

Ghana

Ghana Agricultural Sector Investment Programme

Supervision Report

Main report and appendices

Mission Dates: From 4 Feb 2019 to 15 Feb 2019

Document Date 22/06/2019

Project No. 1100001678

Report No. 5077-GH

West and Central Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AWPB	Annual Work Plan and Budget
ASAP	Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme
BAC	Business Advisory Councils
CA	Conservation Agriculture
CCR	Climate Change Resilience
COSOP	Country Strategic Opportunity Programme
DDA	District Departments of Agriculture
DVCC	District and Village Coordinating Committees
EOI	Expression of Interest
EPA	Environment Protection Authority
FBO	Farmer Based Organisation
GADS	Gender and Agricultural Development Strategy
GALS	Gender Action Learning System
GASIP	Ghana Agriculture Sector Investment Programme
GIDA	Ghana Irrigation Development Authority
GOG	Government of Ghana
GPS	Geographic Positioning System
ICO	IFAD Country Office
ICR	Inter Cycle Review
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
LTB	Letter to the Borrower
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MED	Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate
METASIP	Medium-Term Agriculture Sector Investment Plan
MFI	Micro Finance Institution
MIS	Management Information System
MG	Matching Grant
MOF	Ministry of Finance
MOFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
MOTI	Ministry of Trade and Industry
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NO	No Objection
NPC	National Programme Coordinator
NPSC	National Programme Steering Committee
NRGP	Northern Rural Growth Programme
OVCF	Outgrowers Value Chain Fund
PCU	Programme Coordination Unit
PDR	Programme Design Report
PFI	Participating Financial Institution
PFJ	Planting for Food and Jobs

PIM	Programme Implementation Manual
RCB	Rural Community Banks
VCC	Value Chain Committee
VCF	Value Chain Facilitators
WA	Withdrawal Applications
WIAD	Woman in Agricultural Development

A. Project Overview

Region:	West and Central Africa Division	Project at Risk Status:	Actual problem
Country:	Ghana	Environmental and Social Category:	B
Project Name:	Ghana Agricultural Sector Investment Programme	Climate Risk Classification:	2
Project Id:	1100001678	Executing Institution:	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Project Type:	Credit and Financial Services	Implementing Institutions:	not available yet
CPM:	Hani Abdelkader Elsadani Salem		
Project Director:	Dr. John Manful		
Project Area:	National		

Approval Date:	08/04/2014	Last audit receipt:	24/05/2018
Signing Date:	18/05/2015	Date of Last SIS mission:	15/02/2019
Entry into Force Date:	18/05/2015	Number of SIS Missions:	9
Available for Disbursement Date:	16/12/2015	Number of extensions:	0
First Disbursement Date:	21/12/2015	Effectiveness lag:	13 months
MTR Date:	22/02/2018		
Original Completion Date:	30/06/2021		
Current Completion Date:	30/06/2021		
Financial Closure:	not available yet		

Project total financing

IFAD Financing breakdown	IFAD	\$40,831,386
	ASAP Trust Fund	\$10,000,000
	IFAD	\$36,600,000
Domestic Financing breakdown	Local Government	\$1,661,000
	National Government	\$7,628,000
	Beneficiaries	\$4,625,000
	Domestic Financing Institutions	\$17,474,000
Co-financing breakdown,		
Project total financing:		\$118,819,386

Current Mission

Mission Dates:	From 4 Feb 2019 to 15 Feb 2019
Days in the field:	4

Mission composition: IFAD Team: Mr. Swandip Sinha (Technical Mission Leader); Jonathan Agwe (Lead Technical Specialist, IFAD); Claudio Mainella (Financial Management Specialist, IFAD), Suwadu Sakho (Environment and Climate Officer, ECG, IFAD); Don Greenberg (Value Chains/Agribusiness Specialist); Mohamed Abdelatif (Procurement Specialist); Peter Akari (Project Management and Engineer); and ICO staff (Theophilus Otchere Larbi-CPO; Mariko Nakayama – JPO; Amine Zarroug – TPO; Federico Rossetti – Finance Officer) participated in the mission carrying out activities related to mission coordination, Targeting, Monitoring & Evaluation, Knowledge Management, Gender and Youth, and Financial Management.

Government of Ghana team: The Government of Ghana team comprised Angela Danson (Director Policy, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Division); Kwesi Korboe (Advisor to MoFA); Klutse Kudomor, Youth Programme Coordinator; Patrick Ofori (Head of M&E, PPMED); Joseph Tommie (Projects Coordination Unit, PPMED); Jeremy Opoku (Head, ABU), and Kingsley Amoako (Head, Climate change Unit - Crops Services Directorate) Kingsley Agyemang (Climate Change Unit, Directorate of Crop Services), Inusa Musah Yameogo (IFAD Desk, Ministry of Finance); and Edmund Nkansah (Head, IFAD/IFID/BADEA Unit, Ministry of Finance).

Field sites visited: North zone: Tamale, Walewale, Kumbungu, Bongo, Bolgatanga, Bontanga. South Zone: Ho, Accra, Gomoa Budu Ata, Asutuare, Sogakope.

B. Overall Assessment

Key SIS Indicator #1	Ø	Rating	Key SIS Indicator #2	Ø	Rating
Likelihood of Achieving the Development Objective		3	Assessment of the Overall Implementation Performance		3

Effectiveness and Developmental Focus	3	Project Management	3
Effectiveness	2	Quality of Project Management	4
Targeting and Outreach	3	Knowledge Management	3
Gender equality & women's participation	3	Value for Money	2
Agricultural Productivity	3	Coherence between AWPB and Implementation	3
Nutrition	2	Performance of M&E System	3
Adaptation to Climate Change	3	Requirements of Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP)	4

Sustainability and Scaling-up	3	Financial Management and Execution	3
Institutions and Policy Engagement	3	Acceptable Disbursement Rate	2
Partnership-building	3	Quality of Financial Management	3
Human and Social Capital and Empowerment	3	Quality and Timeliness of Audit	5
Quality of Beneficiary Participation	3	Counterparts Funds	3
Responsiveness of Service Providers	3	Compliance with Loan Covenants	4
Environment and Natural Resource Management	3	Procurement	3
Exit Strategy	2		
Potential for Scaling-up	2		

Relevance	5
------------------	----------

C. Mission Objectives and Key Conclusions

Background and Main Objective of the Mission

1. **Background:** The Ghana Agricultural Sector Investment Programme (GASIP) is implemented by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MOFA). The overall goal of GASIP is to contribute to sustainable poverty reduction in rural Ghana. The development objective is to enhance the profitability and climate change resilience of agribusinesses, including those of smallholders. GASIP is implemented in cycles of three years each, and the current design covers a period of six years comprising two three-year cycles. GASIP was expected to directly benefit at least 62,900 farmers by the end of the first cycle and 86,400 farmers by the end of the second cycle through 4,000 Farmer Based Organisations (FBOs) integrated into programme supported value chains. GASIP has so far been financed only for the first cycle by an IFAD loan of US\$ 36.6 million and an ASAP grant of US\$ 10 million. The programme became effective in May 2015 and is scheduled for completion on 30 June 2021 and closure on 31 December 2021. GASIP was designed to be implemented through a Project Coordination Unit (PCU) located in Accra and three Zonal Coordination Offices (ZCOs).
2. **Mission details:** The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the Government of Ghana (GoG) carried out joint supervision of the Ghana Agricultural Sector Investment Programme (GASIP) from 04-15 February 2019. The objectives of the Mission were to review the progress made, results achieved in implementing the 2018 Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) and Procurement Plan (PP), expedite programme implementation and guide in addressing emerging issues.
3. The mission began with a meeting with the IFAD Country Director at the ICO which was followed by a meeting with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) staff members made a detailed presentation to the mission about the progress and the current status of implementation of the different components. The mission divided into three groups and spent four days in the field visiting the different value chain actors in some of the clusters that have been identified by the programme for potential investments. The actors met during the field visits includes agribusinesses, FBOs, smallholder farmers and financial institutions.
4. The mission organised a technical meeting with the PCU on 13 February 2019 to discuss and agree on the main findings and recommendations. Comments received at the technical meeting are incorporated in this Aide Memoire. A wrap-up meeting with the GoG was held on 15 February 2019, chaired by Mr Robert Patrick Ankobiah, Acting Chief Director of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, and attended by representatives from the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Ministry of Finance, and staff of GASIP.
5. The Mission expresses its thanks to the authorities of MOFA, MoF, the staff of GASIP, cluster drivers, financial institutions and other programme partners for their availability and cooperation with the mission in facilitating the field visits and providing the required information and data.

Key Mission Agreements and Conclusions

1. GASIP's pace of implementation remains very slow. The programme is in its fourth year of implementation (completion date 30th of June 2021) and its disbursement rate, for the IFAD loan and the ASAP grant combined, stands at 19.2% (15% for the loan and 34.3% for the grant). The implementation rate of AWPB 2018 is only 22%. GASIP is affected by programme management and staffing related bottlenecks, lengthy process of selecting cluster drivers, and the lack of focus on developing MoUs and implementation arrangements with the cluster drivers that would enable project investments to commence and strengthen the selected value chains.
2. GASIP has completed the due diligence for 45 EOIs from cluster drivers, developed potential investment plans aggregating to USD 14 million in infrastructure development activities. However, in the absence of selecting value chain cluster drivers and MoUs with implementation arrangements with them, actual investments in the clusters are yet to start. To meet the objectives of the programme in the limited time available the mission recommended Level 2 restructuring leading to the following agreements;
3. **Develop implementation MoUs with at least 20 cluster drivers:** GASIP will aim to select and sign implementation MOUs with at least 20 cluster drivers that are capable of developing market linkages aggregating to 10,000 smallholder farmers by December 2019. The basic criteria for selecting high potential cluster drivers is their capacity to develop marketing linkages with at least 500 smallholder farmers for rice, 200 farmers for cassava and 150 farmers for vegetables. Also, GASIP will expand the scope of collaboration with relatively larger cluster drivers who have the financial capacity to expand their outreach to multiple project clusters.
4. **Pilot partnership with other developmental programmes:** GASIP will develop partnerships with other developmental programmes, such as the Youth in Agriculture Programme (YIAP), the Valley Rice Initiative and the Planting for Export and Rural Development, to expand its outreach to smallholder farmers. Such partnerships will be subject to criteria agreed between IFAD-GASIP and the partnering programme regarding the project objectives, targeting strategy and implementation arrangements.
5. **Equipment financing:** The GASIP matching grant for equipment financing will finance 70% of equipment cost with a ceiling of US\$ 50,000 (increased from US\$ 30,000). The remaining 30% will be beneficiary contribution which can be financed by the beneficiaries from savings, loans and other sources. A loan from the bank will not be a mandatory condition.
6. **Financing innovative crop production kits:** Only where required the project will support FBOs to finance up to 70% of the innovative production packages (including inputs and services) required by the smallholders to assure high-

quality production demanded by the cluster drivers. The remaining 30% (at least) will be the beneficiaries' contribution mobilised either from own savings, bank loans or pre-financing from cluster driver.

7. **Infrastructure development:** the GASIP financing grant support to FBOs to build commercial infrastructure will be 90% which is equal to that provided to District Assemblies (or public sector agencies).

D. Overview and Project Progress

- **Component 1: Value chain development (refer Annex 1 for more details)**

- Sub-component 1.1: Agribusiness linkage development

1. This sub-component aims at formalising agribusiness linkages with smallholder farmers, allowing them to reliably access inputs, services, finance, and markets. GASIP has taken a demand-driven approach to agribusiness linkages and has solicited EOLs from prospective value chain drivers (VCDs), the agribusinesses to which the smallholders were to be linked in outgrower or similar arrangements. The EOLs submitted to date have focused primarily on rice, cassava, and vegetable production.
2. **The first round of EOLs:** Of the first round of 25 business proposals, which focused on rice and cassava, 10 of the most promising were selected for further assessment after field verification and due diligence by the GASIP staff. However, they did not address i) increase in number of outgrowers and hectares cultivated projected as a result of GASIP support and ii) Projected increase in net income in outgrowers/farmers as a result of GASIP support.
3. **Impact assessment:** After a lengthy contracting process, Impact Assessment (IA) reports were completed by two external contractors, and were submitted to GASIP in early 2019, some 2.5 years after the EOLs reviewed were submitted. Out of the 10 EOLs reviewed, the contractors have selected at least six value chain drivers that are highly promising and viable candidates for immediate GASIP support; these would benefit an estimated 4,632 small-scale farmers. There are important gaps in the Impact Assessment reports, and therefore the process has not resulted in actionable proposals ready for support.
4. **The second round of EOLs:** Of the 125 EOLs by prospective VCDs were submitted in a second round after public advertisement, an internal field review and due diligence process completed in late 2018 resulted in 35 EOLs ranked as high priority, 10 as possible for support in the future, and 9 that could play a role as service provider or facilitator but were not credible as VCDs. This field verification and due diligence exercise was well-executed, but further prioritization and shortlisting of the EOLs needs to be undertaken based on the marketing and financial strength of the VCD, and the expected development impact indicators noted earlier (e.g., the expected number of farmers, hectares cultivated, and income increases to occur as a result of GASIP interventions).
5. **Capacity Building:** Component 1.1 is specifically designed to identify VCDs and clusters, and provide technical and business capacity building support, technology demonstrations, and other facilitative support. To date, no capacity building activities have been undertaken. GASIP in principle can provide capacity building and facilitation support to farmers, FBOs, and VCDs through four primary mechanisms, although these should be complemented by specific support arranged through implementation agreements negotiated with each cluster. The four include:
 1. **Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA):** An Implementation Agreement has been drafted between the project and the Directorate of Crop Services (acting as lead directorate for the Directorate of Extension Services and the Agribusiness Unit of MoFA). This Implementation Agreement would provide ToT for district-level Agricultural Extension Agents (AEAs), and implicitly some capacity building for the 10 clusters selected for IAs. However, the draft that was reviewed is highly focused and specific, and does not allow for flexibility in support and approach, and has no concrete mechanisms to ensure that services are delivered to the clusters.
 2. **Value Chain Facilitators:** Independent firms or NGOs were to be recruited on a performance-based contract as Value Chain Facilitators (VCFs) to “develop a well-defined value chain from production to end-user or market” as well as provide other capacity building and facilitate services. A solicitation for EOLs for firms has been submitted to IFAD for approval. A major concern is that the lengthy process required to first contract qualified VCF firms and then agree on specific programs of work for the value chain clusters would seriously further delay project support for capacity building and facilitation.
 3. **Value Chain Committees** made of volunteer stakeholders from all actors in a designated value chain are intended to provide a coordinative function for the GASIP; these VCCs are envisioned to contribute after project completion. GASIP so far has taken no steps to establish VCCs.
 4. **GASIP Project Staff:** The absence of a substantive Value Chain Manager and acting Value Chain Officers has serious management issues, but it has also meant that there is no significant capacity building and facilitative support to ensure the success of the VCCs. The capable acting value chain manager is part-time, with considerable responsibilities outside of GASIP. During the mission, the team was informed that the recruitment process for substantive value chain manager and officer positions is underway, but requirements are urgent.

- **Sub-component 1.2: Rural financial services**

1. The purpose of the Rural Financing sub-component is to provide increased and systematic access to and use of short and long-term financing for value chain actors. GASIP has the provision for matching grants intended to address three constraints on financing for agricultural value chains: i) persistently high real interest rates which make term loans expensive for small agribusinesses and agricultural smallholder

farmers; ii) high collateral requirement of banks, and iii) perceived high risk associated with agricultural loans.

2. Responding to the recommendations of the inter-cycle review mission the GASIP has recruited a full-time agribusiness finance specialist who has developed the matching grant manual. The manual was reviewed before and during the mission and the equipment grant for the FBO is found to be too rigid as its release is currently linked to the beneficiaries receiving bank loans for financing a part of the investments. However, banks consider it too risky to finance these loans and interest rates are also very high. Consequently, the GASIP has not been able to disburse matching grant for equipment financing. Another major constraint in GASIP is the lack of matching grant support for financing innovative agricultural packages for improving agricultural production and meeting the quality standards demanded by the cluster drivers. To overcome these challenges GASIP will immediately implement two major steps as discussed below:

- **Equipment financing:** The GASIP matching grant for equipment financing will finance 70% of equipment cost with a ceiling of US\$ 50,000. The remaining 30% will be beneficiary contribution which can be financed by the beneficiaries from savings, loans and other sources. A loan from the bank will not be a mandatory condition. Only FBOs can be the owners and recipients of the machinery. Where FBOs do not have immediate capacity and expertise in the delivery of the machinery services, GASIP can support them to partner with machinery service providers (can be the cluster drivers) for managing these assets against predefined rental or revenue sharing arrangements.
- **Financing innovative crop production kits:** Only where required, the project will support FBOs to finance up to 70% of the innovative production packages needed for the smallholders to assure high-quality production demanded by the cluster drivers. The remaining 30% (at least) will be the beneficiaries' contribution mobilised either from own savings, bank loans or pre-financing from cluster driver. The full package of the production inputs and services to be set up for the FBOs could be called GAP/Technology Innovation Uptake Starter Kit. The details of the kit are presented in Annex 4. Safeguards will be put in place to guard against (i) misuse of the starter kit, (ii) misuse of the equipment bought with MG, (iii) elite capture, and (ii) any potential form of collusion.

● Sub-component 1.3: Climate change resilience

1. The Climate Change component of the GASIP aims to contribute to a reduction in poverty and vulnerability of smallholder farmers to climate change by promoting and mainstreaming climate change resilience approaches in Ghana, particularly in the northern regions. The Component is focused on the implementation of activities to address the challenges of increasing dry spells, drought occurrence and the issues of land degradation and low soil fertility.
2. The Programme has mounted 30 demonstrations of modern conservation agriculture techniques under rain-fed conditions in 10 districts (1 acre per district and three communities in each district) in the northern regions. Demonstrations were mounted on maize, cowpea/soya to provide location-specific adaptation of proven technologies for conservation agriculture. The Programme engaged with the Centre for No-Till Agriculture (CNTA) to facilitate the mounting of the CA demonstration and the mission noted with satisfaction the level of quality and achievements realised during the 2018 cropping season. Modest yield increases were recorded on the demonstration fields, in certain cases, 100% over yields on farmer-owned fields. This was attributed to the use of improved seeds, row and optimum planting distances (plant population density), spot application of fertilizer, timely weeding, cover cropping (mucuna) and mulching (moisture conservation). GASIP team collaborated with other projects such as WAAPP and GCAP to learn and share information and harmonise knowledge for effective implementation. The staff of the various District Departments of Agriculture (DDAs) were involved in the CA demonstrations conducted in 10 districts.
3. Farmers indicated some challenges that could hamper their full scale adoption of the CA concept: (i) unavailability of climatic information to help them plan their farm activities, (ii) effort and cost of protecting the fields against grazing by stray animals; and (iii) change of mindset and shift of focus from food security to value chain development and market approach. The mission recommended that the current demonstration sites should be expanded to 2 acres and protected from livestock (using climate-friendly methods). These demonstration sites should also be provided with solar-powered boreholes and integrated with vegetable production to facilitate the progression to commercial production and value chain markets.
4. Discussions with producers confirmed the use of improved seeds in the CA demonstration fields for maize, soybean and cowpea. A total of 22,693 individual farmers (74% for male and 26% for female) received 600mt of climate-resilient rice seeds, as part of the package under the Planting for Food and Jobs (PFJ) programme. Irrespective of these achievements, climate information services are not yet provided and the fields visits confirmed the need for those services, given that most of the producers reported negative impacts of rainfall on their soybean production. The contract with FAO to conduct CA profiling in the ASAP region received IFAD No objection but is yet to commence.
5. Regarding the 2018 AWPB, little implementation progress was made so far because 2 activities out of 8 were fully implemented and completed, in addition to 3 activities inherited from 2017 (refer Annex 4 for details). The limited implementation of some planned activities was attributed in part to the prolonged back

and forth discussions with implementation partners such as the Ghana Irrigation Development Authority (GIDA) and FAO. Of the six remaining activities, four are at various stages of implementation. The technical issues surrounding the partnership with the FAO Ghana Office for CA profiling have been concluded; Implementation agreement with the GIDA to form water user association (WUAs) and carry out demonstration on efficient water use technologies in 3 selected irrigation schemes have just been submitted to the ICO for no objection; and the draft terms of reference to recruit a consultancy firm or institution for climate change awareness creation and capacity building programme has been prepared ready for submission to ICO for 'No Objection'.

- **Component 2: Rural value chain infrastructure (refer Annex 1 for more details)**

1. The purpose of this component is to finance essential commercial and public infrastructure to optimise the benefits of the accompanying value chains. Implementation progress under this component is low with less than 1% delivery as at January 2019 with the financing of investments to one cassava processing plant and 1 Km electricity connected to a guinea fowl farm in Kumbungu, Northern Region. There have been two expressions of interest (EOI) publications to select potential value chain clusters. The first yielded 10 clusters and the second yielded 52 clusters reduced to 35 after conducting due diligence assessments. About 87 km of rural roads were identified under the ten value chain clusters for construction. However, the tender process to award the contracts for construction was stalled for over one year. The initial tender was cancelled by the entity (MoFA) tender board due to excessively low priced bids as it was felt that the works could not be completed smoothly with such low priced contracts. The cancellation was unwarranted as the reasons given (excessively low winning bids) for the cancellation was against established norms in procurement. This should have necessitated the reassessment of other bids using market prices as the yardstick to arrive at bidders that had adequately priced bids to undertake the construction contracts.
2. The tenders have been re-launched for fresh bids. Under the second EOI submissions, an additional 80 km of feeder roads have been identified and due for engineering designs. Although consultants have been identified, the process has been on hold pending completion of potential impact studies to confirm the exact locations and scope of the road construction activities. The programme has also identified 300 ha of irrigable land for the construction of water management and control structures. Commercial infrastructure identified under the second EOI comprises cassava processing equipment and rice milling plants with associated warehouses and park houses. The total cost of priority commercial and public infrastructure identified from the two EOI submissions amounts to USD 13.8 m. Thus, additional budgetary reallocation is necessary for additional infrastructure investment in the future.
3. The modalities for financing, ownership and commercial operating infrastructure need to be clarified and streamlined. Currently the modalities for financing commercial infrastructure comprise: (i) District Assembly (DA) initiated and owned attracts 90% GASIP funding; FBO/Cooperatives initiated and owned by the FBO attracts 70% GASIP financing; Co-financing between DA and FBO (or private entities) attracts 90% GASIP funding, owned by the DA. GASIP financing grant support to FBOs to build commercial infrastructure can be equal to that provided to District Assemblies (or public sector agencies), that is 90%.

- **Component 3: Knowledge management, policy support and coordination**

1. The main objective of this component is to promote knowledge sharing and dissemination of information collected during programme implementation. GASIP does not have a Knowledge Management (KM) strategy and a communication plan. It is recommended that GASIP prepares a KM strategy including a communication plan which is aligned to the programme M&E system.

E. Project implementation

a. Development Effectiveness

Effectiveness and Developmental Focus

Effectiveness

Rating: 2

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

There is still no significant outputs and outcomes since the MTR. Beyond 30 CA demonstrations mounted in 10 districts of the ASAP targeted regions, no value chain development activities have been implemented. Tools and instruments for delivering matching grant and decision-making tools for investments in the selected value chains have just been finalised but not yet operationalised. With two years of the programme life remaining, full achievement of the programme objectives is uncertain. Weak programme management issues persist and absence of full-time VC personnel at the PCU is a contributory factor.

Log-Frame Analysis & Main Issues of Effectiveness

1. The pace of GASIP implementation remains very slow and the performance of all three Programme components are poor. The project's disbursement rate for both IFAD loan and ASAP grant is 19.2% (Loan- 15%; Grant - 34.3%). The implementation rate of the AWPB 2018 was only 22%. GASIP has been affected by programme management and staffing related bottlenecks, lengthy process of selecting cluster drivers, and the lack of focus on developing actionable proposals that could be readily supported.
2. After MTR, steps have been taken to fill the key staff positions in the Programme but many positions remained to be filled. Due diligence has been completed for 45 EOIs. Potential investments to the tune of almost US\$ 14.0 m in infrastructure development activities have been identified in these clusters. A matching grant manual for equipment financing and infrastructural investment has been drafted. Yet, in the absence of actionable proposals, actual investments in the value chain clusters are yet to start. The only activity that has so far directly benefited smallholders is the distribution of 636 MT of climate resilient rice seeds through the Planting for Food and Jobs programme of the government. Other minor investments in the areas of demonstrations of climate resilient farming technologies, cassava processing and extension of electricity to a livestock cluster were undertaken.
3. The mission recommended that GASIP should focus on expanding the outreach of smallholder farmers' linkages to cluster drivers by adopting three broad approaches; i) developing actionable proposals and implementation agreements with high potential cluster drivers out of the already identified 45 clusters; ii) partnering with other development programmes for expanding the outreach beyond the 45 clusters; and iii) strengthening the partnership with larger cluster drivers and directly approaching new cluster drivers for expanding outreach in adjoining areas of the current clusters.
4. The development of the actionable proposals and implementation agreements for high potential clusters out of the 45 clusters is aimed at developing market linkages between 10,000 smallholder farmers and at least 20 cluster drivers by December 2019. The programme should target developing actionable proposals and signing implementation agreements (IAs) with at least 20 cluster drivers based on predetermined criteria.
5. GASIP should explore and develop partnerships with other developmental programmes to expand its outreach to smallholder farmers. This will include working in already chosen clusters and expansion to clusters outside those that have already been identified, subject to criteria to be agreed upon between IFAD and GASIP. Partnerships and synergies should be explored on a pilot basis with the Youth in Agriculture Programme, the Valley Rice Initiative and the Planting for Export and Rural Development. Where feasible, IAs providing clear justifications, targeting criteria and clear roles and activities of the partners and other financial and implementation arrangements should be developed GASIP and these Programmes.
6. Partnering with the large cluster drivers and directly approaching other drivers for expanding outreach should be based on the initial experience of working with 500 to 1000 farmers. This approach could be expanded to relatively larger cluster drivers with the financial capacity to expand their outreach to other areas. The lengthy processes of selecting cluster drivers should be replaced by directly approaching agribusinesses which operate in these areas and supporting them to develop actionable proposals and implementation agreements

• Log-Frame Analysis & Main Issues of Effectiveness

1. The programme's Log-Frame is in line with the required IFAD's format and MoFA standards. The indicators have also been aligned to the IFAD's new core indicators to ease the corporate reporting task. The overall implementation progress of the programme is very slow. The slowness could be identified through the overall disbursement rate of the project which didn't reach the level of 20%. This has, therefore, impacted the capacity of the programme to deliver concrete results (outputs and outcomes) on the ground. The programme, which reached its fourth year of implementation, suffered from many issues that have reduced its capacity to achieve the development objectives. The staffing issue, the long recruitment process and the difficult access to the matching grant resources are the main reasons behind the slow implementation of the programme. These issues necessitated Level 2 restructuring during the mission.

2. On one other hand, the ASAP component has performed better than the IFAD loan. The achievements look better although results cannot be fully attributed to the programme. The general theory of change of the programme remains valid despite the risk related to the achievement of objectives caused by the slow implementation. Due to the considerable delays in the implementation of the programme's activities, the targets of several indicators looks a bit too optimistic considering the limited time remaining in the programme.

Development Focus

Targeting and Outreach

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

By mid-term GASIP should have reached 62,900 smallholders and 3,140 FBOs in 134 districts. GASIP targeted at least 50% women; 20% youth (15-24 years) and 30% young adults between 25-34 years. Some efforts to introduce targeting mechanism have been made, but not systematically. The Programme has no targeting strategy for achieving the set targets. The EOIs for the value chain investment did not address clearly the resource-poor and vulnerable target groups. No specific assistance has been extended to target groups to apply for calls for proposals and expressions of interest. Beyond the geographical targeting in the selection of climate change vulnerable communities and groups, little or no direct- and self-targeting occurred.

Main issues

1. The target groups of GASIP are the rural entrepreneurial poor and are supposed to be typically rural smallholder farmers and micro- and small enterprises (MSEs). This includes individual farmers, farmer-based organisations, traders, transporters, service providers, and agro-processors. GASIP is expected to target an increased inclusion of women (50% of clients), youth 15-24 years (20%) and young adults, 25-34 years (30%) on all steps of the value chain.
2. The possible instruments available to GASIP to target these clients are: (i) geographical targeting (ii) self- targeting (iii) direct targeting and (iv) capacity building and empowerment mechanisms. The Programme coverage is nationwide and in line with geographical targeting. The implementation of the conservation agriculture (CA) activities of the ASAP component also used the climate change vulnerability assessment as a basis for selecting the districts and communities for intervention, in line with direct targeting. Beyond this, GASIP doesn't have a clear strategy for targeting its clients, and virtually no activities have been implemented to ensure participation, empowerment and the development of capacities of smallholder farmers, rural poor, women and youth. However, in some instances, criteria have been developed to guide the selection of farmers and FBOs.
3. The ASAP Component, however, has developed a template with criteria to guide the District Department of Agriculture in targeting women, youth and young adults. However, this has not been carried through thoroughly due to weak monitoring and guidelines to ensure effective targeting. The lack of awareness and weak capacities of the beneficiary target groups also puts limitations to the extent to which self- targeting could happen. The recruitment and deployment of value chain facilitating agents (VCFs) and/or District Department of Agriculture to intensify the awareness on GASIP and support value chain actors to respond to GASIP EOIs may improve self-targeting under the Programme.
4. The use of reliable data on beneficiaries of previous projects and their state of development would be an effective tool/criteria and complimentary to the selection of the project communities and effectively target the project beneficiaries. The segregation of the beneficiary groups into categories depending on their level of development could also enable the project to target the farmers and FBOs with specific interventions and group development processes. The incidence of poverty remains very high and far above the national average in the Northern, Upper East and the Upper West regions, with the Upper West Region having the highest incidence of poverty in the country, and with many districts having poverty headcount ratios of over 80%. The focus of the ASAP component in the three northern regions remains very relevant and can contribute to the poverty reduction efforts of the Programme.
5. The northern regions have the highest rate of youth unemployment, and field survey indicated that close to 4 out of every 10 youth were unemployed. The lack of jobs and economic opportunities encourages young people to migrate in large numbers to the South. Targeting the youth through the GASIP intervention can contribute to reversing this trend. In the northern regions, agricultural livelihoods are mostly subsistence in nature although commercial agriculture is increasing in some areas. Large volumes of food crops produced are consumed rather than being sold and integrated into the value chains markets. The GASIP will have to expand its focus on value chains (crops) that are peculiar in the northern regions to have any influence or impact of poverty reduction.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Development Effectiveness		
Targeting (1) Develop targeting strategy to guide all programme implementation activities (including geographic, self-targeting, capacity building and empowerment measures and direct targeting)	PCMU	04/2019
Targeting (2) Assist targeted groups to develop proposals and appropriate business plans	PCMU	06/2019
Targeting (3) Revisit the value chain and infrastructure components to develop clear guidelines and targets for inclusion of target groups	PCMU	06/2019

Gender equality & women's participation

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

Due to the vacancy position of the Gender Specialist, GASIP remains without a champion for the gender, leading to inadequate capacity for gender mainstreaming. Out of the 31,238 beneficiaries, 3% are youth, 15.6% are young adult and 29.8% are women. These achievements fall short of the targets in the design. Gender/Youth Action Plans are yet to be implemented. GASIP has initiated the preparation of the draft implementation agreement with WIAD and YIAP. The draft agreement is to be formalised within GASIP once the gender specialist is on-board. Specific indicators for measuring gender equality and women's empowerment are incorporated in the logical framework and M&E System. WAEI have been incorporated in the baseline study to capture the required set of data.

Main issues

1. It is acknowledged that rural women, and youth, are among the most vulnerable groups. GASIP lacks gender champions and adequate capacity to appreciate the magnitude of gender and social inclusion as a core to its activities. A Gender Specialist is yet to be recruited to help develop the targeting strategy of GASIP and its Gender and Youth Action Plans.
2. The recruitment of the Gender Specialist was agreed during the inter-cycle review mission which took place in March 2018. During the mission, it was concluded that the gender specialist will be recruited for 6 months. The gender specialist will prepare the targeting strategy; inclusive of the gender and youth action plans for GASIP, with clear terms of reference and adequate financial resources to coordinate and implement gender/youth activities for component 1 and component 2. According to GASIP design documents gender and targeting objectives were supposed to be mainstreamed by all staff and would include gender/age-disaggregated monitoring and reporting. Attention was to be paid to the gender perspective at every step, from production to the sharing of benefits.
3. Inter Cycle Mission recommended that all staff should be held accountable for reaching and reporting on gender and youth targets. This responsibility should be incorporated in their performance contracts explicitly.
4. To mainstream gender equity and youth empowerment, GASIP has embedded a gender and youth sensitive criteria when assessing the potential impact of proposals and EOIs. The proposals were given a score of two if the estimated smallholder beneficiaries, who are youth or women, are below 40% of the total smallholder beneficiaries. The proposals received the score of five if the estimated smallholder beneficiaries, who are youth or women, are above 40% of the total smallholder beneficiaries. In addition to this effort, GASIP may consider selecting a gender-sensitive crops value chains (especially vegetables) with identified off-takers or leveraging the market-driven approach to empower female and young smallholder farmers in decision-making capabilities and market participation.
5. The inter cycle mission noted that, although GASIP has been working with MoFA's Women in Agriculture Development (WIAD) and Youth in Agriculture and Aquaculture Production (YIAAP), this is not done in a structured way. GASIP is working to formalize the draft implementation agreement with WIAD and YIAAP. The draft agreement should be supported with the required financial resources to enhance the activity implementation.
6. GASIP has supported Planting for Food and Jobs (PFJ), the Government of Ghana's flagship programme, by providing the improved inputs; namely certified climate-resilient rice seeds to smallholder farmers (equivalent of \$1.8 million in monetary value). Total of 22,693 smallholder beneficiaries have received the climate resilient certified seeds. 26.1% of the beneficiaries were women and 21.6% were youth. GASIP should further analyse

what has been the root cause of the lower usage of the improved seeds by women and youth and implement the measures to improve the rate of the adaptation.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Development Effectiveness		
Gender equality & women's participation (2) Finalize GASIP implementation agreement with WIAD &YIAAP	GASIP/WIAD/YIAAP	03/2019
Gender equality & women's participation (3) Provide training on project staff, FBOs, VCCs and PFIs, to mainstream gender and youth and to facilitate the achievement of the target	PCU/WIAD/YIAAP	06/2019
Gender equality & women's participation (4) Include the responsibility of targeting, gender and youth explicitly in performance contracts of all staff	PCU/MoFA	06/2019

Agricultural Productivity

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

The rating remains moderately unsatisfactory. There has been no progress in the development of the value chain cluster programs and thus no impact on agricultural productivity. However, through C1.3 Climate Resilience a) 636 mts of climate-resilient rice seeds were distributed to 22,000 farmers covering over 33,000 hectares and b) 30 hectares of conservation agriculture demo plots were developed, both in the Northern Region. For the climate-resilient rice seeds distributed, GASIP has not yet received any results on productivity compared to farmers using non-climate resilient seeds. On the project-managed conservation agriculture demonstration plots, modest yield increases were reported compared to farmer's own plots, but significant practical issues (e.g. cattle grazing on crop residues) will inhibit farmer uptake

Main issues

GASIP was intended to increase agricultural productivity through the introduction of GAP and more specialised crop-specific training, as well as access to improved infrastructure, inputs and services through the value chain cluster programs. GASIP's achievement of Agricultural productivity impact will depend on the successful implementation of components 1 and 2.

Nutrition

Rating: 2

Previous rating: 2

Justification of rating

The nutrition is rated as unsatisfactory (2). The observation made during the Inter-Cycle Review at the time of March 2018 on the nutrition remains valid. The nutrition sensitive interventions are yet to be implemented at the time of the supervision mission in February 2019. Original Design of the GASIP included the soya beans as one of the value chains that have a potential impact on nutrition. Investment on soy beans has not been started.

Adaptation to Climate Change

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

Adaptation to climate change has been rated moderately unsatisfactory. Although improvement has been noted, GASIP is still poorly delivering results on the climate sub-component as per targets established during the formulation stage. The main reasons of this slow performance are (i) delay of recruiting the new team and the manager of the ASAP component ii) delay in implementing ASAP planned activities as per the recommendations of the MTR and (iii) delays in the implementation of infrastructure development activities and value chain related activities.

Main issues

1. Despite the slow pace of implementation of planned activities under this component, the project has delivered successfully few activities. Amongst them, the distribution of climate-resilient rice seeds and the investments in demonstrations of climate resilient farming technologies. It was also noted demonstrated deep understanding and ownership of proven technologies for conservation agriculture (CA) in the four districts (West Mamprusi, Bongo, Bolgatanga Municipal and Kumbungu). As a result of the project, a total of 30-acre demonstrations were established in 10 districts (1 acre per district and 3 communities in each district) on maize, alongside soybean or cowpea. The demonstrations so far were conducted mainly in the three northern regions of Ghana, with the participation of district-level officials. Local communities were confident in sharing lessons learned and willingness to adopt these technologies in their own fields, namely zero-tillage cropping, row planting and fertilizer placement, soil moisture conservation, crop residue retention, appropriate crop rotations, cover cropping. The target to increase yield for maize under CA demonstration field from 1 to 2,5 mt/ha was met and GASIP is already above the target with 2,7 mt/ha.
2. The discussions with farmers revealed challenges that could hamper the promotion and uptake of CA, and the strengthening of local production systems to climate change effects. These are the (i) unavailability of climatic information to help them plan their farm activities, (ii) effort and cost of protecting the fields against grazing by stray animals; and (iii) change of mindset and shift of focus from food security to value chain development and market approach. Activities related to climate information services and agro-forestry have not yet been implemented although recommended during the Inter-Cycle Review mission. During the supervision mission, farmers reported the failure of soybean production mainly due to excessive rainfall shortly after planting. This confirms the dire need to provide timely and accurate climate information services that will help farmers to better plan the agricultural calendar.
3. With regard to the outreach, the distribution of climate-resilient rice seeds, the project has reached out 22,693 individual farmers (74% for male and 26% for female). 600mt of climate-resilient rice seeds have been distributed to them in support to the government programme called Planting for Food and Job (PFJ programme). Disaggregated data are needed to determine the number of farmers that are direct beneficiaries under the ASAP targeted activities, to adequately inform the ASAP indicators.
4. The partnership with GIDA, to train water user associations and carry-out demonstration on efficient water use technologies in selected irrigation schemes, still need to be implemented to generate impact.
5. While much effort has been put into the inclusion of climate risk assessment into the impact studies (climate change adaptation checklist for identifying/prioritising interventions in the other components), recommendations to mainstream climate change in all GASIP components are still not well considered. Therefore, it is recommended that the components on infrastructure and value chain development, to retrofit mainstream climate change aspects into each of the components and subcomponents

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Development Effectiveness		
Adaptation to Climate Change (1) Update the protocols for the CA demonstrations and Integrate all other proven Climate Change adaptation technologies/innovations in the CA Demonstrations.	PCU	02/2019
Adaptation to Climate Change (7) Develop community gardening with solar irrigation systems, targeting more women and youths, and in an integrated manner with the CA demonstration fields	PCU	06/2019

b. Sustainability and Scaling up

Institutions and Policy Engagement	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 2
---	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

The period under review has seen staff temporarily seconded from MoFA to ameliorate the serious staffing shortage at GASIP pending the recruitment of permanent personnel. The staff performed satisfactorily and the engagement with MoFA has improved. GASIP did not engage with institutions of Policy and Research. Programme oversight structures that were not functional have just been revamped and indications are they will function in the future. The PCU had very limited staff and their performance was unsatisfactory. There was no ownership of GASIP by MoFA as the PCU did not engage with MoFA. However, most of these issues have been partially addressed.

Main issues

1. In order to address the serious staffing issues that plagued GASIP since inception, MoFA set about to revamp the PCU with the requisite technical skills through competitive recruitment of competent Programme Coordinator, Managers and Officers. In the meantime, MoFA has seconded staff to temporarily run the programme pending the recruitment of permanent staff. The process to recruit eight staff positions, including the Programme Coordinator position, has been slow and was ongoing at the time of the supervision mission. Some of the staff currently seconded to GASIP have other duties and consequently, they are not devoting enough time to GASIP work leading to excessive delays in GASIP activities.
2. The National Programme Steering Committee (NPSC) set up to provide overall governance and strategic direction to the Programme has been ineffective and had never met since the last ICR mission. The NPSC is being revamped to enable it to exercise its oversight function more effectively. In addition, a Technical Committee to deliberate on technical reports and important GASIP documents has been established and a meeting was held during the mission.
3. GASIP did not engage with relevant institutions dealing with policy and research to enable the programme access good practice, new technology and know-how in sustainable value chain development. GASIP has not internalised lessons from previous IFAD projects, such as REP and NRGPs nor have they engaged with other similar programmes funded by other development partners to learn from their experience. GASIP was designed to work with other programmes to mainstream processes and systems into a sector-wide approach to a "private sector-led" value chain development, however, this goal is unlikely to be attained as the required engagements have not taken place.
4. Refer to the "quality of project management" section for recommendations.

Partnership-building	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 2
-----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

75. Partnership Building is rated as moderately unsatisfactory (3). GASIP has not yet established firm partnerships with agribusinesses, FBOs, institutions dealing with policy; however, there is considerable progress to establish these partnerships. Strategic partnerships with financial institutions with the potential to lend to agribusiness and FBOs has not progressed to the stage of firm partnerships, even though initial contacts have been made. Proposed partnerships with FAO to collaborate on Climate Change Adaptation has been slow. However, a formal MOU may soon be signed. Collaboration with MoFA technical departments to undertake capacity building of FBOs and other value chain actors may soon be signed.

Main issues

1. Design Expectations: The programme was designed to be demand responsive private sector led initiative to improve competitiveness and thereby benefit smallholder farmers to increase their incomes. To achieve this objective there has been the need to involve agribusiness, off-takers, and financial institutions; partnerships were to be built with organisations that have the know-how in production, markets and climate change adaptation. Policy dialogue with government and knowledge institutions was to take centre stage to propel the programme towards mainstreaming innovations and scaling-up best practice approaches. GASIP was also supposed to collaborate with similar projects to synergise best practice experiences and to forge common approaches.
2. Actual Implementation Progress: Many of the proposed partnerships at design have not been established due to the poor performance of the programme in general. Although attempts were made, no partnerships have been established with Financial Institutions to collaborate on promoting lending to value chain actors. GASIP has not engaged with institutions on knowledge and research. Where partnership discussions have started, progress towards firm partnerships has been slow. Negotiations between GASIP and FAO to enable the latter support Climate Change adaptation in northern Ghana has lasted over one year and still not quite completed. GASIP has taken steps to work more closely with its Implementing Agency – MoFA. The MOU with MoFA technical departments, comprising Department of Crop Services, Department of Extension Services and Agribusiness Unit, has now been cleared for signature. This MOU will enable MoFA departments to undertake capacity building of FBOs and lead farmers in partnership with the District Departments of Agriculture Extension Agents. Discussions have also progressed to enable Ghana Irrigation Development Authority (GIDA) collaborate on Climate Change adaptation demonstrations in the northern regions of Ghana. The supervision mission has met with Ghana Incentive-Based Risk-Sharing System for Agricultural Lending (GIRSAL), a government of Ghana initiative to increase and leverage public funding to incentivize private sector lending to agribusiness. This initiative will be achieved through credit guarantees for crowding in commercial lending into Agriculture. The mission also met with financial institutions including ARB Apex, Fidelity Bank and Stanbic Bank. All these institutions have shown willingness to be future partners of GASIP.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Sustainability and Scaling up		
Partnership-building (1) Value Chain Driver partnership agreements Select +/- 20 MOU of the 45 EOIs that have passed internal due diligence for negotiation of partnership MOU agreements that ensures greatest likelihood of development impact	GASIP	12/2019

Human and Social Capital and Empowerment

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

Activities related to the capacity development and strengthening of the FBOs as a part of the sub-component 1.1 value chain development are yet to commence. The value chain committees (VCCs), meant to be social and capital platforms for actors within specific value chains at decentralized local district levels, are yet to be formed.

Main issues

1. GASIP's investment in human and social capital is assessed against empowering measures in place – including information and communication channels being used, capacity and confidence building of smallholders, women and youth, and organizational support to empower and encourage more active participation and inclusion of the targeted vulnerable groups.
2. GASIP's planned measures for human and social capital include: i) information and mobilising campaigns, using mass media and local information meetings to ensure activities and services are accessible to all and to enhance transparency; ii) empowering women FBOs, VCCs, and providing leadership training; iii) Sensitizing District Assemblies; iv) adequate capacity building in targeting of gender and youth for core staff and implementing entities. GASIP is to use Gender Learning Systems (GALS) – an empowerment methodology which aims to give the targeted groups (i.e. women and youth) more control over their lives and catalyse sustainable gender equality. These measures are yet to be implemented.
3. The Inter Cycle Mission recommended training for PCU and implementing partners on targeting aspects, gender and social inclusion - to ensure their support for target groups in general, and for women and youth's active participation in the programme, in making decision in FBOs/VCC/District Assemblies. The mission recommends such training to take place as a part of the start-up workshop upon completion of all the staff recruitment. GASIP sets the target of 50% of beneficiaries to be women, 20% to be youth (age group between 15-24 years old) and 30% to be young adult (age group between 25 to 34 years old). Awareness campaigns on GASIP at national or district levels should equally reach all the intended beneficiaries and; when selecting a media for a specific purpose (i.e. calls for EOIs and proposals). GASIP should ensure that the tools used are accessible, taking into consideration of the language skills, and literacy levels and mobility among target groups.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Sustainability and Scaling up		
Human and Social Capital and Empowerment (1) Build capacity of GASIP Staff & Partners on gender targeting and social inclusion (note: this action is already included in Gender section)	PCU/WIAD/YAAP	06/2019

Quality of Beneficiary Participation

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

Quality of beneficiary participation was rated as moderately unsatisfactory (3). There is still no consultation mechanism in place to ensure that the views of smallholders, SMEs, women and youth are sought and systematically reflected in planned activities and neither is the participatory M&E feedback system in place. Because of the delayed intervention along the value chains, there is little evidence to show quality of beneficiary participation; No awareness activities have been conducted since MTR to ensure that the target groups are well informed of the programme's opportunities. Irrespective of this, some limited consultations were held during the due diligence on the submitted proposals

Main issues

1. With the continued delay of actual implementation of filed activities, many of the proposed actions for participation

- ... that the continued delay or total implementation of these activities, many of the proposed activities for participation of the various actors have not been actualised. Partnerships have not been established due to the poor performance of the programme. For example, no partnerships have been established with Financial Institutions to collaborate on the matching Grants interventions, no engagement with institutions of research, collaboration with FAO on Conservation agriculture is yet to start, though that with the No-Till centre has commenced. The development and capacity building of FBOs is yet to commence, though GASIP has taken steps to work more closely with three Directorates of its Implementing Agency – MoFA, to conduct trainer of trainers of selected Agriculture extension agents, who will in-turn train FBOs in the selected clusters. It is expected that participation of the targeted groups should lead to specific outputs and other results that should be well included in the GASIP LogFrame and M&E systems (i.e. smallholder farmers, women and youth are making decisions and their needs/priorities are captured during consultation meetings held with FBOs, VCCs and District Assemblies). Additional measures should be put in place to increase outreach to women, male and female youth through MoFA field staff and NGO group promoters, especially in the Northern and Upper East Regions where mobility may be limited.
2. Through its M&E system, GASIP should put in place a systematic way of providing equitable feedback, grievance and redress mechanisms easily accessible to all community members' rural smallholder farmers, women, female and male youth.

Responsiveness of Service Providers	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
--	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

Because of the slow pace of implementation, there have been only one significant service provision contract since the last ICR mission. This was for Impact Assessments of the 10 selected value chain clusters by two contractors.

The rating remains at moderately unsatisfactory. Five of the ten Impact Assessment reports (from one of two contractors) were reviewed, and they have generally completed the terms of reference provided by GASIP and provided thorough reports. However, there are some significant gaps due to 1) omissions in the terms of reference (e.g. feasibility analysis of equipment requested), and 2) gaps on the service providers part (e.g. the cash flow projections provided were not realistic). The other five of the 10 Impact Assessment reports (by the second contractor) were not provided to the mission, and have not been accepted by GASIP because of gaps in responsiveness by the contractor.

Main issues

An agreed action of this mission is that independently contracted Impact Assessment Reports are no longer necessary for selection of value chain clusters. The impact assessments required will be undertaken by the GASIP project staff and value chain facilitators when recruited. Any gaps in the existing Impact Assessment Reports will also be undertaken by GASIP project staff and facilitators.

Environment and Natural Resource Management	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
--	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

No change in rating made. The delays in the planned activities related to irrigation schemes and other infrastructure, most of the activities related to environment and natural resources management are yet to be implemented. However, pilots activities on conservation agriculture were completed and communities reported a better understanding of the technologies which are likely to contribute to environmental sustainability.

Exit Strategy	Rating: 2	Previous rating: 2
----------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

Exit strategy ranking remains unsatisfactory, as the core value chain support activities that would reinforce the capabilities and incentives of government, the private sector, farmer, and civil society actors to upgrade and scale-up value chains have not been implemented.

The mission recommends that one aspect of the GASIP exit strategy, the use of multi-stakeholder value chain committees (VCCs), should be de-emphasized (except where already functioning in Northern Province). This is because 1) there is insufficient time left in the project to develop new VCCs (estimated to take 3-5 years by former NRGP staff) and 2) only an estimated 10% of VCCs formed by NRGP were still functioning two years after NRGP project closure (MoFA estimate).

Potential for Scaling-up	Rating: 2	Previous rating: 2
---------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

The potential for scaling-up is considered moderately satisfactory, based on the acceptance by all parties to the supervision mission of important agreed actions that will unlock project implementation. The team believes that there is a reasonable potential that the positive commercial benefits that will be realized by smallholders, value chain drivers, and other value chain actors will encourage them to scale-up their activities as a matter of mutual commercial interest. The team also believes that MoFA will be encouraged by the impact that GASIP value chain driver model has on smallholders and the rural poor, and will ensure that resources are provided for enabling environment support for value chain clusters.

c. Project Management

Quality of Project Management	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 2
-------------------------------	-----------	--------------------

Justification of rating

The quality of Project Management is rated 4, moderately satisfactory. Implementation rate remains slow with only 22% of the AWPB 2018 achieved. After 3 years implementation of a 6 year programme, overall disbursements of the IFAD loan and ASAP grant are 15% and 34.3% respectively (combined disbursement of 19%). Project management and coordination have improved following the secondment of an Acting Programme Coordinator about a year ago. Also, programme operations have improved following the secondment of technical staff to the programme, pending the recruitment of permanent staff. About 45 potential value chain investments have been appraised through due diligence and potential impact assessments with about 25 of these expected to be supported following the signing of an MOU with the selected Value Chain Cluster Drivers and their FBOs.

Main issues

1. The major challenge identified by previous missions with the implementation of GASIP has been weak leadership and poor management. This was attributed to inadequate skills of management and staff characterised by ineffective planning and poor coordination of activities, which was exacerbated by critical staff vacancies that were never filled. The mission has determined that implementation progress is still slow, however programme management improved following the secondment of an Acting Programme Coordinator early in 2018 by MoFA. Technical staff were also seconded leading to improved programme operations that has identified several potential investments in about 45 value chain clusters. Staffing at the PCU and the 3 Programme Zones remains a challenge as the seconded staff have other duties and consequently not devoting sufficient time to GASIP duties leading to excessive delays in all GASIP activities. There is an ongoing process to recruitment 8 permanent management and staff positions and even though the process is slow, the filling of these vacancies will see a revamp the PCU with the likelihood of delivering successful programme outputs and outcomes.
2. The National Programme Steering Committee (NPSC) that was set up to provide overall governance and strategic direction to the Programme has been ineffective and has not met since the previous ICR mission. The lack of oversight exacerbated the weak programme management in the past and prevented corrective actions to address the situation. Currently, the NPSC is being revamped to adequately exercise its oversight function more effectively. In addition, a national Programme Technical Committee has just been established to examine and adopt important GASIP reports and documents.

Knowledge Management	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
----------------------	-----------	--------------------

Justification of rating

98. The Knowledge Management (KM) component is rated as moderately unsatisfactory (3) because knowledge management and communication strategy has not been developed. Few achievements have been realized as compared to last year's ICR mission; such as some lessons learned from the implementation of the ASAP component related to the conservation agriculture and the production of a documentary video about the programme during the Farmer's day. Nevertheless, these achievements have not been shared and appropriately disseminated.

Main issues

1. The main objective of this component is to promote knowledge sharing and dissemination of information collected during programme implementation. The project coordination unit is required to organise programme related information, lessons, skills and expertise and make it available to project staff, MoFA staff, FBOs and other beneficiaries. Based on lessons learned and best practices, rural smallholder farmers will access all kinds of information that could help them to better develop their activities and improve their resilience to shocks.
2. GASIP does not have a Knowledge Management (KM) strategy and a communication plan. It is recommended that GASIP prepares a KM strategy including a communication plan which is aligned to the programme M&E system. A

good communication plan will help to identify, not only the clusters and cluster drivers that may be interested in joining the programme, but also the interested farmers and FBOs and it will also create awareness about GASIP. The communication action plan will give GASIP more visibility and introduce it at the zonal level. It will also catalyse the demand from the different actors of the value chains.

3. While preparing the KM strategy, special focus should be on policy dialogue and partnership building. This will improve the efficiency of the institutional environment and will assure the development of a better rural poverty reduction policy. The efforts of the PCU should be harmonized with the other ongoing operations led by the different development partners and MoFA in order to make use of other programmes' results and give more relevance to GASIP.

Value for Money	Rating: 2	Previous rating: 2
------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

Value for money rating is maintained at moderately unsatisfactory since the intercycle review mission because of delays in project implementation and the lack of M&E data on the impact of the few activities implemented (e.g. the climate-resilient rice seed distribution). The external contracted Impact Assessment reports reviewed (only 5 were provided to the team) contain valuable information and recommendations, but they have not provided GASIP with 1) sufficient information to select value chain clusters for support, 2) produced actionable proposals for matching grant funds. The committed cost of USD 150,000 for the Impact Assessment studies was not good value for money.

Coherence between AWPB and Implementation	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
--	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

The coherence between AWPB is rated moderately unsatisfactory because of the low utilization of the budget and the slow implementation progress of the programme. Over the last four year, the programme faced significant implementation challenges. The low performance is mainly due to the slow recruitment process due to which most of the critical positions responsible for the implementation remain vacant. This situation has been worsened by (i) the time lapse between planned activities and the effective time of implementation of those activities (ii) several procurement activities has been delayed (iii) the absence of a matching grant manual to guide the disbursement and (iv) the slow identification of clusters and cluster drivers which are the main targets of the programme's investments

AWPB Inputs and Outputs Review and Implementation Progress

In March 2018 the programme submitted an AWPB which was cleared by IFAD. The AWPB amounted to US\$14.61 million made of US\$9.55 million IFAD loan and US\$3.45 million ASAP grant. The plan was in line with IFAD requirement. The proposed budget was not totally exhausted as some of the activities have not been implemented. It is important to highlight in this context that the ASAP component has performed better than the other sub-component and that was mainly due to the rigidity of financing model of the programme, especially with regards to the access to the matching grant facility. The mission highlights the slow implementation progress of activities which was also due to the staffing issues and the slow recruitment process. The mission aims to put in place, through some proposals, a more simplistic and actionable plan for 2019 to avoid such issues for the current year. The 2019 AWP&B will be updated in line with the agreed actions of the current mission.

Performance of M&E System	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
--------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

106. The performance of the M&E system is rated moderately unsatisfactory. The web-based M&E system has not yet been developed and no training has been conducted. The M&E team is currently restricted to an acting M&E manager while the recruitment of an officer and two zonal M&E staff is undergoing. This issue limited the advancement of the implementation of the actions agreed in the last mission. The M&E manual was developed but it will fine-tuned to reflect the changes proposed by the current mission. The procurement of the consultant to develop the system has not been done yet.

M&E System Review

1. The progress of the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation component is still slow just as the general programme performance. Most of the agreed recommendations of the last mission has been implemented. A draft M&E manual has been developed but was not yet cleared by IFAD. The manual needs to be updated to reflect the changes proposed by the current supervision mission. The M&E team is currently limited to an interim manager. The recruitment of a permanent M&E manager and an officer is currently underway. Two zonal officer positions

also need to be filled to support M&E activities at the zonal levels.

2. Currently, the programme identifies only, through a call for proposals, potential clusters to be supported. Once identified, a due diligence, followed by potential impact assessment is done on each cluster after which baseline data is collected on the selected clusters. The current arrangement is costly and time-consuming which impacted negatively on the implementation of the M&E system and the access to data. So far, potential impact study and baseline data collection has been completed on some 10 identified clusters from a first call for proposal. To simplify this approach and save resources, it is proposed that the process is limited to a more robust due diligence on the clusters and then baseline data can be collected. The proposed change will be applied on the 27 clusters identified in the second call for proposals and for any future clusters that may be identified.
3. Building on the experience with the two firms that conducted the baseline on the 10 clusters, the PMU will assure the recruitment of a good firm/consultant with the capacity to conduct a timely baseline survey. It is recommended in this context to consider a reduced sample size for each segment of the clusters.
4. In line with the operational manual and the M&E manual, an online M&E system is to be developed. The development of such a system was agreed at an early stage of the implementation of the programme. Some delays have been registered with regards to the setup of the system, that was mainly due to two reasons: (i) the draft M&E manual was not cleared by IFAD, and, (ii) the pending recruitment of a consultant to develop the system. The online tool is to be aligned to IFAD and MoFA systems. In addition to the monitoring of results and reporting, the system will allow the assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of FBOs and cluster drivers.

Requirements of Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP)

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

SECAP related guidance is being monitored and the quality of the implementation of mitigation measures is adequate both for the climate change compliance and the Environment and natural resource management with minor positive outcomes as described above. Nevertheless, full implementation of the SECAP key recommendations to address potential risks is recommended

d. Financial Management & Execution

Disbursement by financier

Type	Name	Current Amount	Disbursed Amount	Actual Rate
Domestic Financing breakdown	Local Government	\$1,661,000		
	National Government	\$7,628,000		
	Beneficiaries	\$4,625,000		
	Domestic Financing Institutions	\$17,474,000		

Acceptable Disbursement Rate

Rating: 2

Previous rating: 2

Justification of rating

The project is in its fourth year of implementation (completion date 30th of June 2021) and its disbursement rate, for the IFAD loan and for the ASAP grant combined, stands at 19.2%

Main issues

Overall Financial Performance: As at February 2019, the project has disbursed USD 8.7 million out of the available USD 75.6 million (all financiers included), yielding a financial performance rate of only 11%. The IFAD Loan has disbursed approximately USD 5 million while the ASAP grant disbursed approximately USD 3.2 million. Total amount disbursed is calculated including the initial advances.

Submission and quality of WAs: In 2018 the project has submitted 15 WAs for the ASAP grant and 5 for the IFAD loan amounting to SDR 1.6 million and SDR 1.3 million respectively. Two WAs application are currently under preparation, one for the Loan and one for the Grant, for a total estimated amount of SDR 0.26 Million. The mission reviewed WAs No 14, 16 and 18 (two direct payments and one replenishment) for a total amount of USD 0.85 Million. These WAs have been

found to be acceptable, although the mission has made a number of recommendations to improve the quality of the supporting documentation to be provided.

IFAD Loan / ASAP Grant status of funds The status of funds under the IFAD loan shows a limited utilisation of all categories except for the "Operating Costs" one which is expected to be disbursed to 116% when the next WA will be submitted by the project. The reallocation will be finalized within the context of broader exercise to be completed considering the mission findings and indications. Even if the expenditures on salaries are in line with the maturity of the project, the overall expenditures on recurrent costs compared to the amount initially allocated (62%) are still very high compared to the expenditures in investment costs (11%). Therefore, a significant effort will need to be deployed by the Project to focus more on investments until project closure.

AWPB 2018: At year end, the implementation rate of the AWPB 2018 was 22%. In terms of financial commitments by components, The Knowledge Management, Policy Support and Coordination Component was realised up to 67% while the Value Chain Development and Rural Value Chain Infrastructure achieved 27% and 5% respectively. In terms of categories, the project failed to disburse any funds on the category "Works" and on "Grants and subsidies", while it exceeded its disbursement target on "Goods, Services and Inputs".

AWPB 2019: The approval process of the AWPB 2019 is still ongoing. A fast approval of this document will be key to facilitate the project in meeting its disbursement objectives for 2019.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Financial Management & Execution		
AWPB - Submit 2019 AWPB for NO	PC	02/2019
Funds reallocation A request for funds reallocation needs be submitted to IFAD approval	PCU and MOF	03/2019
Improve the efficiency by focusing in the AWPB on investment activities and by introducing cost savings with regards to operating costs.	PCU	

Fiduciary aspects

Quality of Financial Management

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

Basic FM arrangements are in place and ensure an almost acceptable level of functionality. However some FM areas are in need of substantial improvements

Main issues

1. **Staffing:** The absence of a full time Finance Manager undermines the overall quality of FM at PMU level. The recruitment process of the new Finance Manager is ongoing. The finance unit is sufficiently staffed with three accountants; two of them should be decentralized to the zonal office when these are revamped. Of the three current staff, two have been recently recruited and still have limited understanding of IFAD FM rules and procedures. It has been recommended to undertake the FM e-learning training and in general dedicated training to finance staff needs to continue to be run on a regular basis.
2. **Accounting and Financial Reporting:** The project follows a cash basis of accounting and no accruals are taken into account. Payables are not regularly monitored. In this regard it has been recommended the set-up and maintenance of contract monitoring forms, effective contract register and proper customization of the accounting software. A Double Entry accounting software (ISCALA) is being used by the project; the software has been customized to allow automatic generation of financial reports and Withdrawal Applications (WAs). Financial statements are produced through the extraction of accounting transactions from ISCALA and manipulation of these in MS Excel. 2018 draft annual financial statements have been reviewed and found acceptable, but substantial improvements have been recommended. Preparation of Interim Financial Reports was discontinued after the departure of the former Finance Manager and now needs to be resumed.
3. **Internal control system:** The absence of a full time Finance Manager undermines the quality of the internal control system. Asset management as well as contract management is weak and needs substantial improvements. Use of vehicles needs to be further improved. Segregation of duties is sufficiently effective, including the expenditures authorization process and bank reconciliations. The provisions of the financial manual are mostly respected. A

fixed Assets register is maintained but contains many inconsistencies, physical verification of fixed assets has not been conducted since a long time; overall fixed assets management is weak. Suggestions have been given to improve in this area.

4. Treasury and funds flow: The project has two designated accounts in USD to receive IFAD funds and three project accounts in GH¢ for operational purposes (for the IFAD loan, the IFAD grant and the counterpart funding). To increase the accountability and ownership, GoG has now moved all the project accounts to Bank of Ghana. Due to delays for the release of the 2018 counterpart contribution, the project has temporarily transferred a total of USD 60 000 from the IFAD Loan account to the counterpart funding bank account. Now that the counterpart funding has been released, the USD 60 000 are in the process of being transferred back to the IFAD loan account. The mission has recommended the interruption of such a practice. The supporting documentation of WAs is not completely satisfactory and needs improvements. The overall disbursement rate of the project is not satisfactory. The project is using ICP; no major issues to report.
5. Internal audit: MoA internal audit unit visits regularly GASIP and issues reports. The quality of the review performed and the related reports are unsatisfactory. There is no added value from the activities performed by internal auditors. Relevant suggestions have been provided to the internal audit team.
6. Reallocation: as result of the mission findings a reallocation may be necessary to accommodate implementation needs.
7. Ineligible expenditures: An amount of USD 5.250 has been declared ineligible by previous missions. The project is committed to refund the IFAD Loan account of the above mentioned amount transferring funds from the counterpart account. The refund process has been already initiated while the mission was ongoing. The process should be finalized by the end of February 2019.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Financial Management & Execution		
Internal controls - to ensure that in all cases the payments of contracts are processed upon receipt and acceptance of activity reports.	PC/FMgr	02/2019
Improve Fixed Asset Management: Conduct an inventory exercise annually and provide the report to MoFA. Ensure all programme assets including vehicles are only used by programme staff and for programme activities.	PC, Finance Manager	03/2019
Staffing Recruit to fill in vacant positions	PC	03/2019
Ineligible expenditures Settle ineligible expenditures and inform IFAD on the outcomes of the litigation	Finance Team	03/2019
Refund Refund USD 60 000 to IFAD Loan account and communicate it to IFAD	Finance Team	03/2019
Ensure that project's payables are properly monitored Ensure that project's payables are properly monitored	Finance Team	03/2019
log-books and monitoring of fuel consumption. Improve the use of project's vehicles, with proper use of log-books and monitoring of fuel consumption.	Finance Team	03/2019
Fixed asset register set-up Set-up of a proper fixed asset register and perform a detailed fixed assets verification to be signed off by management.	Finance Team	04/2019
Interim Financial Reports submission Regular preparation and quarterly submission to IFAD of Interim Financial Reports	Finance Team	04/2019
FM e-learning Finance team to undertake the FM e-learning training to increase understanding of IFAD FM procedures and transmit certificates to IFAD.	Finance Team	04/2019
Staffing: The zonal accountants are to be deployed to the zones as soon as the operations in the respective zones resume	PC and FC	

Quality and Timeliness of Audit

Rating: 5

Justification of rating

External Audit. The audit of the fiscal year 2017 accounts was conducted by the Ghana audit service in accordance with ISSAI standards and it was submitted on time. The auditors expressed separate unqualified opinions on the SOE, PSF,

DA and compliance with the loan covenants. The auditors also issued a management letter including follow-up on prior audit recommendations. The audit management letter raised concerns about the (i) Delays in recruitment of Zonal staff; and (ii) Gasification plant installed and financed under PROVACCA in 2016 no yet operationalized.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Financial Management & Execution		
Ensure operationalization of Gasification Plant	Project Coordinator	03/2019
External Audit/ Ensure that the Ghana Audit Service is notified of the GASIP audit for FY2018	Project Coordinator	12/2019

Counterparts Funds

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

As per the Financing Agreement, Government of Ghana (GoG) committed to support GASIP with an amount of USD 5.3 Million to cover tax and duties not included in the tax exemption. At the date of this mission GoG has contributed to the Project for a total amount of 2 million GHs, equivalent to approximately USD 0.49 Million. Overall, the actual amount provided by the Government to the project corresponds to 9% of the total commitment negotiated in the financial agreement.

Main issues

Due to the delay in the submission of counterpart funding for 2018 and in order to cover for GoG financial commitments toward the project, Project Management decided to transfer a GH¢ amount equivalent to USD 0.06 Million from the IFAD Loan operational account to the GoG counterpart account on a temporary basis. The process to transfer this amount back to the IFAD Loan account has started upon receipt of 2018 counterpart contribution. The counterpart contribution due for 2019 has not yet been received by the Project. The additional in-kind contribution provided by GoG in the form of office space and vehicles is not accounted for. The same is applicable to beneficiaries contribution. Relevant recommendation have been issued.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Financial Management & Execution		
To start the accounting for in kind-contribution at GoG and beneficiaries level	Finance team	03/2019
Counterpart financing to be provided in a timely manner - 2019 counterpart contribution to be provided to GASIP by 30 June 2019.	Mo	06/2019
Counterpart funds to be provided on a timely manner Continuous action	PCU and MOF	02/2020

Compliance with Loan Covenants

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

In regard to the 11 compliance elements analysed by the mission, and concerning both the Financial agreement and IFAD General Conditions, the Borrower/Recipient was found to be compliant in 7 cases and non-compliant in 2 cases. For the remaining 2 cases actions are ongoing to ensure borrower compliance with legal covenants.

133. The two cases of non-compliance raised during the mission concern the opening of bank accounts in the zonal offices and the submission to IFAD of the project AWPB. With respect to the first remark, the mission acknowledged that the Zonal offices have not been activated yet by the Project. Hence, non-compliance with this specific covenant is due to the actual project's implementation status. The other non-compliant element is the non-submission of the 2019 AWPB. The reasons behind it has been already examined in this report and the process of submission is meant to be completed by the end of March 2019.

Main issues

The two cases of non-compliance raised during the mission concern the opening of bank accounts in the zonal offices and the submission to IFAD of the project AWPB. With respect to the first remark, the mission acknowledged that the Zonal offices have not been activated yet by the Project. Hence, non-compliance with this specific covenant is due to the actual project's implementation status. The other non-compliant element is the non-submission of the 2019 AWPB. The reasons behind it has been already examined in this report and the process of submission is meant to be completed by the end of March 2019.

Procurement

Procurement	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
-------------	-----------	--------------------

Justification of rating

This rating is mainly due to the following: a) delays have been experienced in procurement in excess of one year and have negatively affected implementation. Only 0.8% of the planned activities for year 2018 were contracted.; b) procurement is not following the approved plan; c) the Procurement post review revealed that Procurement often not in compliance with IFAD Procurement Guidelines and Handbook in what relates to preparation of bidding documents, evaluation process, incomplete procurement filing system and periodic update of the procurement plan. Corrective action is being taken in terms of recruitment of full time experienced Procurement manager.

Procurement Review

1. **Structure of the Procurement Unit.** *The Procurement Unit is in the PCU in Accra, currently the Procurement Specialist of the Ghana Commercial Agriculture Project (World Bank funded project) is working for GASIP on part time basis after the resignation of the Procurement Manager. This is quite serious as it will lead to further delay in Programme implementation.*
2. **Procurement Planning.** The 2018 & 2019 procurement plans were found to meet the basic requirements. However, the mission noted that the procurement plan is currently not used as a monitoring and tracking tool to measure implementation performance against the initial planning as it is not periodically updated. Moreover, the plan was not fully respected with regard to packaging and some data were mistakenly enrolled such as status of IFAD review.
3. **Bidding Documents.** The Programme has adopted the World Bank Standard Bidding Documents (SBDs) for the procurement of works using NCB and ICB methods. It was agreed that the Programme will use the National Standard Bidding Documents for the procurement of Goods and Works using NCB method. For ICB method, the World Bank recent SBDs will be utilized without any customization except in the Bid Data Sheet and Contract Special Conditions sections and when refereeing to the source of finance and supervision. For shopping method, the mission recommends that the Programme will utilize the National Template for Request for Quotations.
4. **Procurement Progress.** The Procurement Progress was assessed based on the cleared Procurement Plan for 2018 and the corresponding Contract Register prepared by the Programme. In total, 14 procurement packages were planned for year 2018 with a total of USD 11,693,920. The contract register shows a total value estimated to be around USD 102,800 covering 4 signed contracts. The low rate of contracted packages (0.8% of the originally planned number) will result in implementation delays. This mainly due to: i) the insufficient number of staff responsible for carrying out procurement activities; ii) the non-timely submission of the requests for procurement with specifications/BOQ/TOR by the originators.
5. **Contracts Register.** The mission reviewed the project register of contracts, which was found to be in conformity with IFAD requirements. However, several contracts signed by the programme are not properly recorded especially those developed through shopping method. Furthermore, some important information is missing, such as financier, reference to the approved AWPB, Financing category, date of IFAD No Objection and the payment status.
6. **The procurement Filing System.** The mission was pleased to find out that the PCU established a dedicated procurement filing system, including all procurement activities. However, in some cases the procurement files were not updated to include the recent payments and progress report.
7. **Procurement Post Review.** Procurement post review has been conducted on sample basis for the contracts carried out during 2018. The reviewer has noted that:
 - National Shopping is being used at the level of PCU without the proper issuance of a Request for Quotations.
 - The RFP issued is for two lots while this is not the practice in the selection of Consultants.
 - Operating costs were not enrolled in the procurement plan.
 - Improper procurement practices were noticed such as negotiating the contract price.
 - In one case, the transaction was not part of the approved procurement plan.
 - Payment terms are not very clear in the contracts handled by the PCU.
 - The Contract management task is not being handled by the acting Procurement Officer. Consequently, contractual terms are not being monitored.
 - The acceptance process is not well documented in the procurement files.

F. Agreed Actions

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Development Effectiveness		
Adaptation to Climate Change (1) Update the protocols for the CA demonstrations and Integrate all other proven Climate Change adaptation technologies/innovations in the CA Demonstrations.	PCU	02/2019
Gender equality & women's participation (2) Finalize GASIP implementation agreement with WIAD &YIAAP	GASIP/WIAD/YIAAP	03/2019
Targeting (1) Develop targeting strategy to guide all programme implementation activities (including geographic, self-targeting, capacity building and empowerment measures and direct targeting)	PCMU	04/2019
Targeting (2) Assist targeted groups to develop proposals and appropriate business plans	PCMU	06/2019
Targeting (3) Revisit the value chain and infrastructure components to develop clear guidelines and targets for inclusion of target groups	PCMU	06/2019
Gender equality & women's participation (3) Provide training on project staff, FBOs, VCCs and PFIs, to mainstream gender and youth and to facilitate the achievement of the target	PCU/WIAD/YIAAP	06/2019
Gender equality & women's participation (4) Include the responsibility of targeting, gender and youth explicitly in performance contracts of all staff	PCU/MoFA	06/2019
Adaptation to Climate Change (7) Develop community gardening with solar irrigation systems, targeting more women and youths, and in an integrated manner with the CA demonstration fields	PCU	06/2019
Sustainability and Scaling up		
Human and Social Capital and Empowerment (1) Build capacity of GASIP Staff & Partners on gender targeting and social inclusion (note: this action is already included in Gender section)	PCU/WIAD/YAAP	06/2019

Partnership-building (1) Value Chain Driver partnership agreements Select +/- 20 MOU of the 45 EOIs that have passed internal due diligence for negotiation of partnership MOU agreements that ensures greatest likelihood of development impact	GASIP	12/2019
Financial Management & Execution		
AWPB - Submit 2019 AWPB for NO	PC	02/2019
Internal controls - to ensure that in all cases the payments of contracts are processed upon receipt and acceptance of activity reports.	PC/FMgr	02/2019
Improve Fixed Asset Management: Conduct an inventory exercise annually and provide the report to MoFA. Ensure all programme assets including vehicles are only used by programme staff and for programme activities.	PC, Finance Manager	03/2019
Staffing Recruit to fill in vacant positions	PC	03/2019
Funds reallocation A request for funds reallocation needs be submitted to IFAD approval	PCU and MOF	03/2019
Ineligible expenditures Settle ineligible expenditures and inform IFAD on the outcomes of the litigation	Finance Team	03/2019
Refund Refund USD 60 000 to IFAD Loan account and communicate it to IFAD	Finance Team	03/2019
Ensure that project's payables are properly monitored Ensure that project's payables are properly monitored	Finance Team	03/2019
log-books and monitoring of fuel consumption. Improve the use of project's vehicles, with proper use of log-books and monitoring of fuel consumption.	Finance Team	03/2019
To start the accounting for in kind-contribution at GoG and beneficiaries level	Finance team	03/2019
Ensure operationalization of Gasification Plant	Project Coordinator	03/2019
Fixed asset register set-up Set-up of a proper fixed asset register and perform a detailed fixed assets verification to be signed off by management.	Finance Team	04/2019

Interim Financial Reports submission Regular preparation and quarterly submission to IFAD of Interim Financial Reports	Finance Team	04/2019
FM e-learning Finance team to undertake the FM e-learning training to increase understanding of IFAD FM procedures and transmit certificates to IFAD.	Finance Team	04/2019
Counterpart financing to be provided in a timely manner - 2019 counterpart contribution to be provided to GASIP by 30 June 2019.	Mo	06/2019
External Audit/ Ensure that the Ghana Audit Service is notified of the GASIP audit for FY2018	Project Coordinator	12/2019
Counterpart funds to be provided on a timely manner Continuous action	PCU and MOF	02/2020
Improve the efficiency by focusing in the AWPB on investment activities and by introducing cost savings with regards to operating costs.	PCU	
Staffing: The zonal accountants are to be deployed to the zones as soon as the operations in the respective zones resume	PC and FC	

Ghana Agricultural Sector Investment Programme

Logical Framework

Results hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
Outreach Ghana Agricultural Sector Investment Programme	1.b Estimated corresponding total number of households members									PCU Estimation	
	Household members	300 000	374 000	514 200	46 256	54 996	10.7				
	1.a Corresponding number of households reached									PCU Estimation	
	Households	44 000	55 000	75 600	11 564	13 749	18.2				
	1 Persons receiving services promoted or supported by the project									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Males	25 000	31 450	43 200	20 968	21 929	50.8				
	Females	25 000	31 450	43 200	8 085	9 309	21.5				
	Young	25 000	31 450	43 200	5 844	5 844	13.5				
	Total number of persons receiving services				29 053	31 238					
Project Goal Contribute to a sustainable poverty reduction in rural areas of Ghana	% decrease in the incidence of rural poverty in Ghana							Ghana Statistical Services			Favourable macro-economic environment (A)
	Rural population below the poverty line	29			24.5						
	Increase in the agricultural GDP							Ghana Statistical Services			
	Increase in the agricultural GDP (GHS million)	16 687			6 892	0					
	% of children under 5 suffering from malnutrition weight for height)							Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) - UNICEF			
	Children underweight	14			13						

Results hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
	Average crop yields for cassava (in MT/ha)							Farmers book tracer study			
	MT/ha	9.4	18	16.4	20.78						
	Average crop yields for maize (in MT/ha)							Farmers book tracer study			
	MT/ha	2	3.8	3.5	2.12						
	Net farm income for cassava (in GHS/ha)							Farmers book tracer study			
	GHS/ha	212	425	875							
	Net farm income for maize (in GHS/ha)							Farmers book tracer study			
	GHS/ha	37	362	875							
	Additional volume of cassava marketed by smallholders (in MT)							Farmers book tracer study			
	MT	0	36 000	216 000	0						
	Additional volume of maiz marketed by smallholders (in MT)							Farmers book tracer study			
	MT	0	7 000	40 000	0						
	Poor smallholder household members supported in coping with the effects of climate change									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Males				3 236	4 197					
	Females				3 059	4 283					
	Total household members		5 000	10 000	6 295	8 480	84.8				
Development Objective											

Results hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
Outcome Outcome 1: Smallholders have formalized commercial linkages to factor and output markets, including small agribusinesses, and have access to essential private and public infrastructure	Number of agribusinesses experiencing sustainable growth							Tracer study			
	Agribusinesses		180	270	0						
	Number of farmers linked to markets by programme										
	Farmers	45 000	55 000	80 000	0						
	Number of FBOs reaching category four (4) status (sustainability)									Value Chain Facilitator	
	FBOs	0	300	800	0						
	% of VCCs established fully functional and sustainable									Value Chain Facilitator	
	VCCs			100	0						
	Number of hectares under improved production techniques									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Hectares of land	0	30 000	74 300	12	12	0				
Output 1.1. Value Chain Committees (VCCs) and FBOs are established/capacitated and value chain actors are linked	Number of VCCs established									Value Chain Facilitator	
	VCCs established	43	34	180	0						
	Number of agribusinesses supported									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Agribusinesses	105	200	300	0						
	Number of FBOs involved									Value Chain Facilitator	
	FBOs	0	3 100	4 300	0						
	Number of farmers trained (Men)									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Males	0	15 000	30 000	16	16	0.1				
	Females	0	15 000	30 000	9	9	0				
Output 1.2 Commercial infrastructure is improved	Km of rural roads rehabilitated (RIMS)							ZPO			
	Length of roads	0	1 000	1 200	0						
	Km of rural electrical connections							ZPO			

Results hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
	Length of roads	0	450		0	0					
	Number of storage facilities constructed/rehabilitated							ZPO			
	Storage facilities		50	100	0	0	0				
Output Output 1.3. Essential, enabling public infrastructure are constructed in support of growth and value chains' viability	2.1.6 Market, processing or storage facilities constructed or rehabilitated							ZPO			
	Market facilities constructed/rehabilitated	0	50		0						
	Processing facilities constructed/rehabilitated				0						
	Storage facilities constructed/rehabilitated				0						
	2.1.5 Roads constructed, rehabilitated or upgraded							ZPO			
	Length of roads	0	1 000	1 200	0						
	Number of water harvesting and management systems constructed (ASAP)										
	Systems constructed				0						
	Number of livestock watering points constructed (ASAP)										
	Watering points				0						
	Number of km of rural electrical connections							Value Chain Facilitator			
	Rural electrical connections	0	450		0	1					

Results hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
Outcome Outcome 2: Increased and systematic access to and use of short and long term financing for value chain businesses	Value of loans facilitated by GASIP with tenure <=1 year								PFIs quaterly reporting		Low capacity of programme to interest PFIs in financing value chains (R) PFIs have liquidity (internally or through credit lines (A))
	Loans		1 500	1 500	0						
	Value of loans facilitated by GASIP with tenure > 1 year								PFIs quaterly reporting		
	Loans		500	750	0						
	1.2.5 Number of persons reporting using rural financial services								Funds and PFIs quaterly reporting		
	Clients accessing leasing, equity, investments or other products	0	4 000	10 000	0						
	Clients using structured trade financing	10 000	30 000	50 000	0						
	1.2.6 Partner financial service providers with portfolio-at-risk ≥30 days below 5%								PFIs quaterly reporting		
	Percentage				0						
	Percentage of supported PFIs reaching operational self-sufficiency								PFIs quaterly reporting		
	Households				0						
Output Output 2.1. Rural and community banks receive strategic and operational development support and linked with commercial banks	1.1.6 Financial service providers supported in delivering outreach strategies, financial products and services to rural areas							ZPO			
	Service providers	50	100	150	0						
	Number of PFI staff trained (men and women)							ZPO			
	Men and Women	0	500		0						
Output Output 2.2. A matching grant scheme is established and operated to support value chain actors	Value of loans leveraged by matching grants							ZPO			
	Loans	0	7 000	20 000	0						

Results hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
	1.1.5 Persons in rural areas accessing financial services								Funds and PFIs quarterly reporting		
	Total persons accessing financial services - savings	30 000	50 000	70 000	0						
	Total persons accessing financial services - credit				0						
	Value chain actors supported through the matching grant mechanism										
	Males				0						
	Females				0						
Outcome Outcome 3: Value chain stakeholders and local production systems increase their resilience to climate change	Land under climate-resilient practices										Low capacity of Programme to mainstream commercial climate change technologies (R)
	Land area	0	7 500	10 000	12	12	0.1				
	Irrigated land using efficient technology									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Hectares of land	0	200	1 000	0						
	Yield from conservation farming for maize (in tons/ha)									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Yield	1	2.5	3	2.7						
	Number of direct beneficiaries having improved water management practices (ASAP)									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Beneficiaries	0	1 000	4 000	0						
	Yield from conservation farming for soja (in tons/ha)									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Yield	0.7	1.6	2	0.6						
	1.1.2 Farmland under water-related infrastructure constructed/rehabilitated										
	Hectares of land	0	250	350	0						
	Households supported with increased water availability or efficiency										
	Households			1 081	0						

Results hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
	Production and processing facilities supported with increased water availability and efficiency										
	Facilities			50	0						
Output Outputs: 3.1 Adaptative trials and demonstrations of modern conservation agriculture and water-efficient irrigation techniques are undertaken	Number of demonstrations undertaken (ASAP)									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Demonstrations	0	30	50	30	30	60				
	Number of WUAs trained/supported									Value Chain Facilitator	
	WUAs	0	30	50	0						
	Individuals engaged in NRM and climate risk management activities									Value Chain Facilitator	
	Total	0	10 000	15 000	6 295	8 480	56.5				
	Males	0	5 000	7 500	3 236	4 197	56				
	Females	0	5 000	7 500	3 059	4 283	57.1				
Output Output 3.2. Climate change resilient production technologies and practices are promoted among rural producers	Number of agricultural/livestock production groups formed/strengthened										
	Production groups			4 300	30	30	0.7				
	Number of persons in these agricultural/livestock production groups (men/women)										
	Males				254	254					
	Females				346	346					
	1.1.4 Persons trained in production practices and/or technologies										
	Men trained in crop			30 000	3 236	4 197	14				
	Women trained in crop			30 000	3 059	4 283	14.3				
	Young people trained in crop				3 613	3 613					
	Not young people trained in crop				2 682	2 682					

Results hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
	Indigenous people trained in crop				0	0					
	Non indigenous people trained in crop				0	0					
	Men trained in livestock				0	0					
	Women trained in livestock				0	0					
	Young people trained in livestock				0	0					
	Not young people trained in livestock				0	0					
	Indigenous people trained in livestock				0	0					
	Non indigenous people trained in livestock				0	0					
	Men trained in forestry				0	0					
	Women trained in forestry				0	0					
	Young people trained in forestry				0	0					
	Not young people trained in forestry				0	0					
	Indigenous people trained in forestry				0	0					
	Non indigenous people trained in forestry				0	0					
	Men trained in fishery				0	0					

Results hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification		Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility
	Women trained in fishery				0	0				
	Young people trained in fishery				0	0				
	Not young people trained in fishery				0	0				
	Indigenous people trained in fishery				0	0				
	Non indigenous people trained in fishery				0	0				
	Total persons trained in crop				6 295	8 480				
	Total persons trained in livestock				0	0				
	Total persons trained in forestry				0	0				
	Total persons trained in fishery				0	0				
Outcome Outcome 4 : The policy framework for smallholder farmers has improved	General satisfaction with the policy framework among value chain actors (scale 1 - 6)							Participatory outcome assessment		
	General satisfaction (scale 1 - 6)			5	0					
Output Outputs: Policy development supported	Number of policy forums held									PCU
	Policy forums	0	3	6	0					
	Number of white papers addressing key policy issues									PCU
	Papers	0	3	6	0					

Ghana

Ghana Agricultural Sector Investment Programme

Supervision Report

Appendix 1: Financial: actual financial performance; by financier by component and disbursements by category

Mission Dates: From 4 Feb 2019 to 15 Feb 2019
Document Date 22/06/2019
Project No. 1100001678
Report No. 5077-GH

West and Central Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Table 1: Financial Performance by Financiers (USD'000) as at DECEMBER 2018

Financier	Appraisal (USD '000)	Disb. '000)	(USD	Per disb.	cent
IFAD Loan	36 600		5 000		14%
ASAP Grant	10 000		3 179		32%
Government 1	5 300		478		9%
District Assemblies	1 661		0		0%
PFIs	17 474		0		0%
Beneficiaries	4 625		0		0%
Sub-Total	75 660		8 656		11%
IFAD Loan 2	35 000		0		0%
Government 2	2 328		0		0%
Sub-Total	37 328				0%
Grand Total	112 988		8 656		8%

Table 2: Financial Performance by Financiers by Component (USD'000) as at DECEMBER 2018

No.	Component Description	Appr.	IFAD LOAN I			ASAP GRANT			Government			Domestic			Total		
			Mtr	Actual	%age	Appr. & Mtr	Actual	%age	Appr. & Mtr	Actual	%age	Appr. & Mtr	Actual	%age	Appr. & Mtr	Actual	%age
C1	Value chain development	16 479	13 985	722	5%	7 750	2 432	31%	1 462	39	3%	20 533	0	0%	46 499	3 192	7%
C2	Rural Value Chain Infrastructure	15 768	13 952	312	2%	1 510	7	0.5%	2 944	7	0%	3 227	0	0%	23 450	326	1%
C3	Knowledge Management, policy support and Coordination	4 353	8 663	2 766	32%	740	0	0%	894	432	48%	0	0		5 987	3 192	53%
	Total	36 600	36 600	3 800	10%	10 000	2 439	24%	5 300	478	9%	23 760	0	0%	75 936	6 710	9%
	Authorised Allocation			1 200	**		740	***							0	2 300	
	Total IFAD Financing	36 600	36 600	5 000	14%	10 000	3 179	32%	5 300	478	9%	23 760	0	0%	75 936	9 010	12%

** Approx USD300,000 equivalent has been spent in the last quarter of 2018 and not yet claim. This amount of money will ne claim through W/A 13 which is currently under preparation

*** Approx USD60,000 equivalent has been spent in the last quarter of 2018 and not yet claim. This amount of money will ne claim through W/A 19 which is currently under preparation

Table 3: IFAD Loan Disbursement by Category (SDR) as at DECEMBER 2018

Cat	Category description	Original Allocation	Disbursement	WA 13*** Pending	Available Balance	Per cent disbursed
I	Works	7 590 000	73 923	0	7 516 077	0.97%
II	Equipment And Materials	770 000	161 723	4 841	603 435	21.63%
III	Goods, Services And Inputs	0	-	0	0	0.00%
IV	Consultancies	4 350 000	471 258	49 433	3 829 309	11.97%
V	Training	3 900 000	291 743	17 254	3 591 004	7.92%
VI	Grants And Subsidies	2 090 000	-	0	2 090 000	0.00%
VII	Operating Costs	400 000	398 080	67 250	-65 330	116.33% **
VIII	Salaries And Allowances	2 230 000	1 098 586	74 492	1 056 922	52.60%
	Unallocated	2 370 000	-		2 370 000	0.00%
	Authorised Allocation	0	1 083 306		-1 083 306	
Total	Total IFAD Financing	23 700 000	3 578 619	213 271	19 908 111	16.00%

*** WA 13 is approx US\$300,000 converted to SDR213,000 at the date of conversion, however the total amount may change as the WA is in the process of being finalised

** Reallocation is required for the Operating cost. A formal request is at MoF

Table 4: ASAP Grant Disbursement by Category (SDR) as at DECEMBER 2018

Cat	Category description	Original Allocation	Disbursement	WA 19*** Pending	Available Balance	Per cent disbursed
I	Works	900 000	-	-	900 000	0.00%
II	Equipment and Materials	1 590 000	447 118		1 125 455	28.12%
III	Goods, Services and Inputs	880 000	804 406	17 615	94 259	93.41%
IV	Consultancies	510 000	269 208	-	305 044	52.79%
V	Training	1 970 000	134 518	24 808	1 915 005	8.09%
VI	Grants And Subsidies	-	-	-	-	
VII	Operating Costs		-	-	-	
VIII	Salaries And Allowances		-	-	-	
	Unallocated	650 000		-	650 000	0.00%
	Authorised Allocation	-	577 763	-	-577 763	0.00%
Total	Total IFAD Financing	6 500 000	2 233 013	42 423	4 412 000	35.01%

*** WA 19 is approx US\$60,000 converted to SDR 42,000 at the date of conversion, however the total amount may change as the WA is in the process of being finalised

Table 5: Budget Execution By Component (USD) as at December 2018

	Value chain development	Rural Value Chain Infrastructure	Knowledge Management, policy support and Coordination	Total
2016				
Budget	8 998 133	4 353 050	3 616 335	16 967 518
Actual	548 401	19 048	1 017 935	1 585 384
% execution	6%	0%	28%	9%
2017				
Budget	8 355 253	2 531 530	2 880 010	13 766 793
Actual	365 600	22 424	1 337 763	1 725 787
% execution	4%	1%	46%	13%
2018				
Budget	8 167 849	5 350 101	1 111 712	14 629 662
Actual	2 215 102	282 502	745 130	3 242 734
% execution	27%	5%	67%	22%

Table 6: Government contribution to the project

Year	Amount requested & approved	Amount received	Amount received	% of
	GH¢	GH¢	US	
			\$	
2015	400 000.00	400 000.00	100 000.00	100%
2016	4 694 976.00	800 000.00	202 634.25	17%
2017	3 128 864.59	453 555.00	103 788.33	14%
2018***	400 000.00	400 000.00	83 766.12	100%
	8 623 840.59	2 053 555.00	490 188.70	24%

***funds pertains to 2018 budget but was received in 2019

Table 1: Model Output for the 1000th iteration of the MCMC

Iteration	Year	Age	Sex	Weight (kg)	Length (cm)	Condition	Survival (0-1)	Reproduction (0-1)	Stress (0-1)	Health (0-1)	Notes
1000	2010	10	Male	10.5	10.5	Good	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.1	
1001	2011	11	Female	11.2	11.2	Good	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.2	
1002	2012	12	Male	12.0	12.0	Good	0.7	0.4	0.1	0.1	
1003	2013	13	Female	13.5	13.5	Good	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.3	
1004	2014	14	Male	14.8	14.8	Good	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.2	
1005	2015	15	Female	16.0	16.0	Good	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.4	
1006	2016	16	Male	17.5	17.5	Good	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.5	
1007	2017	17	Female	19.0	19.0	Good	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.6	
1008	2018	18	Male	20.5	20.5	Good	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.7	
1009	2019	19	Female	22.0	22.0	Good	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.8	
1010	2020	20	Male	23.5	23.5	Good	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.9	

2010

Iteration	Year	Age	Sex	Weight (kg)	Length (cm)	Condition	Survival (0-1)	Reproduction (0-1)	Stress (0-1)	Health (0-1)	Notes
1011	2010	10	Male	10.5	10.5	Good	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.1	
1012	2011	11	Female	11.2	11.2	Good	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.2	
1013	2012	12	Male	12.0	12.0	Good	0.7	0.4	0.1	0.1	
1014	2013	13	Female	13.5	13.5	Good	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.3	
1015	2014	14	Male	14.8	14.8	Good	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.2	
1016	2015	15	Female	16.0	16.0	Good	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.4	
1017	2016	16	Male	17.5	17.5	Good	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.5	
1018	2017	17	Female	19.0	19.0	Good	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.6	
1019	2018	18	Male	20.5	20.5	Good	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.7	
1020	2019	19	Female	22.0	22.0	Good	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.8	

2011

Iteration	Year	Age	Sex	Weight (kg)	Length (cm)	Condition	Survival (0-1)	Reproduction (0-1)	Stress (0-1)	Health (0-1)	Notes
1021	2010	10	Male	10.5	10.5	Good	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.1	
1022	2011	11	Female	11.2	11.2	Good	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.2	
1023	2012	12	Male	12.0	12.0	Good	0.7	0.4	0.1	0.1	
1024	2013	13	Female	13.5	13.5	Good	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.3	
1025	2014	14	Male	14.8	14.8	Good	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.2	
1026	2015	15	Female	16.0	16.0	Good	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.4	
1027	2016	16	Male	17.5	17.5	Good	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.5	
1028	2017	17	Female	19.0	19.0	Good	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.6	
1029	2018	18	Male	20.5	20.5	Good	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.7	
1030	2019	19	Female	22.0	22.0	Good	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.8	

Ghana

Ghana Agricultural Sector Investment Programme

Supervision Report

Appendix 2: Physical progress measured against AWP&B

Mission Dates: From 4 Feb 2019 to 15 Feb 2019

Document Date 22/06/2019

Project No. 1100001678

Report No. 5077-GH

West and Central Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Appendix 2: Physical progress measured against AWP&B

Component/ Sub- component or Output	Indicator	Unit	Period: 1 st Jan. 2018 to 31 st December 2018			Appraisal Target	Cumulative Actual	%	Remarks	
			AWP&B	Actual	%					
Component 1: Value Chain Development										
	Sub-component 1.1: Agribusiness Linkages and Development									
1		No. of functional VCC's	Number	50	0	0	134			Various VC actors have been identified with some interaction on GASIP's mandate.
2		No. of agribusinesses supported	Number	43	0	0	200			Potential impact completed for 10 clusters. 9 to be supported
3		No. of FBOs Involved	Number	1 395	0	0	3 100			23 FBOs have been identified in 5 of the 10 identified clusters
4		No. of farmers trained	Number	2 000	25	1.25	30 000			A draft 12 month implementing agreement with DCS, DAES and ABU all of MoFA to train FBOs in the 10 clusters is shared with ICO
Sub-component 1.2: Rural Financial Services										
1		Number of active PFIs	Number	22	0	0	100			Few PFIs approached the programme for possible partnerships •Informal discussions with some financial institutions to gauge their interest ongoing
2		Amounts of Marching Grant disbursed	Amounts	\$1.5m	0	0	\$7.0m			Matching Grant Manual has been developed and forwarded to ICO for comment
Sub-component 1.3: Climate Change resilience										

1		Number of clients trained in CCR (ASAP)	Number	4 500	6 295	139.9	10 000			Beneficiaries of CA demo
2		Hectares of land under conservation agriculture practices	ha	4 500	12	0.3	7 500			10 MMDAs and 30 communities participated
3		Individuals engaging and/or participating in climate risk management activities, disaster risk reduction efforts and/or a collective shift towards less climate-sensitive livelihoods	Number	6 750	6 295	93.3	15 000			
4		Yield from conservation farming (by crop)	MT/Ha	M - 1.68 S - 1.1	M - 2.7 S - 0.6	60.7 -45.5	M: 2.5 S: 1.6			Excessive rain at initial stages
5		Hectares with reliable access to water (ASAP), under GASIP	Hectares	112	0	0	250			Implementation agreement is submitted to ICO for 'No Objection'.
6		Number of demonstrations undertaken	Hectares	30	30	100	50			Target achieved
7		Number of functional WUAs (ASAP) supported by GASIP	Number	22	0	0	50			3 Irrigation schemes have been identified: Bontanga, Libga and Golinga
Component 2: Rural Value Chain Infrastructure										
Sub-component 2.2: Enabling Public Infrastructure to support selected value chains										
1		Length of rural roads rehabilitated	Km	34	0	0	900			77 Km of road re-tendered
2		Length of rural electrical connections done	Km	100	0	0	450			About 1Km identified during due diligence

Ghana

Ghana Agricultural Sector Investment Programme

Supervision Report

Appendix 3: Compliance with legal covenants: status of implementation

Mission Dates: From 4 Feb 2019 to 15 Feb 2019

Document Date 22/06/2019

Project No. 1100001678

Report No. 5077-GH

West and Central Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Appendix 3: Compliance with legal covenants: Status of implementation

Section	Loan Covenant	Target/Action Due Date	Compliance Status/Date	Remarks
Financing Agreement Section B. Para 6	Two designated accounts in United States Dollars shall be opened at the Bank of Ghana	October 2015	Compliant	
Financing Agreement Section B. Para 6	A Program Account denominated in Ghana cedis shall be opened at a commercial bank acceptable to IFAD	27 January 2016	Compliant	Two accounts, one for the Loan and one for the Asap grant were opened at a Commercial bank. The accounts have been recently moved to the Bank of Ghana in compliance with new Government regulations.
Financing Agreement Section B. Para 6	Three additional Program Accounts denominated in Ghana cedis shall be opened at zonal office level in commercial banks acceptable to IFAD		Non-Compliant	The Zonal offices are not yet operational
Financing Agreement Section B. Para 7	The Borrower's counterpart contribution to the Program shall approximately amount to the equivalent of 5.3 million dollars	Throughout the project	Ongoing	The government provides additional in-kind contribution.
Financing Agreement Section B. Para 7	A counterpart account shall be opened	27 January 2016	Compliant	
Financing Agreement Section E. Par 2(c)	National Program Coordinator has been duly appointed	1 December, 2014	Compliant	This position is currently covered at interim and the recruitment process is ongoing
Financing Agreement Section E. Par 2(c)	Financial Manager has been duly appointed	10 April, 2015	Compliant	This position is currently covered at interim and the recruitment process is ongoing
General Conditions Section 7.01	Submission of AWPB each year to IFAD for approval	Annual (by 31 Oct)	Non-Compliant	As at February 2019 the AWPB for this year has not yet been approved. Remedial action is expected to be taken within the next month.
General Conditions Section 8.03	Mid-Term Review (MTR) carried out jointly by Borrower, IFAD	May 2018	Compliant	Conducted in Feb-Mar 2018

Section	Loan Covenant	Target/Action Due Date	Compliance Status/Date	Remarks
General Conditions Section 9.02	Submission of Annual Financial Statements to IFAD	30 April each Year	Ongoing	Done for FY2015, 2016 and 2017, yet to be received for 2018
General Conditions Section 9.03	Audit of Program financial Statements in accordance with Program guidelines by an independent Auditor	30 June each Year	Compliant	Done for FY2015, 2016 and 2017. The audit exercise for 2018 is already scheduled and will be starting soon.