy. Many farmers are not aware of the zoning policy, or did not understand it. These interviews highlighted potential winners and losers from zoning policies. Winners included the CWSs and farmers who broke the rules and sold outside their zone, while losers are largely farmers, cooperatives, and buyers/CWSs that worked to get their farmers certified but lost them as a result of zoning. Zoning was not effectively enforced in much of the country during the first year, and there were substantial cherry sales across zones. Multiple respondents mentioned that zoning was largely unsuccessful in year one. Possible changes include: (1) getting rid of zoning, (2) requiring CWSs to pass premiums back to farmers based on earnings, (3) implementing CWS-based extension programs, and (4) outreach to farmers and CWS on what zoning is and what it intends to do.

Inputs. Despite the sector still suffering from insufficient pesticides and fertilizers from the government, and with unreliable delivery times, some mentioned that the distribution of inputs through CEPAR is improving. They specifically mentioned that they are experiencing less corruption. In general, there is a sense that people are happier with the delivery of inputs and specifically with the move from NAEB to CEPAR. Possible changes include: (1) getting more farmers to buy their own inputs (providing them with

credit) and (2) doing a better job of estimating the number of trees so that the distribution amounts will be more accurate.

Other Presentations

Dr. Daniel Rukazambuga also presented results from the AGLC baseline and midline surveys at the 15th African Fine Coffees Association conference in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in February 2017. The presentation included information about input application and antestia prevalence in the experimental fields.

Dan Clay attended the March 25-27 Food Security Policy Innovation Lab (AGLC's umbrella project) meetings in Washington, DC, organized for project coordination and planning. Clay made a presentation to the group on AGLC progress and findings.

3.1.3. Capacity building/farmer training & outreach

The focus of the AGLC capacity building component is on increasing farmer awareness and reducing the effects of antestia/PTD and low productivity at the farm level. Demonstration plots, farmer training and media messages are the primary vehicles for building capacity at the producer level. Capacity building in Year 2 has three main components: 1) farmer training using the 64 study plots selected for long-term field data collection, 2) training of enumerators/students in data collection and farmer training roles, and 3) scaling up training messages and bulletins through public and private sector partners (PPP).

In Rwanda, progress has been made in the development of training materials on best agronomic practices. Training of field trainers, however, has been delayed due to hurdles with the University of Rwanda's hiring process. Consequently, the training sessions are now expected to take place early in the second half of Year 2. The training materials that have been developed include modules on the following topics:

- Coffee tree and structure
- Tree canopy management
- Coffee varieties in Rwanda
- Erosion Control
- Basic coffee pest management
- Coffee insect pest control
- Coffee quality and standards, harvesting, processing, drying, sampling, storage, and cupping
- Soil and fertility management
- Farm record keeping

During the implementation of the midline survey, an additional group of enumerators has been introduced to antestia bug issues and coffee production, as part of the enumerator training in December 2016.

In Burundi, the capacity training component of the work has progressed according to schedule. Sixty-four leader farmers have been invited to participate in trainings on best agronomic practices. These trainings took place in the experimental fields where the activities began with an explanation of the

different techniques, followed by a demonstrations in the fields. Some of the farmers who participated in the trainings used these techniques on their own farms. An additional eight monitors in Kayanza and Ngozi have been hired and trained on best management practices to work directly with each of the coffee washing stations and the experimental fields associated with each CWS.

Radio messages

The AGLC project is tasked with producing capacity building radio messages for broadcast to a larger (scaled up) audience of coffee producers. During this reporting period radio messages in Rwanda were broadcasted in March, and will continue in April, with messages on improved cherry prices and steps to ensure best quality cherry at harvest. Steps farmers are encouraged to take include:

1. Pick *ripe cherries only, leave the green ones for next week - then you will get more money for those!*

2. *Hand-sort your cherries, removing insect damaged cherries, black cherries, and under and over-ripe cherries.*

3. *After you hand-sort the cherries, float your cherries in a bucket of water, removing the cherries that float.*

In Burundi, there have been radio messages focused on the importance of manure and fertilizer use on coffee farms to improve productivity. A second and creative way in which this same message has been broadcasted by radio has been through interactive sketches developed by partners at the University of Gitega.

SMS messaging platform

The AGLC project continues to develop an SMS messaging system that enables free and open-response messaging and structured basic data gathering. Significant progress has been made on this front, as final contracts with MTN have been signed and authorization letters from RURA have been procured. The next phase, beginning in early April 2017, consists on sending out messages to farmers to invite them to listen to the radio when AGLC will be making announcements, as well as asking the recipients to send information back to monitor their receipt and comprehension of the radio messages.

An important aspect of the SMS platform is that it will enable the project to send questions to farmers and to obtain their immediate feedback on different topics. The first scheduled SMS message will ask for farmers' feedback on the effect of current coffee prices on their willingness to invest in coffee production.

3.2. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan Update

The monitoring and evaluation tasks have continued smoothly in the first half of Year 2. Most of the activity in the first quarter was preparatory work for the second quarter. Much activity to prepare the midline survey was taking place, and in both Rwanda and Burundi, the agronomy teams were working to apply pesticides and fertilizers at the proper times on the 128 (64 in each country) study plots. Both countries took a second antestia knock down count on the fields, in addition to measuring growth parameters.

The midline survey was conducted during December and January, which enable updates to the project indicators in early March. This timing for updating AidTracker with "Year 1" results was on a known and prior-approved time delay from the normal schedule of entering such data before October 1. The reason for this was that the project needed to implement the midline survey in order to obtain the data needed for reporting. The midline survey ran smoothly. Data cleaning and analysis was expedient and we were able to work with the USAID officer in Kigali to enter our indicators (see summary table in Annex 2).

With the midline survey data AGLC was able to correct a problem with estimation of the "average incidents of antestia bugs per tree" indicator. The baseline figure included only those households that had antestia and did not average in those that were "0". They were over-estimated as result. We changed this measure in Year 1. Also, we discovered that this indicator needs to be measured on a continuous scale (0, 1, 2, 3…) rather than in grouped categories. So with the midline survey we have made this change, and we retroactively adjusted the distribution of the baseline groups to make them comparable to the new continuous method. This indicator, incidence of antestia bug per tree, should go down. We believe the fact that it went up in this period is due to lack of motivation of farmers in the 2016 season due to exceptionally low cherry prices, discouraging many farmers from implementing new technologies.

There was an error discovered in how the indicators EG.3.2-17 (number of households implementing improved technology) and EG.3.2-18 (number of hectares under improved technology) were calculated for the baseline values. These two indicators have now been corrected and all the values in AidTracker are accurate. This indicator was also expected to increase, but in this reporting period EG.3.2-17 (households) are virtually unchanged and EG.3.2-18 (hectares) are marginally lower from the baseline. We attribute this to the same factors -- cyclicity of Rwandan coffee and low prices discouraging farmers from implementing new technologies.

4. Management and Administrative Steps and Issues

During the reporting period several important administrative steps were taken and issues addressed in the implementation of the Year 2 Work Plan. These are summarized below.

Reporting. The second AGLC Semi-annual Report (for the period April 1, 2016 to September 31, 2016) was submitted to USAID on time.

AidTracker+. Indicators were expanded and finalized with USAID M&E staff and data against the indicators were updated to reflect current AGLC progress.

Procurement. A significant issue for AGLC are the continuing delays in procurement by the University of Rwanda (UR). Though with good intentions for fairness and transparency, the UR procurement system is complicated and is invariably backed up. That has meant delays in hiring field assistants, procuring needed materials for experimental fields, making radio communications, contracting for the SMS messaging system, and other items/activities. We have endeavored to find "work-arounds" to all of these delays, mainly by shifting budget line items to other partners to complete the work. To avoid the problem in Year 2, AGLC will reduce the UR scope for such procurement and will have other partners with more proficient administrative capacity take on these tasks.

Limitations in Burundi. Due to the continuing unstable political environment in Burundi, AGLC project activities during the reporting period were limited to those in the applied research component of the program. However there have been problems in that our Burundian partners have not always been able to travel easily to Rwanda to participate in scheduled project activities. During the scheduled training in March 2017, for example, one of the partners traveling from Burundi was detained through the night at the Rwanda border.

Project Funding. In a meeting with the USAID Agreement Officer's Technical Representative (AOR), the AGLC Director was informed that Year 3 funding would not be available. Year 3 funding was to come from USAID/Burundi but due to current political/security circumstances in Burundi that funding will not be available. AGLC has been asked by USAID to extend Year 2 funding for as long as possible into Year 3. MSU and the project team have agreed to restructure Year 2 activities and their timing to conform to this request. Due to a lower burn rate than anticipated we now estimate that we will be able to stretch available AGLC Year 2 activities and funding by approximately 6 months, into January 2018.

What will be most affected by the loss of Year 3 funding will be the implementation of a third year of field research. These field activities will require supplementary funds to be completed. The team has had promising discussions with private sector partner Starbucks about "leveraged" support for a third year of experimental field data collection on antestia and GAPS. Starbucks has requested that AGLC submit a concept note requesting the needed resources. Similarly, a request has been submitted to USAID for a supplementary budget of $40,000 to field a Year 3 household endline survey to collect information needed to report on the project's core indicators concerning antestia control and improved productivity.

5. Planned Activities and Upcoming Events over the Next Six Months

During the second half of Year 2 the project will stick close to the Work Plan activities and schedule. Immediate attention is focused on conducting in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, as well as conducting three roundtable sessions with government and private sector decision makers. The discussions will be supported with information and data obtained from the midline survey, key informant interviews and focus group discussions. The roundtable discussions will focus on the policy constraints observed and options for an enhanced environment for coffee production, processing, and marketing. The roundtable titles and dates are as follows:

1. Exploring improvements to input delivery and Antestia Bug/Potato Taste Defect control (6 June)
2. Challenges and opportunities facing women in coffee (8 June)
3. Multi-tiered pricing: Designing mechanisms that connect coffee price to quality (13 June)

After these roundtables the team will turn its attention to a full array of activities in all three components; they are summarized as follows:

1. Analysis of midline survey.
2. Analysis of Year 1 experimental field data base.
3. Compile and prepare Year 2 experimental field data.
4. Analyze CWS data collected from the 16 CWSs sampled in Year 1.

5. Development of multiple policy briefs based on the extensive coffee database generated by the project together with the conclusions emanating from the roundtable discussions.
6. Prepare research articles on key learnings from baseline and midline surveys.
7. Three additional roundtable discussions based on the policy briefs.
8. Continue key informant interviews with leaders of stakeholder groups.
9. Conduct further FGDs that include qualitative research questions on gender and zoning policy issues.
10. Capacity-building/training of coffee farmers based on results from the midline survey and experimental fields.
11. Capacity-building/training of coffee farmers using data from experimental demo plots.
12. Continue to develop and transmit radio messages.
13. Continue to develop and transmit SMS messages.
14. Complete at least two issue-oriented special reports based on data analyses and policy roundtables.
15. Complete April 2017 to September 2017 Semi-annual Report on AGLC for submission to USAID.
16. Update AidTracker+ on core AGLC indicators.
17. Prepare and organize end of Year 2 workshop in Kigali.

Annex 1: AGLC Year 2 Activities and Percent Completed

Activity/Outcome	Quarter Due				% Completed for Mar 2017 Semi-Annual Report
	1	2	3	4	
Applied Research Component Activities/Outcomes					
Year 2 Household Follow-on Survey					
Survey design (45 min survey, 512 HHs in each country)	■				100%
Instrument development	■				100%
CSPro Mobile tablet programming	■				100%
Enumerator training	■				100%
Pretest and revision of Y2 survey	■				100%
Y2 Survey Implementation					
Y2 Survey data collection	■	■			100%
Compile Y2 survey data in CSPro		■			100%
Convert baseline data to SPSS/Stata		■			100%
Clean survey data (range and consistency)		■			100%
Data coding (open-ended Qs to numeric data)		■			100%
Data transformation		■			100%
Data analysis		■	■		50%
Draft Y2 HH survey research reports		■	■		40%
Field-based Experimental Research Implementation					
Field-based data collection (N=64)	■	■	■	■	50%
Compile/enter field-based survey data in Excel			■		0%
Convert field-based data to SPSS for analysis			■		0%
Clean field-based data (range and consistency)			■		0%
Data transformation				■	0%
Analysis of Y2 field-based data				■	0%
Draft field-based research report				■	0%
Coffee Washing Station Survey					
Develop and test CWS questionnaire (N=16)			■		0%
CWS data collection			■		0%
CWS data analysis				■	0%
Capacity Building Component Activities/Outcomes					
Develop training materials	■				80%
Organize farmers in modified FFS groups	■				30%
Hold training sessions on experimental fields	■	■	■		0%
Train broader sample of leader farmers in GAP (ABS)	■				0%
Develop and transmit radio broadcast messages	■	■	■	■	50%
Conduct sessions with partners (public & private) to disseminate best practices recommendations	■	■	■	■	20%
Develop and pilot test system for farm-level SMS reporting of results		■			100%
Develop and transmit SMS messages	■	■	■		50%
Policy/Stakeholder Engagement Component Activities/Outcomes					
Engage coffee stakeholders on policy issues and data needs assessment	■				100%
Hold 10-15 key informant interviews w/ gov't & private sector decision makers on targeted policy issues		■			33%
Hold 10-15 Focus group discussions w/ gov't & private sector decision makers on key policy issues		■			33%

Prepare 4 policy briefs and associated PPTs					
Policy brief and PPT on farmer investments in coffee			■		75%
Policy brief and PPT on zoning issues			■		75%
Policy brief on field-based PTD/antestia control and improved productivity research			■		15%
Policy brief and PPT on TBD topic		■			25%
Hold 4 advocacy round tables with coffee sector decision makers (presentation of results, discussion of policy issues and recs)		■	■		50%
End-of-Year Workshop to present research, capacity building and policy engagement results (UR/GKI will convene)				■	0%
Progress Reports and Data Activities/Outcomes					
Semi-annual Progress Report (mid-year)		■			100%
Semi-annual Progress Report (end of year)				■	0%
Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Reporting	■	■	■	■	50%

Annex 2: AGLC Indicators with Targets

(Rw) = Rwanda only – Burundi data to be combined here when available. Revised March 2017

AGLC core indicator	Indicator definition	Unit of Measure (gender disaggregated when possible)	Method of Data Collection	Reporting Frequency	Baseline	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	
						Year 1	Year 1 (reporting Apr. 2017)	Year 2 (reporting Apr. 2018)	Year 1 (reporting Apr. 2017)	Year 3 (Oct. 2018)	Variable(s)
#1	Incidence of PTD/Antestia in fields	Avg. # of bugs/tree	Farmer surveys (N=2,048) & Field observ on exper. plots (N=128)	Annually	0.763 (Rw)	0.73 (Rw)	0.84 (Rw)	0.70 (Rw)	(Rw)	.65 (Rw)	Farmers: ANTPERTREE
					n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	Avg. # bugs/tree in *treated* study fields.
#2**	Hectares under improved technologies	# of hectares under improved practices	Farmer surveys (N=2,048)	Annually	132 ha (Rw)	135 ha (Rw)	127 ha (Rw)	139 ha (Rw)	(Rw)	145 ha (Rw)	Productivity: COFFEESQM2_sum BestProdPract
#3**	Number of farmers who have applied improved productivity and/or PTD mitigation technologies. *USAID wording: improved technologies or management practices.*	# of farmers in treatment areas exhibiting changed behavior	Farmer surveys (N=2,048)	Annually	329 hh (Rw)	345 hh (Rw)	358 hh (Rw)	362 hh (Rw)	(Rw)	378 hh (Rw)	Productivity: BestProdPract
#4***		Value in US$		Annually	$530 (Rw)	`	$261 (Rw)	$550	(Rw)	$556 (Rw)	USAID:

	Gross margin per hectare ***		Farmer surveys (N=2,048)													CofGrossMargNOLAB
					$374 (Rw)	$376 (Rw)		$61 (Rw)		$383		(Rw)		$392 (Rw)		AGLC: CofGrossMarg
#5****	Number of policy instruments (briefs, presentations, reports) on target issues	Number	Research results	Semi-annually	0	0	4	0	8	6	8	11		10	12	
#6****	Number of new data sets informing food security policies available for public use	Number	Research results	Semi-annually	0	2	4	6	0	6	8	8		10	12	
#7	Percent of total kg producer cherry processed through fully-washed channels.	Kg cherry processed as FW/total kg cherry processed	-Farmer surveys	Annually	95%	97%		96%		98%		96%		99%		Farmers: SALE15CHERKG CherToParchKG

**Indicators to be submitted to the FTFMS system.

***AGLC will calculate this indicator two ways. The indicator reported in FtFMS will be calculated as described in the FtF Handbook. The second version will be used by the project for monitoring, which will include a value for unpaid HH labor in the input costs. The FTF gross margin (which values unpaid household labor at 0) is not being used by the project but we expect it will increase as indicated.

****Indicators related to the FSP-IL leader award strategic results.