

Rwanda: Intensified Land Use Management Project in the Buberuka Highlands

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Rwanda: Intensified Land Use Management Project in the Buberuka Highlands	
Loan No.:	314-RW	
Project Id.:	314	
Board Date	December 1992	
Effectiveness date	July 1996	
Original Closing date	30th June 2002, then extended to Dec. 2003.	
Final Closing date	30th June 2004	
Total Project Cost USD(M)	10,72	
IFAD loan USD (M)	9,45 (88%)	
Cofinanciers if any	Beneficiaries (8%); GoR (4%).	
Implementing Agency	Agricultural Services Regional Direction - ASRD (under the supervision of Ministry of Agriculture and Breeding and UNOPS).	
Principal Components	1) Rural Communities Development; 2) Rural Development Support; 3) NR Management; 4) Programme. Management.	
Link to PCR	https://rms.ifad.org/OfficialRecords/OP1/RW/0314/[0000130507]%201697-RWAND.pdf	
Project Performance		
Design	In general good design, innovative in some few aspects (new crops and new techniques of insemination). Lack of development of commodity chain (not in the design): risk that the increase in productivity will reduce the prices of commodities, vanishing the impact on market functioning. Late insertion of focus on communities participation (after MTR: Comp. 1).	5
Implementation	Positive elements: the rhythm of implementation has been regular but socio-political instability generated some delays. Satisfactory adaptation of NGOs in management after dramatic genocide. GoR poor quality on management. Programme enlarged (from 3 to 16 municipalities/11 districts, after the 1st rev. in 1996) w/o proportional increase of the budget. Negative elements: too late attention to poor participation, after MTR (2001). Unexpected contrib. of WFP (FFW) reduced part of the costs. GoR (implementing the programme) very disorganised and influencing the priorities (sometimes governmental buildings seemed to be a priority). Bad coordination among enabling agencies: the director of the programme had the monopoly of information.	4
Relevance	The programme's activities relevant to the need of the govt. policies (decentralisation, Poverty Reduction Strategies). Highly respondent to the socio-economic needs, but could have been better adapted to the peculiar context and needs after genocide.	4
Effectiveness	In general positive, but important variance within the project. Comp.1) probably the most successful, the target of associations' capacity building and adult literacy courses has been achieved almost completely; Comp.2) Agr. dev.: popularisation, tree plantation, delivery of veterinary and agricultural inputs, training courses and infrastructures results higher than expected, people's access to physical assets increased (bicycles, seeds); Comp.3) not sufficiently effective for environment: three marsh arranged seem to be dangerous for the environment (b/c of soil: turf) and the physical construction (terraces) started a degradation phase. The arrangement of the marsh was one of the main parts of the first draft of the project but the most unsuccessful; Comp.4) not satisfactory implementation.	4
Efficiency	Positive efficiency of the programme after enlargement of the intervention area. Respect of timeliness and targets quite satisfactory. The cost of the activities per beneficiary was higher than the average, but their organisation were more intense (in terms of resources). Since impact has been satisfactory and sustainability sufficient the programme can be considered efficient.	5
Partner Performance		
Partner Perf. & Quality	GoR's behaviour (borrower) negatively affected the implementation of the programme, but the external interventions and missions (UNOPS=CI and IFAD) have reduced the risk of excess of centralisation. CSOs collaboration good.	IFAD=5; UNOPS=5; GoR (ASRD)=2 NGOs=4;

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Rwanda: Intensified Land Use Management Project in the Buberuka Highlands	
Rural poverty impact		
Physical Assets	One of the major impacts of the programme (improvement of access to productive inputs and rural infrastructure to avoid soil erosion).	5
Food Security	Diversification of crops, water management, fuel wood access make the project strongly impacting food security.	5
Environment	Impact will be probably lower than expected, but people were sensitized and trained on how to preserve NR.	3
Human Assets	Positive impact from literacy courses.	4
Soc. Cap. & Emp.	The highest impact of the activities: strong increase in the capabilities of the associations and enhanced reciprocal trust of people in post conflict situation, but impact penalised by poor attention to women/men relations.	5
Ag. Productivity	Phys. assets distribution. increased impact in agricultural prod. as well as new crops introduced and integrated approach (crops+livestock).	5
Inst. & Serv.	ASRD increased its management capacity: positive impact for other programmes in Rwanda.	5
Financial Assets	Microfinance impact very low: missed chance to train on restitution of credits.	2
Markets		NA
Rural Poverty	Rural poverty through training and distribution of inputs or microfinance products was highly reduced in the 11 district of intervention. Physical and productive assets access increased. Enhanced relationships are a further element for the basis of economic recovery. Slightly penalised by targeting (not poor of the poor).	4
Overarching factors		
Targeting	Ruhengeri Province (11 districts). Target focussed not always on most vulnerable (target groups or villages made already productive activities), but also to the most responsive to change and increase in productivity. Good targeting for environment.	4
Gender	The attention paid to gender inequalities reduction has been unsatisfactory. Though part of the activities took gender component into consideration, only quantitative data were considered, w/o focusing on impact.	3
Sustainability	The great increase in social cohesion is the more sustainable impact of the programme, but even economic and political sustainability. are quite satisfying (the econ. activities will continue), contributing to the creation of a favourable context for a productive continuation of most of the activities. For the rest general low sustainability: low ownership and environment. degradation not compensated, no sustainability in access to finance risk to affect negatively the whole programme's purpose.	4
Innov, Rep & Scaling	The replication and scaling could be done in areas with same environmental features, but a greater attention should be paid in the sustainability. the associations' training should be replicated at national level. Some innovative components: terraces and insemination (with very effective techniques).	4
Overall Performance	The impact of the programme will be sufficiently high to contribute in reducing poverty in the region. Targets in general satisfactorily achieved, but some activities (microfinance + environment protection) not sustainable. Too large targets after MTR probably will reduce the intensity of the impact within the 11 districts. Need to improve gender component. Strongly positive impact on social relationships, basis for further development.	4
Contribution to IFAD Strategic Objectives	Strategic objectives well focused (though not specifically mentioned), especially the 2nd. Contribution to SO1 and SO3 poorly sustainable.	4
Contribution to MDG's	Missing contribution of the programme for MDG3. not sustainable impact for 7 but strong impact for the achievement of MDG1.	4
PCR Quality		5
Scope	PCR covers all the points required. Unique failure is gender: rarely mentioned and lack of lessons on how to enhance its impact at least in the context of the programme.	4

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Rwanda: Intensified Land Use Management Project in the Buberuka Highlands	
Quality	The data presented are sufficient to individuate the cause / effects determining the impacts. Analysis is deep, structured and complete. Analysis of effectiveness per component and interesting considerations on impacts.	6
Lessons	Deep and structured analysis of the main problems of the programme. The lessons have a potentially broad relevance for the effectiveness of participatory approach have been highlighted, adaptable to similar programmes in the country or outside, but they are quite basic suggestions on participatory approach. The management of the programme must be independent from Govt. In post-conflict people wait for free aids (bad impact on microfinance.).	5