

Mali: Income Diversification Programme in the Mali Sud Area

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Mali: Income Diversification Programme in the Mali Sud Area (PDR-MS)	
Loan No.:	367-ML	
Project Id.:	367	
Board Date	November 7th 1995	
Effectiveness date	October 1996.	
Closing date	March 31st 2003, then extended to June 30th 2005	
Total Project Cost USD(M)	27,04 M USD	
IFAD loan USD (M)	13,7 M USD	
Co financiers if any	BOAD (West African Development Bank) 16,9%; Fond de l'OPEP 12,2%; GoM 7,2%; Beneficiaries 1,3%.	
Implementing Agency	Programme Management Unit (PMU, under the supervision of the Ministry of Rural Development and Environment).	
Principal Components	1) support to rural context organisations (12%); 2) popularisation and research on crop intensification and diversification and on environment protection (15%); 3) support to rural finance system (27%); 4) rural infrastructures (34%); 5) management of the programme (12%).	
Project Performance		
Design	The activities were in general coherent with the purposes and consistent among each other. Logframe designed only after the mid-term review/ MTR.	4
Implementation	The too general features of the log frame's risks and hypothesis probably negatively affected the implementation and the impact. The implementation was slow during the first five years b/c of the insufficient management capacity of the PMU which affected the coordination with partners and b/c of the double role of some main service delivering agencies (national Company for Textile Development was both). Probably overestimated costs for rural infrastructures made the programme save 12% of its budget. The overall approach was participatory.	3
Relevance	The aim of the programme is relevant with the needs of the rural poor in the region. Neither the country strategic opportunities program (COSOP) nor the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) are mentioned. Nonetheless, the interventions are consistent with the IFAD strategy in the Region.	5
Effectiveness	1) Support to rural context: low effectiveness in the creation of Village Development Societies (VDS) to plan the village development because of low quality training, but the adult literacy courses have reached the targeted groups; 2) crop intensification and diversification: training courses (for horticultural crops, small livestock and transformation and commercialisation of sesame) were successful in terms of attendance, but the environment component wasn't effective; 3) support to rural finance systems: although the rural banks were created, their activities didn't reach the target because of unsatisfactory organisation and not concrete availability of managers (volunteers managing the CMEC -Mutual Banks for Saving and Credit- were not sufficiently motivated and committed); 4) rural infrastructure: rural roads for disenclavement and fresh water points creation were successful (100% of the objectives); 5) management of the programme: probably bad performance at the beginning, then corrected thanks to interventions of both IFAD and CI (BOAD). Generally, there is a lack of data to compare the previous productions and the effects of the programmes"	4
Efficiency	The cost of the programme was too high compared with its low benefits for rural poor. Rural infrastructure are an exception (same objectives achieved with lower budget).	3
Partner Performance		
Partner Perf. & Quality	The coordination didn't work properly because of insufficient PMU (project management unit) administration capacity (first four years) and because of a lack of a formal negotiation framework. IFAD's support for the correction of the problems was very satisfactory. GOM collaborated proactively after the mid-term review/ MTR. Regular and effective missions of CI (BOAD). PMU was very	IFAD=5; GOM=4

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Mali: Income Diversification Programme in the Mali Sud Area (PDR-MS)	
	disorganised at the beginning (highest responsibility for bad implementation), then improved after the help of other enabling agencies. No mention of other partner's role in implementation.	
Rural poverty impact		
Physical Assets	The impact of the new rural roads and produce transformation centres will probably have a strong impact on transportation and commerce. Water points are an asset for the poor, but in the long run the impact on access to water is uncertain because the NR users association seem to be not well organised.	4
Food Security	The activities of training on crops diversification and for other IGA (stockbreeding and commercialisation) can be considered as a proxy for positive impact on food security.	4
Environment	Anti-erosive techniques disseminated and adopted, but the expected impact was higher than the realised one.	2
Human Assets	The adult literacy courses generated positive impacts on almost the 100% of the targeted poor, but people is not prepared to manage the common resources such as water.	4
Soc. Cap. & Emp.	The VDS have been created all around the region, but they are not self-sufficient in terms of management. Gender mainstreaming seems to be absent by the project.	2
Ag. Productivity	The economic activities for agriculture and commerce will contribute in creating a value added in the region. No substantial changes and but the impact can be increased by the diversification of the crops through inter-sectoral advantages.	3
Inst. & Serv.	The support to the creation of the VDS didn't sufficiently take into account an involvement of the customary authorities. Water users association are not sufficiently analysed.	2
Financial Assets	Microfinance Institutions will not be able to reach their objectives in terms of stimulating savings and credits in rural areas after the programme's intervention.	3
Markets	Markets were absent in the design of the programme, but a positive indirect impact on their functioning can be expected b/c of the opening up of some remote areas (through rural roads) of some villages and the parallel increase and diversification of the cultivated crops and IGA.	4
Rural Poverty	The programme tried to stimulate the poor on how to better manage and organise their development on a large scale. In the short term the impact will be poor. Rural organisations have not been sufficiently focused.	3
Overarching factors		
Targeting	The two regions of Ségou (4th) and Mopti (5th) previously benefitting of a national programme on cotton production, were selected to both contribute to diversify the sources of income and to compensate the abandonment of support to cotton formerly provided by a national programme and to reduce the dominance of this monoculture production. There is no mention on the criteria used to select the targeted villages (they are the same of the previous interventions). Nevertheless, the targeted poor needed to diversify their income.	4
Gender	Although the importance of gender equity has been highlined within the activities, the project paid a moderate attention to gender.	4
Sustainability	The programme is weakly sustainable. The VDS didn't receive the sufficient transfer of competencies to be sustainable. The CMEC's functioning system need to be supported by credit institutions found outside the project. Rural infrastructure risk lack of maintenance because of the non-proper functioning of the management committees. No elements to evaluate the Land Tenure dichotomy: not clear which incentives to secure the access to both fresh water and land. Some of the activities need to be implemented by the following programme (FODESA).	2
Innov, Rep & Scaling	The approach to diversification was a traditional one and the need to organise and coordinate better the activities affect the scaling of this programme, which need to be improved even locally.	5
Overall Performance	Initial constraints (in design and implementation) and lack of organisation affected the overall achievement of the targeted poor and of the objectives. The programme needed an extension and the activities implemented are not sufficiently sustainable without the continuation of external support such as the FODESA.	3

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Mali: Income Diversification Programme in the Mali Sud Area (PDR-MS)	
Contribution to IFAD Strategic Objectives	SO 1, 2 and 3 were centred in the design phase. The impacts for the SO 1 was satisfactory, while for 2nd and 3rd low impact were registered.	3
Contribution to MDG's	Satisfactory impact for MDG 1, 4 and 5. The 2 only partially while the 7 not sufficiently. The programme contributed positively to gender equity but only for quantitative indicators (i.e. # of women in a water users group).	4
PCR Quality		3
Scope	The PCR covers the majority of the points required and the assessment is well organised. Agricultural production: lack of assessment of the previous productions and the changes introduced by the programme. Costs are not clearly presented.	3
Quality	Some comparative data are lacking, the attention to gender is not analysed while the activities were focused also on that aspect. The analysis of the activities for the majority of the objectives is only quantitative (% of women in VDS or other NR committee). There are some difficulties in inferring the impacts. The bad functioning of the rural finance component has been well analysed. No ERR calculation.	3
Lessons	Several sound lessons were extracted by the experience, useful for the following programme operating in the same areas.	3