

Burkina Faso: South-West Rural Development Project

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Burkina Faso: South-West Rural Development Project - (PDRSO)	
Loan No.:	418-BF	
Project Id.:	512	
Board Date	11 September 1996	
Effectiveness Date	12 January 1998	
Original Closing date	December 10th 2003	
Final Closing date	December 2005 (for 4th comp. June 2006)	
Total Project Cost USD(M)	22,41M US\$	
IFAD loan USD (M)	13,00M US\$ (58%)	
Cofinanciers if any	West African Development Bank/ BOAD (CI) (6%); Belgian Survival Fund - BSF (10%); SNV - Netherlands development agency (4%); GoBF (14%); Beneficiaries (6%).	
Implementing Agency	project management unit/ PMU	
Principal Components	1) local capacities increase; 2) rural infrastructures; 3) agricultural development; 4) rural finance; 5) health and education; 6) programme management support.	
Project Performance		
Design	The classic rural development programmes' components are properly designed, sub-divided in 6 components. The structure was complex. The innovative element in this programme is the aim to respond to unusually covered needs by IFAD, such as health and primary education.	5
Implementation	The initial 16 months delay compromised the impact of the programme, most of the activities have not been completed. Only 67% of the funds were utilised for the implementation of the activities. The rest remained unused. Three modifications: for the contents, for the internal organisation and for the local structures involved within the programme. Slow rate of implementation affected the final results. Several interventions of co-financers (mostly Belgian Survival Fund/ BSF) tried to redress the programme during the last years of implementation, but the effects were scarce.	2
Relevance	The aims of the programme are perfectly in line with the domestic policies for poverty reduction, coinciding with the ones of IFAD. No mention of the country strategic opportunities program (COSOP) or the Poverty reduction strategy paper (PRSP).	5
Effectiveness	In general the programme's effectiveness was unsatisfactory. Very unsatisfactory rate of realisation for the economical components (2nd, 3rd component and a part of the 4th), partly unsatisfactory for the local capacity promotion (1st and part of the 4th) and a partly satisfactory one for health and education (5th). In general: 1) positive results for literacy courses (around 90% of target), less positive for professional training (50%); 2) well construction was positive (150%, but no mention on how to manage natural resources) but difficulties in rehabilitations (5%), rural roads rehabilitated 100%; 3) very unsatisfactory realisation of the activities to increase agricultural productivity and to avoid soil erosion; 4) no more than 40% of the activities for rural finance were accomplished; 5) schools and health centers were realised, professionals and teacher were trained and the public buildings could function in a proper way.	2
Efficiency	Despite the average cost per person of the whole set of activities wasn't too high (266US\$), compared to other similar (though less 'multidimensional') programmes in the region, the efficiency has been very low. The rate of realisation of the activities was unsatisfactory. Probably the benefits of the Health and Education component will be higher than the ones of the other components, compared to the costs, but in general the overall programme was inefficient.	1
Partner Performance		
Partner Perf. & Quality	The performance of IFAD, BOAD (CI) and BSF, defined satisfactory, is overstated considering their role in correcting the unsatisfactory management. Their effort in trying to change the activities and redressing the failures assessed in the last years has been inadequate or ineffective. The borrower didn't properly monitor the performance of the PMU.	BOAD=3; BSF=3; IFAD=3; GoB=3.
Rural Poverty Impact		
Physical Assets	Not sufficient impact, apart from the wells, rural roads and public education and health centres. The sustainability of the wells is doubtful because no intervention was made on natural resource management (NRM).	2

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Burkina Faso: South-West Rural Development Project - (PDRSO)	
Food Security	Impact on food security insufficient with respect to the possibilities of the programme.	2
Environment	Environment degradation, a problem both before and after the intervention, wasn't modified despite the 3rd component's targets.	2
Human Assets	The main impact of the programme was concentrated in this area: the domains of education and health were positively affected by the programme, positively impacting on the future possibilities of people to decide for their own development.	5
Soc. Cap. & Emp.	Youths empowerment not sufficiently impacted (no actions for them, though targeted) as well as for women.	2
Ag. Productivity	Insufficient impact despite the target in the design phase, lack of sufficient implementation.	2
Inst. & Serv.	The contribution of the programme to the reinforcement of civil society organisation/ CSOs and institutions, despite working with several NGOs, wasn't as high as expected. Nonetheless the management capacity of the partners increased. Public services increased and reached (and are reaching) more remote areas, which was a greatly positive impact.	4
Financial Assets	Rural credit and agricultural productivity weren't effective and the impact on access to financial assets is poor, not sufficient to change the structure of the economy in the region.	2
Markets	Beneficiaries seem to be positively affected by the programme (rural roads); this could prompt greater commerce. But the region had great potential anyway, and the contribution of the programme is unclear.	3
Rural Poverty	The contribution to rural poverty reduction can be considered insubstantial: inconsistent and unsustainable in the domain of rural infrastructure, as reported in the PCR. It can be positively influenced by the positive impact on education and health, which are a part of rural development (considering the poor access to these kinds of services by rural and remote areas).	3
Overarching factors		
Targeting	Target of the programme is the South-Western region of Burkina Faso (90% of people working in agricultural sector). Indirect target: 50% of the population (26 000 households); direct: 10 000 Households (84 000 people); some of the activities of the programme – rural infrastructures – will positively affect the whole population (530 000 people). The targeting was good (rural poor) but no precise criteria are specified.	4
Gender	The programme's highest contribution for women is the rural finance component, which nonetheless had very little impact (only 1.5% of borrowers were women). The programme didn't enhance women's empowerment to the extent desired.	2
Sustainability	The only positive element with regard to sustainability is the increase of human capabilities through access to education and health, which in itself is a very positive element. But the overall sustainability of rural investments and agricultural development activities is suspect.	2
Innov, Rep & Scaling	The unsatisfactory performance of the programme makes it a non-replicable programme. Few elements are provided to estimate to what extent the education and health component (the innovative aspect for IFAD) could be a good practice for other development / agricultural programmes.	2
Overall Performance	The programme in itself has been a failure: the main problem was in implementation, but the causes are unfortunately not that clear. Not one of the activities was effectively completed, barely any results achieved, barring scarce impacts on the different aspects of human development. An initial delay in the start-up and the incomplete management capacity of the personnel hired by GoBF compromised the overall performance. Ultimately, the results weren't as substantial as expected. However, beneficiaries received important tools to enhance their own development outcomes.	2
Contribution to IFAD Strategic Objectives	Very poor, apart from the education and health components: therefore only Strategic Objective 2 witnessed a positive impact.	2
Contribution to MDG's	The programme has a positive impact on MDG 2, 4, 5 and 6. The impact did not match the objectives, but there was a clear enhancement of people's capabilities.	3
PCR Quality		3
Scope	The PCR's scope is satisfactory, all the points required to draw weaknesses and strengths of the programme are covered. However, the role and performance of the co-financers was not outlined clearly.	4

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Burkina Faso: South-West Rural Development Project - (PDRSO)	
Quality	Some cost data are unclear (funds use rate: between 75% and 67%). There was a large- but slightly unconvincing- effort to explain the positive aspects and impact of some of the activities. Otherwise, the report is satisfactory.	3
Lessons	Unfortunately among the lessons of the project there is no clear mention of where the weakness of the programme resides.	2