

Lesotho

Smallholder Agriculture Development Project

Supervision Report

Main report and appendices

Mission Dates: 18 - 29 May 2019

Document Date 23/08/2019

Project No. 1100001530

Report No. 5128-LS

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|----------------|--|
| AF | Additional Financing |
| AIP | Agricultural Investment Plan |
| CAHW | Community Animal Health Workers |
| CERC | Contingent Emergency Response Component |
| CGP | Competitive Grants Program |
| DAO | District Agricultural Officer |
| E&S | Environmental and Social |
| ESMF | Environmental and Social Mitigation and Management Plans |
| ESMP | Environmental and Social Management Plan |
| KM | Knowledge Management |
| LASAP | Lesotho Adaptation to Small-Scale Agriculture Project |
| M&E | Monitoring& Evaluation |
| MAFS | Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security |
| MDP | Ministry of Development Planning |
| MSBDMC | Ministry of Small Business Development, Marketing and Cooperatives |
| MTR | Mid-Term Review |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organizations |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| NRM | Natural Resource Management |
| PDO | Project Development Objective |
| PI | Productive Investments |
| PMC | Project Management Committee |
| PMU | Project Management Unit |
| SADP | Smallholder Agricultural Development Programme |
| WAMPP | Wool and Mohair Promotion Project (WAMPP) |
| WB | World Bank |

A. Project Overview

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Region: | East and Southern Africa Division | Project at Risk Status: | Not at risk |
| Country: | Lesotho | Environmental and Social Category: | B |
| Project Name: | Smallholder Agriculture Development Project | Climate Risk Classification: | not available yet |
| Project ID: | 1100001530 | Executing Institution: | not available yet |
| Project Type: | Rural Development | Implementing Institutions: | not available yet |
| CPM: | Philipp Baumgartner | | |
| Project Director: | Pheko Retselisitsoe Daniel | | |
| Project Area: | ButhaButhe , Leribe, Berea, Maseru, Mafeteng, Mochale's Hoek and Quthing | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Approval Date: | 27/11/2011 | Last audit receipt: | 29/08/2018 |
| Signing Date: | 19/12/2011 | Date of Last SIS Mission: | 29/05/2019 |
| Entry into Force Date: | 19/12/2011 | Number of SIS Missions: | 17 |
| Available for Disbursement Date: | 21/06/2012 | Number of extensions: | 1 |
| First Disbursement Date: | 21/06/2012 | Effectiveness lag: | 1 month |
| MTR Date: | 12/05/2014 | | |
| Original Completion Date: | 31/03/2018 | | |
| Current Completion Date: | 31/03/2020 | | |
| Financial Closure: | not available yet | | |

Project total financing

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| IFAD Financing breakdown | IFAD | \$4,998,654 |
| | Debt Sustainability Framework | \$4,998,654 |
| Domestic Financing breakdown | Beneficiaries | \$980,800 |
| | National Government | \$3,477,865 |
| Co-financing breakdown, | World Bank: International Development Association | \$9,997,315 |
| | GEF: Least Developed Countries Fund | \$4,330,000 |
| Project total financing: | | \$28,783,288 |

Current Mission

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Mission Dates: | 18 - 29 May 2019 |
| Days in the field: | 4.5 |
| Mission composition: | Bobojon Yatimov (Senior Agricultural Specialist, World Bank); Meeta Sehgal (Senior Agricultural Specialist, World Bank); Philipp Baumgartner (Country Director for Lesotho, IFAD); Tiffany Minjauw (Environmental Specialist, IFAD); Eva Jordans, (Irrigation and Rural Development Specialist, IFAD Consultant); Garry Christensen (Agricultural Economist, World Bank); Justice Morena Mokoteli (Country Operations Analyst, IFAD); Motsoasele Leballo (Senior Implementation Specialist, IFAD); Ntaoleng Mochaba (Environmental Specialist, World Bank); Moipone Ndlovu (Social Specialist, World Bank); George Daniel (Senior Procurement Specialist, World Bank); Tandile Msiwa (Senior Financial Management Specialist, World Bank); and Matsemane Seitebatso Tsemene (Team Assistant, World Bank) |
| Field sites visited: | Berea, Butha-Buthe, Leribe and Mafeteng districts |

B. Overall Assessment

| Key SIS Indicator #1 | Ø | Rating | Key SIS Indicator #2 | Ø | Rating |
|---|---|--------|--|---|--------|
| Likelihood of Achieving the Development Objective | | 4 | Assessment of the Overall Implementation Performance | | 4 |

| | | | |
|--|----------|---|----------|
| Effectiveness and Developmental Focus | 4 | Project Management | 4 |
| Effectiveness | 4 | Quality of Project Management | 4 |
| Targeting and Outreach | 3 | Knowledge Management | 4 |
| Gender equality & women's participation | 4 | Value for Money | 4 |
| Agricultural Productivity | N/A | Coherence between AWPB and Implementation | 5 |
| Nutrition | N/A | Performance of M&E System | 3 |
| Adaptation to Climate Change | 4 | Requirements of Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP) | 3 |

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

| | |
|------------------|----------|
| Relevance | 4 |
|------------------|----------|

C. Mission Objectives and Key Conclusions

Background and Main Objective of the Mission

From 18 to 28 May 2019, the World Bank and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) conducted a joint implementation support mission for the Smallholder Agriculture Development Project - Additional Financing (SADP-AF)/ Lesotho Adaptation of Small Scale Agricultural Production (LASAP). The Additional Financing of ten million USD funded by World Bank became effective in April 2018 together with the LASAP (GEF) financing of 4,333,333 million USD channelled through IFAD to promote climate resilience in agricultural investments funded through SADP (and SADP AF). The mission's objective was to support the project management team in reviewing implementation progress and processes to allow for sustainable, timely and efficient project delivery in the remaining 10 months until completion, reviewing what feasible actions are planned for the coming months and how to ensure project interventions' sustainability beyond the life-span of SADP-AF. Moreover, the mission explored the lessons learned and the challenges and successes of SADP to inform the design of SADP II, as well the progress made on the recommendations from the previous supervision mission in November 2018. In particular, the mission focussed on (i) assessing the overall progress towards achievement of the PDO, reviewing implementation progress and processes to allow for sustainable, timely and effective project delivery; (ii) evaluating the progress towards completion of the CGP sub-projects; (iii) reviewing the disbursement rate and confirming the action plan and resources available for the remainder of the project life; and (iv) discussing the sub-projects sustainability beyond the life-span of the SADP-AF financing and discussing project exit. The mission further also served to prepare the start-up and final design aspect for IFAD co-financing of SADP II, which is approved by the World Bank board on May 30th. These discussions are not reflected in this ORMS report but captured in the mission's AM.

The mission met with the Principal Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), the Principal Secretary of the Ministry of Development Planning, the Project Management Unit, and with a number of MAFS District-level officers from the seven districts covered by the project. Field visits were carried out to four of the seven districts covered by the project namely Berea, Botha-Bothe, Leribe and Mafeteng. A workshop to discuss the mission findings with the district teams and the PMU was held in Leribe at the end of the field visits (24th of May). The wrap up took place on Tuesday the 28th May with a formal presentation of the Aide Memoire and mission findings. The final version of the Aide Memoire was endorsed by the Bank management and IFAD Country Manager.

Key Mission Agreements and Conclusions

Overall, the project is on track to achieve the PDO and the implementation pace continues to improve - with a marked increase in disbursement from 16.4% to 33% since the last supervision mission. Field visits by the mission indicated that grants to individual beneficiaries are having a marked impact. Farmers are not only finding ready markets for their output and generating good returns, but also re-investing their profits to further expand their enterprises.

The PMU has worked on the previous mission's agreed actions, paying increased attention to environmental issues, developing the excel database of all the sub-projects, requesting water permits for all boreholes, opening bank accounts with restricted mandates and debit freeze, recruiting climate smart officers and assistants, and contracting a social capital mentoring consultancy. Therefore, although issues still pertain, the initiatives undertaken have been recognised and commended.

While this progress is encouraging, there are numerous key issues to resolve before project closure in February 2020. The PMU and Agricultural Extension officers were urged in the past two supervision missions to increase their support for sub-projects involved in pig and poultry production, particularly in the areas of sow mating, the cost-effectiveness of animal feed use and financial management. Training in financial management needs close attention to management of working capital and cash flow, the pros and cons of selling produce on credit, and obtaining insurance to cover the increasing risk of wind and hail damage.

The project has 9 months ahead before closure, and the PMU is urged to develop and implement a coherent exit strategy whilst preparing all documentation and preparing for project closure. Disbursement of outstanding milestones to all CGPs and PI groups that have not received milestones needs to be fast-tracked, as well as the evaluation of round 10 CGP (under LASAP funding) in order to be able to conclude the disbursement of all milestones in time.

In the context of an exit strategy and capacity building on business management and social capital, it is important that the PMU assess all sub-projects and determine remaining gaps to be addressed, and in case of problem projects how these should be restructured or closed. The preparation of ToRs for this assessment are underway and the mission will further review them to ensure appropriate quality of the ToRs.

The following agreed actions remain pending from the previous reporting period:

1. Dissemination of sample enterprise-based business plans to the district teams;
2. Obtain water abstraction permits for all SADP sub-projects;
3. Cooperate with GOL ministries at national & district levels, as well as WAMPP in programming activities;
4. Complete disbursement of current CGP & AIP sub-projects;
5. Improve data base for assessment of monitoring of beneficiaries contribution both in kind and in cash;

6. Submit reports from students from Limkokwing working in collaboration with the accounts unit to capture the beneficiaries contribution.

The WB has expressed a need for project restructuring of SADP to resolve disbursement issues, whilst also providing an opportunity to rationalize some of the project indicators. Further details are included in Section D below.

D. Overview and Project Progress

The project has made good progress since the last mission in November 2018, including increased disbursement of CGP and AIP milestones and addressing some of the issues flagged. The use of mandated bank accounts for grant beneficiaries in order to improve PMU monitoring and supervision of grant financial flows is now fully operational. These accounts, with Standard Lesotho Bank and Nedbank, require a counter-signature by PMU staff for all withdrawals and prevent withdrawals from cash machines. The PMU is complimented on this initiative, which will greatly improve its capacity to ensure that project money is used as intended. Activities under the parent project need to continue to reach completion, in particular the disbursements of milestones under sub-component 2.1 (Agricultural Investment Plans), which were supposed to be phased out before the beginning of the Additional Financing period.

The WB has expressed the need for project restructuring of SADP to resolve disbursement issues of an original IFAD allocation which has only been disbursed at 88%. This restructuring also provides an opportunity to rationalize some of the project indicators as follows:

1. The target for "Number of Direct Beneficiaries" should be revised from 66,000 to 75,000 to reflect the increased project coverage following the restructuring.
2. The intermediate indicator "Incremental net value of marketed production of smallholders in targeted sub-centers" should be dropped from the Results Framework.
3. The three intermediate indicators: Change in total cash crop production (tons/year), Change in Yield of major cash crops in target area, and Average change in smallholder livestock production in target area (disaggregated by type), should be dropped from the Results Framework.

A great majority of the projects activities fall under capacity building, in the form of ToTs. Whilst this method is cost-efficient in training for wider geographic areas, there is little evidence that farmers have benefitted from the capacity building activities. The mission recommends that trainers are given milestones to accomplish after each training received, with adequate reporting on the number of farmers reached and close follow up thereupon.

Environmental management issues have been prioritised but not solved. ESMPs have been developed and screenings of projects have taken place and an environmental consultant has been hired, but the recommendations made by the consultant have not all been fully adopted due to financial and capacity shortcomings as well as weak monitoring. All new sub-projects have water permits for the boreholes, but water permits are still being sourced for sub-projects from the previous rounds of grants. Dialogue at national level to ensure that land planning is carefully done at district level was recommended in the previous mission but has not yet been addressed. Social impacts and risks (such as elite capture, increased conflict generation, decreased health and well being, and increased inequities) have remained unaddressed. No resettlement risks have been raised and the project does not have a complaints and grievance mechanism in place.

Sub-Component 1.1: Promotion of Innovative Agri-Business Initiatives

The PMU has set a deadline for final payments for Rounds 1-7 of the CGP and the AIP for February 28th, 2020. All sub-projects will be closed at this date. The focus is now on Rounds 8 and 9, with 76 sub-projects operative in Round 8 and 87 sub-projects in Round 9. All first milestone payments have been made for both Rounds, with total disbursement of USD 1.66 million. Given the need to complete payments to sub-projects well before project closure on February 28th 2020 the mission recommends that all payments to sub-projects be completed by September 30th, 2019.

Seventy beneficiary field days have been conducted since the last supervision mission, which were attended by 7,425 people – of whom 3,829 were women. Three workshops were also held with grant beneficiaries to review lessons learned from the CGP.

Subcomponent 1.2. Market Linkages Development

Trade fairs were held in Leribe, Berea, Botha Bothe and Mafeteng to publicize the agricultural commodities produced by project beneficiaries. Round Table Meetings were also organized in all seven districts to bring farmers and potential buyers together. While these events have raised the profile of commercial agriculture in Lesotho, they have yet to result in any expansion of formal contractual relations between farmers and buyers.

Development of the Market Information System is largely complete for the four districts in the original project. The server is in use and weekly data collection is operative, although staff recruitment is still ongoing in two districts. A full schedule of price information is published weekly in the main national newspaper and the system will soon be available online, at no cost to users.

In terms of Social Capital Mentoring (SCM). The South Africa Business Resource Institute (SABRI) was contracted for the Social Capital training. A total of 63 extension officers and project staff were trained. They are now in the process of training other extension staff, and work plans have been prepared for training the Farmer Associations – grouped by commodities - for one week, under the supervision of SABRI. The training consists of four modules, and is a blend of social capital and business skills. Follow-up mentoring of the groups is essential in ensuring impact on the ground. During the workshop on 24 May, it was discussed that District Business Management Teams (BMT) would be responsible for the mentoring and follow-up. This would then also become part of the exit strategy of the 107 AIPs that were not yet

completed.

Under LASAP, the PMU in Collaboration with the District Agricultural Offices identified sub-projects with infrastructure that could be climate proofed. 95 sub-projects were identified and the budgets based on quotations were prepared. No Objections were requested and granted. 6963 people (1055 households) are currently receiving project services and the grant agreements have been amended and signed. The beneficiaries were requested to open bank accounts with restricted mandate and debit freeze to prevent or minimize the misappropriation of funds or ineligible expenditure so that farmers use the money for the intended purposes as contained in the implementation plan. On station and on farm demonstrations for 6 commodities are being conducted. These incite farmers to use new crop varieties under the changing climate conditions, and for different soil types. Farmers are introduced to more tolerant varieties of maize, beans, etc., which are adapted to rain fed stress prone production systems and ultimately lead to higher yields. Pamphlets are being prepared for knowledge transfer and dissemination.

The Department of Marketing has identified a site in Mohale's Hoek district to develop build regional the Regional Fruit and Vegetable Market Center. Field visits highlighted that farmers who already receive support under SADP could greatly benefit from aggregation and packaging centers, however, discussions are recommended before making a final decision on the financing of such market center as it appears that other unutilized examples already exist in the country.

Sub-component 2.1: Preparation and Implementation of Agricultural Investment Plans (AIPs)- Climate Smart Technology packages.

This sub-component was funded the original project (SADP), whereby contracts were signed with 144 Productive Investment groups to date. In the period under review, additional LSL 1,506,935 were disbursed. However so far only 38 PI sub-projects have completed all their milestones, 13 were already closed and with around 12 sub-projects which are still at milestone 1 which most likely will be closed in the next few months. 71 sub-projects are still awaiting to receive the last and final milestone for a total outstanding of LSL 1,893,373. The mission has observed that PI groups are on average less performing than CGP recipients, and around 20% of sub-projects can be considered as a problem sub-projects. Given that this sub-component was not extended into the SADP AF, the PMU is urged to finalize the disbursements of the last milestones and develop an exit strategy plan for these sub-projects.

Under Natural Resource Management. Two steel water tanks were constructed in Botha Bothe. It is envisaged that the water tank will each serve a total of 10 farmers (5 ha) who are involved with irrigated vegetable production and the tank is designed such that at most 5 farmers will irrigate all at the same time. The mission visited one of these sites. The tank is quite small for the area to be irrigated. The mission further noted that the tank overflow is not protected, with the risk of eroding the base of the tank. It would be good to have more tanks constructed, possibly with a slightly adapted design, that would be partly below the ground surface, and would have a bigger capacity.

Subcomponent 2.2 Climate smart Technology packages for smallholders. No additional progress has been made since the previous supervision mission on this subcomponent. The manual for sub-component 2.2 was adapted from SADP to include climate smart technologies – under SADP AF. A technology forum workshop was held, and four thematic areas were identified: (i) broiler fertile egg production (ii) protected irrigated vegetable production under shade nets (iii) ration formulation for small stock feeds and aquaponics (which is a combination of fish culture and vegetable farming). TORs have been developed for the two starting topics; broiler fertile eggs production and irrigated production under shade-nets.

Preparation of the Irrigation Master Plan has started. WAPCOS, an Indian firm held an Inception workshop on 3 May. The Irrigation Master Plan has attracted significant government and donor interest and will serve as a key vehicle to plan future investments in the sector. As such, SADP is making a significant contribution to the country's development planning and regulatory framing to boost irrigated agriculture. It is important that the WAPCOS consultants work closely with the Irrigation Officers at National and District level. Furthermore, an assessment of available water resources at national level needs to be done, which would also include the current and possible future water sales to neighboring countries. This would also include planned projects such as the Lesotho-Botswana Water Transfer Project, which is currently undertaking feasibility studies. SADP has initiated the recruitment of an irrigation engineer to support the irrigation activities under AF.

As per last mission recommendation, SADP in discussion with the District Engineers is in the process of selecting small-scale irrigation schemes to be rehabilitated foreseen under sub-component 2.2. This includes potential schemes in Botha Bothe, Leribe, Maseru and Quthing. Based on the available budget a short-list of no-regret irrigation schemes to be rehabilitated will be prepared, and after government consultations and approval, the necessary technical feasibility surveys and assessments, design and construction will start. It should also be noted that according to the Water Act of 2008, any non-domestic water use requires an abstraction permit. Therefore, the above mentioned surface water irrigation schemes are required to apply to the Director of Water Affairs for water use permits which are valid for 5 years.

Project Management is described in the section on the Quality of Project Management below.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Overview and Project Progress | | |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|---------|
| enterprise-based business plans Proceed to immediately dissemination of sample enterprise-based business plans to the district teams to be used as blueprint to develop simple business plans for all new sub-projects to be funded under rounds 9 and 10 prior to disbursement of funds | PMU/PFOs | 12/2018 |
| PMU staffing The finalization of additional PMU staff, to increase technical and physical capacity, now that three additional districts are participating in the SADP-AF/LASAP | MAFS-HR/PMU | 01/2019 |
| Procurement Develop arrangements with local banks to establish a special joint signatory accounts for sub-grantees to procure local and international services and equipment only upon receiving co-authorization from district staff | PMU- Project Manager | 01/2019 |
| Permits Obtain water abstraction permits for all SADP subprojects that source water from a river, stream, shallow well or borehole PMU to assist SADP beneficiaries in obtaining water abstraction permits with the DWA | PMU | 04/2019 |
| Recruitment Proceed with the selection and implementation of small-scale irrigation scheme rehabilitation foreseen under sub-component 2.2, including hiring of irrigation consultants | PMU | 04/2019 |
| Provide the full data base for all grants and other projects Provide the full data base for all grants and other project information to the IFAD-supported survey team | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Environmental and Safeguard (ESS) audit report Finalize Environmental and Safeguard (ESS) audit report and communicate findings and recommendations | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Impact Screening Impact Screening of all on-going sub-projects to be conducted | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Impact Screening all new sub-projects Impact Screening all new sub-projects to be conducted prior to project approval | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Increase Support for CGP beneficiaries Increase Support for CGP beneficiaries involved in pig and poultry production | PMU | 08/2019 |

| | | |
|---|----------|---------|
| ESS training Roll-out ESS training sessions to all implementing agencies and project beneficiaries | PMU | 08/2019 |
| Finalize all payments for AIP and CGP Rounds 1-7 Finalize all payments for AIP and CGP Rounds 1-7 | PMU | 09/2019 |
| Complete Review and Impact Assessment Complete Review and Impact Assessment of all grant programs | PMU | 10/2019 |
| Project Exit Strategy Develop a Clear Project Exit Strategy and begin its implementation | PMU | 10/2019 |
| Finalize all payments for Rounds 8-10 Finalize all payments for Rounds 8-10 | PMU | 12/2019 |
| Project Impact Assessment Complete the IFAD Project Impact Assessment | PMU/IFAD | 12/2019 |
| monitoring and follow-up of all sub-projects Periodic monitoring and follow-up of all sub-projects to be done regularly | PMU | |

E. Project implementation

a. Development Effectiveness

Effectiveness and Developmental Focus

Effectiveness

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

Implementation progress in the last six months has picked-up compared to the previous reporting period. Many contracts were signed, and both round 8 and 9 grants were awarded Log frame indicators as reported in the results framework show that the projects has achieved and surpassed the targets set at project design. However, outcome indicators have not been measured, as this requires an impact assessment. The RIA/IFAD-led impact assessment will survey all enterprises benefiting under CPG/IAP windows and shall have robust results in November. Current results show effectiveness at output level.

Log-Frame Analysis & Main Issues of Effectiveness

With the addition of round nine and ten beneficiaries the project keeps exceeding the targets in terms of outputs (e.g. number of direct beneficiaries, number of persons trained). It is difficult to determine the effectiveness using the logical framework considering that outcome indicators have not been updated since 2016/2017.

Observations from the field, however, show that not all sub-projects visited by the mission exhibit potential for economic viability, most notably the AIP groups. Furthermore, the range of trainings, delivered through ToTs, do not effectively trickle down to beneficiaries.

Reporting and use of ME data remains weak. This is a trend that has not changed from the previous mission, where it emerged that the project tend to report mostly on outputs. The M&E officer is now developing terms of reference for an evaluation that will take place in 2019 and that will inform the Project Completion Report. In addition, an IFAD RIA impact study is being planned.

As mentioned in Section D above, there is a need for project restructuring of SADP to resolve disbursement issues and to provide an opportunity to rationalize some of the project indicators such as the "Number of Direct Beneficiaries".

Measurement of the project's impact on productivity is necessary, nevertheless. The household survey used to inform the impact assessment will thus collect data on key productivity indicators and compare the results with baseline data compiled from available secondary data sources. These productivity indicators will also be used in the results framework for SADP II.

Development Focus

Targeting and Outreach

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

SADP targets smallholder farmers & farmer groups that need support to improve their income generating activities and have the basic resources and motivation required to successfully improve agricultural productivity and diversify into market-oriented agriculture. The focus on the more commercially oriented market-ready CGPs is resulting in a shift in targeting focus to wealthier farmers, as well as to individual farmers or small companies, which now constitute almost 50% of all beneficiary sub-projects. Given the lack of monitoring data it is not possible to assess whether spill-over income opportunities are generated among their communities. The shift to CGPs and individual farmers is thus reducing the outreach of the project as far fewer farmers are getting directly involved.

Main issues

Initially, sub-component 2.1 specifically identified poorer farmers as part of the target group. SADP AF has done away with that sub-component as a result of performance issues, therefore since the AF no more PI and NRM sub-projects have been financed. These projects tended to involve Farmer Groups, mostly consisting of women and poorer farmers. However, the concept of joint production activities by these farmer groups is in itself problematic. Even if the project runs well, the benefit per member tends to be very small, and thus provides little incentive to contribute labour or money for working capital. As a result, 107 of the 144 existing AIPs have still not yet completed their milestones due to a range of problems linked to financial management, business management, group cohesion issues etc. This requires follow-up, especially in the context of the exit strategy. The shift to more successful CGPs, which provides for larger grants and with a counterpart contribution of 40% results in a change of target group for SADP AF. The Annual progress report indicates that the majority of the projects are now undertaken by companies. Out of the 605 projects up to round 8, 285 involve companies, 219 are associations, and 101 are cooperatives. The growing number of companies, will in part be a result of

the requirement to register as business to apply for the grant, as a result of the evolving grant-manual.

This thus also involves a change of focus from public goods (such as the NRM interventions) to financing of purely private goods (individual assets) which should be carefully evaluated to gauge the actual benefit to the wider community. CGP's visited by the mission generally tend to provide labour for one to two persons, with additional casual labourers brought in at times of peak labour demand. It is not clear what the wage and employment conditions are, and how stable this employment is. Both outcome and impact studies to be conducted will take these into account.

Other observations include the involvement of young people. It appears that most recent CGP rounds, as well as LASAP, have attracted a larger amount of young people. Up to round 6, the % of youth among the direct beneficiaries was between 0 and 1.8%, in round 7 it was 7.8%, in round 8 it was 3.6%, and in round 9 25.6%. A total of 200 youths are now involved, the majority, 72.5% of them are young men.

This could partly be the result of the increased focus on youth, but also that youth tend to prefer to work on their own or in small companies instead of groups. The counterpart contribution was considered to be one of the requirements that may discourage young people to apply for the CGP grants, though there were also cases where this money was advanced by their parents, or where they applied jointly with their parents. SADP II will need to take these observations into account when defining outreach and targeting, and especially when targeting young people.

It is worth noting, that the mission used the targeting approach and documentation as an example to discuss with the respective line ministries and the PMU how to improve targeting under SADP2 which is currently being finalised. The IFAD team has made significant input in the improved targeting strategy.

Gender equality & women's participation

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

This is in line with the previous rating. In CGPs women's participation is lower than in the AIPs (39% vs. 58%). Overall, women beneficiaries are now at 42% of the total number of direct beneficiaries. However, women are still a small minority of CGP applicants (only 12%) even if they are the majority of those participating at the information dissemination workshops (60%). Women still have a good representation in trainings, especially on piggy and business management. Mission observations highlighted that many PI groups are composed of a majority of women. Concerns highlighted in the Targeting section therefore apply to this specific target group (poorer women).

Main issues

Women continue to benefit from all project activities also in the round 8 of CGPs as beneficiaries (54%), and in round 9 of CGP at 45%, however they tend not to be main applicants (only 12% are women). Women benefit from trainings on technical issues such as pest control management (47%), vegetable production under tunnel (62%) and with peaks of 92% of participants in piggy training and in business management (61%). They participate less in round tables (25%). SADP has also promoted women in leadership positions; there are 132 CGP sub-projects, and 30 PI, under women leadership (21.5%). The gender balance is reflected also in the PMU where 50% of officers are women (M&E, Procurement, CGP, Accountant and Assistant Accountant) and 4 out of 7 Project Field Officers too. Field observations highlighted that women are represented in a variety of enterprises, but mostly in poultry, piggy and vegetable production. They are less represented in wool & mohair and processing/enterprise activities. While women are also well represented in CGPs, the bulk of older and less wealthy women are found in PI sub-projects. It is difficult to determine the actual benefits they are gaining in terms of status and wealth generation. This type of analysis will be included in the outcome and impact evaluation that will be carried in 2019. The M&E Officer is also the Gender Focal Point however she has not received specific training and her activities are limited to gathering data on sex and youth disaggregated indicators.

It is positively noted, that SADP collaborated with Ministry of Gender Youth and sports Recreation to encourage both women and youth to apply for CGP grants. As a result, advertisements for grants were placed in social media so that youth can access and apply, including a message saying "Youth are encouraged to apply".

Agricultural Productivity

Rating: N/A

Justification of rating

Through SADP assistance, beneficiaries acknowledge increased agricultural productivity & the noticeable efficiency in converting given amounts of inputs into agricultural yield. Field visits by the mission indicated that grants to individual beneficiaries are having a marked impact. These farmers are not only finding ready markets for their output and generating good returns, but also re-investing their profits to further expand their enterprises. Farmer Associations continue to struggle, with low productivity, low returns and problems with financial management and working capital.

Main issues

To maximise agricultural productivity, it is important that extension staff visits are regular and purposeful. The current mission has observed that subgroups engaging in poultry or piggery production are faring worse than subgroups engaging in vegetable production. This could be explained by the high costs of non-labour variable costs, and the cash flow nature of the production. Whilst vegetable production can generate a continuous cash flow, poultry and piggery production are cycle dependant and therefore farmers may face problems with their cash flow, especially if they sell on credit. To ensure success of their business the poultry and piggery production farmers, in particular the associations, have to significantly increase their stock numbers and also improve their financial management. The mission recommends that the PMU address such challenges and provide additional support to farmers engaging in such production, and closing projects when necessary.

However, many horticulture farmers who produced tomato under protected agricultural production experienced serious problems of management of the crops and losses of income as a result of pests and resorted to growing other vegetables. Generally, a moderate increase in agricultural productivity or production in many projects was observed. Improved record keeping is fundamental for farmers, beneficiaries (and the mission) to adequately assess the agricultural productivity and target areas of concern.

| | |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Nutrition | Rating: N/A |
|------------------|--------------------|

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Adaptation to Climate Change | Rating: 4 | Previous rating: 4 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|

Justification of rating

Since the addition of the LASAP design and funding, adaptation to climate change has been prioritised and efforts have been made to climate proof 95 existing SADP sub-projects. Four Climate Smart officers have been recruited and on farm trials and demonstrations are being held to sensitise farmers to more tolerant varieties of 6 different commodities. The trials and demonstrations adequately promote climate adaptive practices and have a strong potential to increase smallholder resilience, but there is little evidence that the climate proofing initiatives have already increased farmer's adaptive capacities.

Main issues

Under LASAP funding, 95 sub-projects were selected for climate-proofing. Interventions included drilling and rehabilitation of boreholes, shade-nets, following pans, water harvesting tanks, and placing drinking systems or heating and cooling systems. However, clear links have not been made between identified risks and possible mitigation and adaptive strategies. The drilling of boreholes is a favoured solution, but these do not adequately increase a producer's resilience to climate change (especially because the potential for irrigation with groundwater in Lesotho is limited and borehole construction under SADP has so far been done without hydrological assessments).

Some adaptation measures have been identified, such as heating and cooling systems, but without a conducive enabling environment (such as proper infrastructure and technical know-how) these measures fail to adequately adapt the producer to a changing climate. In the case of problem projects, some farmers may be left increasingly vulnerable to climate change if their financial, labour, and time investments have not been successful.

The 10th Call for applications addressed the following areas: drought, high temperatures, inconsistent rainfall patterns, frost and early winter or late summer patterns. The following interventions are emphasized in the AWPB and the project made significant progress on its implementation: introduction of protected production units (shade nets/ greenhouses), resilient plant types, and vegetable production under controlled conservation agriculture. Moreover, livestock production will be supported under climate controlled production units with the introduction of resilient animal breeds and controlled grazing production.

14 farm trial and demonstrations to determine yield potential of maize, beans and sorghum varieties have so far been implemented and demonstrated positive results in incentivizing farmers to adapt to climate change. The project is preparing pamphlets for knowledge sharing purposes.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Development Effectiveness | | |
| Staffing Appoint two additional technical climate experts to participate in project selection by the CGC | CGC chair | 12/2018 |

b. Sustainability and Scaling up

| Institutions and Policy Engagement | Rating: 4 | Previous rating: 4 |
|------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
|------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|

Justification of rating

SADP/LASAP does not have specific policy related activities or targets, as these were not deemed necessary at design stage. The project is financing the development of the National Irrigation Master Plan, which will structure investments in the sector and has already attracted significant interest from Government and other donors. SADP cooperates with the Ministry of Small Business Development, Cooperatives and Marketing, though this could be strengthened. Further cooperation is with the Department of Water Affairs concerning water permits.

Main issues

The preparation of an Irrigation Master Plan, one of the activities under Additional Financing, has started. WAPCOS, an Indian firm held an Inception workshop on 3 May. With the first draft expected earliest as August 2019, the outcome will not be able to underpin irrigation investments in the current SADP AF. There is nation-wide interest in the outcomes of the Master Plan, especially among development partners. However, during the Inception workshops participation of national level irrigation staff of MAFS was very limited.

Most of the sub-projects appear to need support in business management skills. In some Districts the Marketing Officers are actively involved in the implementation of project activities, but not yet in all Districts.

In the context of drilling boreholes, a concern is that the potential for irrigation with groundwater in Lesotho is limited and borehole construction under SADP has so far been done without hydrological assessment. Limited water yield is the main reason for rehabilitation of the 7 boreholes with LASAP funds. Based on recommendation of last mission, PMU now involves the Department of Water Affairs (Rural water Supply), which consults a hydrological database and advises on borehole depth.

It should also be noted that according to the Water Act of 2008, any non-domestic water use requires an abstraction permit. Therefore, all the cooperatives/ associations/ companies/ individuals supported by SADP that are drawing water from surface or groundwater sources are required to apply to the Director of Water Affairs for water use permits which are valid for 5 years. For irrigation schemes under SADP, the Water Act requires i) a permit for construction of the scheme (applies to any works done concerning use of water), ii) abstraction of water and iii) discharge (assuming that a scheme will also have drains flowing back to the river). Water permits should therefore be secured, in order to avoid breaking the law. The mission noted that project beneficiaries were approaching the Dep. of Water Affairs to get water permits for new boreholes, but that there was a delay in the process of getting them. Not all older projects have applied for water permits. Follow-up will need to be done by PMU so that in 6 months' time all water permits are available.

| Partnership-building | Rating: 4 | Previous rating: 4 |
|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|
|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|

Justification of rating

The project is co-financed with the World Bank, with a GEF grant under ASAP and with the Government of Lesotho. The WB is using the project as a good practice to showcase partnership across the region. The project unit has had the opportunity to participate in several trainings across East and Southern Africa, increasing its cooperation and knowledge sharing with development partners. Further, efforts are ongoing to enhance collaboration and cooperation with the IFAD-funded sister project (WAMPP) in Lesotho. The rating has not changed from the previous reporting period as more successful collaboration with WAMPP, notably on support to the wool and mohair projects, is still to materialise.

Main issues

The expansion of SADP-AF/LASAP into three additional districts (Maseru rural, Mphahle's Hoek and Quthing) has seen greater knowledge sharing/collaboration and partnership building with other Government of Lesotho ministries (such as Tourism and Environment) and Development partners (such as FAO). Given the crucial role of business management and marketing in insuring profitability and sustainability for the sub-projects the partnership with staff from the Ministry of Small Business Development, Cooperatives and Marketing is crucial. This partnership is not evenly strong across all SADP districts, and needs to be re-enforced in the period up to project closure.

With just over 9 months to go to the closure of the SADP-AF/LASAP, the objective to increase commercialization of agricultural produce, will continue through a strategic transition to the WB led partnership with IFAD on SADP 2. The PMU has been tasked with insuring that new investments supported 'have an eye' on commercialisation through participating in production groups and marketing centres. However, these type of partnerships are still limited and not actively encouraged by SADP activities. Some farmers have established commodity partnerships for marketing purposes from

their own initiatives.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Sustainability and Scaling up | | |
| Cooperation Cooperation with GOL ministries at national & district levels, as well as WAMPP should be more effectively in programming activities | SADP and WAMPP PMUs/ CPM to support | 03/2019 |

Human and Social Capital and Empowerment

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

The capacities of poor rural women and men, and of their organizations, are being improved, although many capacity building activities have still to reach the majority of beneficiaries. Many smallholder organizations have been supported by the project through AIPs. Only a minority of these groups can be considered mature enough to realize concrete benefits for their members in the long-term. They have gained limited control over economic relations and institutions. CGP projects, on the other hand, fare much better in terms of empowerment, but many of these beneficiaries had a much stronger starting position in terms of education, experience and resources.

Main issues

Empowerment of beneficiaries is most noticeable in agricultural production aspects, particularly in vegetable production. Many of the capacity building activities in SADP follow a ToT approach, whereby there is the assumption that the trainees in turn train the farmers and groups. However, this trickle-down effect is not always very evident. Lack of clear benefit sharing mechanisms and low overall-returns, have led to group conflicts; approximately 20 percent of group projects have failed. Inadequate business skills still hamper many of the sub-projects. Recognising that group strength and profitability of their enterprises go hand in hand, the mission recommends taking measures in strengthening capacity of the AIPs and CGPs with specific focus on the profitability of the sub-projects and by revisiting the business plans. Sample enterprise budgets by type of value chains (e.g. poultry, vegetable production) should be used as templates and benchmarks. The last mission recommended that these sample budgets are availed to the PMU district staff and used to develop simple business plans for all sub-projects. Since this has not yet been done, this is recommended again.

The South Africa Business Resource Institute (SABRI), a non-for-profit that specializes in the facilitation of business resources that are required to establish, grow and increase the sustainability of SMEs and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) was selected for the Social Capital training. A total of 63 extension officers and project staff were trained. They are now in the process of training other extension staff, and work plans have been prepared for training the Farmer Associations – grouped by commodities - for one week, under the supervision of SABRI. The training consists of four modules, and is a blend of social capital and business skills. Follow-up mentoring of the groups is essential in ensuring impact on the ground. During the workshop on 24 May, it was discussed that District Business Management Teams (BMT) would be responsible for the mentoring and follow-up. This would then also become part of the exit strategy of the 107 AIPs that have not yet completed their milestones.

The mission noted some further progress on horizontal linkages. Vegetables producers and eggs producers, agreed to form an association so that they can plan together from production level to marketing stage so as to supply buyers consistently. Egg producers also united to draw attention to (illegal) imports of eggs from South Africa into Mafeteng District. There are more opportunities for horizontal linkages in the same VCs and more knowledge management platforms could be created incl. the use of social media. Furthermore, there are more opportunities for farmer to farmer training, including involving progressive farmers in capacitating peer farmers on technical issues.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Sustainability and Scaling up | | |
| Social Capital Mentoring consultancy to be contracted and start training activities PMU consider hiring a consulting firm, using resources from the AF, to continue this good work of fostering cooperation among farmers | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Support for CGP beneficiaries Increase Support for CGP beneficiaries involved in pig and poultry production | PMU | 08/2019 |

Quality of Beneficiary Participation

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

There is very little evidence that appropriate consultation methodologies have been used to target all groups within the community, especially in regards to vulnerable groups. As a result of no existing grievance and feedback mechanism, vulnerable groups do not have an opportunity to express their concerns regarding project positive and negative social impacts. That said, the project works closely with extension services and District Agricultural Officers who interact regularly with communities and can report conflicts and concerns. In line with the expectations from all producer organizations that receive funding, beneficiaries contribute (in cash or in kind) through co-financing that has to be provided.

Main issues

Views of the beneficiaries are generally sought and reflected in the planning of project activities, but their involvement in project M&E is not significant. As much of the information is provided through service providers, this could jeopardize sustainability once the project and contracts close.

Expectations were noted from some of the visited projects for SADP to assist even for minor repairs deemed to be related to the climatic conditions such as hail, and exhibiting poor understanding of the responsibilities that come along with accessing the funding. From the previous experience where some issues arose with livestock rearing groups, in regards to the rule requesting livestock farmers to prove that they have purchased at least 3 months-worth of feed before receiving the grant, farmers need to be aware that the project is in its final lap, in order for them to step up.

The presence of Project Field Officers in each project district allows for close monitoring of the progress made by the farmer groups in their endeavours and the possibility to interact in a timely manner.

Despite farmer associations being the vehicle to raising working capital for many poor farmers, it was observed that individual farmers' financial benefit accrued is conversely related to the number of members of the association - low profit margins. As a result of this, and also the amount of effort needed for projects to be profitable, a limited number of young beneficiaries join the associations. It was suggested that PMU come up with ways to encourage the associations while at the same time ensuring that individual farmers yield significant returns.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Sustainability and Scaling up | | |
| Disbursement Complete disbursement of current CGP & AIP sub-projects | PMU | 06/2019 |

Responsiveness of Service Providers

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

Overall, the project uses service providers in two ways: there are individuals providing services to the CGBs and AIPs during preparation of applications and once awarded grants. These service providers vary significantly in quality and performance. Furthermore there are NGOs/BDS providers procured under service contracts to support project benefiting

enterprises. These service providers tend to perform well, but also had one weak performer in the past.

Main issues

The project has awarded a significant contract to strengthen human capital development of project benefiting enterprises and initial activities financed so far look promising. At the same time, one service provider hired to deliver market and business skill training performed moderately unsatisfactory and the project is in the process of increasing performance in line with agreed contracts. Individuals supporting project applications in the past rounds have shown mixed performance, too. Some applications and businesses seem to benefit from support, yet a significant share of applications failed to pass the application stage due to incomplete applications, despite having been supported in the application process.

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

Justification of rating

The rating remains unchanged since the last mission because although the significant efforts made by the PMU to address environmental issues are commendable, negative environmental impacts are not fully resolved. An environmental safeguards consultant has been recruited and all new projects have gone through the screening and identification of environmental risks and impacts. Capacity building activities have taken place for both staff and beneficiaries to be fully aware of the consequences of health and environmental hazards. Due to a lack of technical and financial resources it has been difficult for the beneficiary groups to implement/incorporate ESMP plans (e.g. construction of septic tanks for piggeries and slaughter houses).

Main issues

LASAP has just about 9 months until completion, and the PMU has taken action to appropriately assess and select climate smart sub-projects to be supported by LASAP resources and to climate proof some existing projects. These efforts include: i.) the completion of a Resettlement Policy Framework of SADP II, (ii) preparation of training material (iii) Preparation of Environmental and Social Safeguards Audits materials and (iv) field Environmental and Social Safeguards Audit runs of the on-going Sub-projects.

Issues in waste management and safe disposal of pesticides were already raised by previous missions. These led to the recommendation to prepare Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMP) for all sub-projects, with a special attention to those dealing with livestock and horticulture production. Whilst significant efforts have been made and action proposed, the actual implementation of activities remains slow (such as the construction of septic tanks).

The environmental specialist has trained farmers in environmental management, how to properly dispose of waste and agrochemicals, and how to manage water for a number of sub-projects. The audits have revealed that the project beneficiaries were now generally aware of the environmental and social requirements of the project, but the extent to which these practices are adopted remains limited. Some project beneficiaries are failing to install appropriate waste handling facilities like septic tanks, due to financial constraints as they had not included these costs in their requests.

The handling of agro-chemicals has generally improved as most of the facilities now have separate and lockable storerooms. The empty pesticide containers are also being disposed of properly by puncturing them first and then burying them in a pit. Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) is generally being used, although some workers are still using everyday clothes in duties which require this protection.

It remains unclear whether farmers are cognizant of how environmental and social safeguards can enhance their investment performance.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Sustainability and Scaling up | | |
| Permits Obtain water permits for new and existing water sub-projects from Ministry of Water . | PMU/DAO, Service Providers, Suppliers | 04/2019 |
| Environmental and Safeguard (ESS) audit report Finalize Environmental and Safeguard (ESS) audit report and communicate findings and recommendations | PMU | 06/2019 |
| ESS training Roll-out ESS training sessions to all implementing agencies and project beneficiaries | PMU | 08/2019 |

Exit Strategy

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

Although the project's exit strategy has so far received cursory consideration and is not reflected in the Annual Report, staff demonstrated strong awareness and commitment during the workshop held on 24th May, proposing activities to ensure project sustainability after closure. The majority of the sub-projects still show a dependence for SADP/LASAP support and a need for handholding, particularly concerning profitability and access to markets. The mission strongly recommends that the PMU addresses the sustainability of the project beyond completion and defines as early as possible the roles and responsibilities in regards to project completion activities, including ownership of assets and further government financing of activities.

Main issues

The business and social sustainability of the financed sub-projects requires further efforts from project staff and recipients. All previous missions have noted that the majority of the groups exhibited weaknesses both in how to run a business and how to face conflicts and organize themselves for long-term growth. A lack of record keeping renders it difficult to assess whether a subproject is viable or not.

The exit strategy for different value chains may differ. As SADP II is being designed, there appears to be a focus on horticulture value chains. Therefore, it seems appropriate that SADP map existing farmer associations, cooperatives and companies active in the horticulture value chain and facilitate horizontal linkages between them for grading, bulking and collective marketing, and include this information in the Management Information System. This was already recommended by the previous mission but so far, no action has been taken.

The mission recommends a 4-point approach to an exit strategy: i.) Assessing all sub-projects and categorizing them in order to develop an adequate strategy to either provide tailored support, or close the sub project; ii.) Focus on mentorship and assisting farmers in developing their succession plans post completion of the project; iii.) PMU preparation for project completion- including, but not limited to- closing of the books and accounts, communication and knowledge product dissemination (on lessons learned for example) and defining roles and responsibilities for the 10 months ahead; and iv.) Defining the ways in which SADP I and SADP II merge and differ.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Sustainability and Scaling up | | |
| Project Exit Strategy Develop a Clear Project Exit Strategy and begin its implementation | PMU | 10/2019 |
| Review and Impact Assessment Complete Review and Impact Assessment of all grant programs | PMU/IFAD | 11/2019 |

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Potential for Scaling-up | Rating: 5 | Previous rating: 5 |
|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|

Justification of rating

SADP Phase II is being prepared at the request of the Government of Lesotho. The project continues the partnership between the WB and IFAD in Lesotho, and builds on the positive experience from joint implementation of SADP (phase 1). The WB asked IFAD to co-finance SADP Phase II in September 2018 and details were discussed during a joint implementation support mission in November 2018, which informed the Project Concept Note. In the development of this new project, IFAD, the World Bank, and the PMU will take into account the lessons learnt from SADP I, and will build on its achievements.

Main issues

IFAD's mandate defines its "target group" as rural people living in poverty and experiencing food insecurity in developing countries. Direct beneficiaries of SADP II will include small holder farmers (producers) and off-takers (traders/aggregators/agro-processors). The project will also benefit agro-processors and agri-business enterprises by: improving their supply of quality produce, improved post-harvest management, increasing access to finance for investment and providing training in technical issues and business management. Farm households in all ten districts will have access to training programs. Beneficiaries of value chain development will tend to be more progressive farmers in areas with higher potential, but within this group priority will be given to small-holder farmers. A high priority will also be given to support for women and youth in all project activities.

IFAD promotes **policy engagement** in projects in order to reach two main objectives: (i) help create an enabling environment for implementation and achieving the project's impact, and (ii) help create the conditions for a large number of rural population to out of poverty. The SADP II will play a strong role in operationalizing the irrigation master plan developed under SADP. SADP II through its investment in small irrigation schemes and the mobilisation of WUAs will inform and improve regulatory work across relevant line ministries.

Building on the lessons learned in SADP I, SADP II will furthermore increase smallholders' climate resilience by diversifying income streams through alternative income generating activities. Increased use of irrigation will result in increased farm productivity and a more climate resilient cropping system with the capacity to produce for domestic and export markets.

c. Project Management

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Quality of Project Management | Rating: 4 | Previous rating: 3 |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|

Justification of rating

Overall, the project is on track to achieve the PDO and the implementation pace continues to improve – with a marked increase in disbursement from 16.4% to 33%. While this progress is encouraging, a substantial increase in disbursement is required before February 2020. Even though the PMU staff continues to work very hard in providing overall management and oversight, some findings of the external audit have identified significant managerial gaps. Project management is reactive in addressing implementation issues, and there is only a partial implementation of agreed actions of last mission. To this end, the rating for the quality of project management will remain moderately satisfactory as some tasks are not adequately carried out and concluded in some project management areas.

Main issues

The PMU is struggling to effectively carry out their entire oversight responsibilities. With the incorporation of LASAP as part of the SADP-AF, the PMU had demonstrated last year signs of technical capacity challenges. Technically capable PMU members who specifically focus on the LASAP activities, as well as augment M & E, procurement and financial management with the PMU have now come on board. Payments of all milestones for AIP and CGP rounds 1-1 need to be completed by September 30th 2019, and all payments for round 8-10 by 30 December 2019. Overall, out of 13 agreed actions of the last support mission in October, 2 were not done, 7 were partially done, and 4 were fully addressed. M&E and Financial Management information does not feed consistently into the management and coordination of the project.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Project Management | | |
| Staffing Complete recruitment of the required PMU staff to ensure that the SADP-AF/LASAP is effectively implemented. | MAFS/PMU | 01/2019 |
| payments for AIP and CGP Finalize all payments for AIP and CGP Rounds 1-7 | PMU | 09/2019 |
| Finalize all payments for Rounds 8-10 Finalize all payments for Rounds 8-10 | PMU | 12/2019 |

Knowledge Management

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

Under LASAP, information dissemination workshops were held both for farmers in all the seven districts and for extension staff in two districts; Quthing and Mohale's Hoek. A "Lessons learnt workshop" was held on the 9th – 11th October 2018 and was attended by 105 people. The lessons learned have been drafted but not yet disseminated. There is still no clear KM plan nor staff allocated to perform KM-related activities. However, there is evidence that project staff at central and district level has a clear idea of what is working and what needs improvement and the lessons are used to rectify some of the issues emerging.

Main issues

Knowledge sharing is provided for through regular 'implementors meetings', organized by the PMU. However, it has been noted in this mission and in the previous one that district staff have stressed the need for improved communication between the PMU and the district teams, especially in terms of financial resources made available by the AF and LASAP to access training and support of extension activities. Communication is done via hard copies of reports and acquisition forms. This causes delays and therefore the mission recommends that the PMU considers electronic means of communication.

Although knowledge products are being prepared by the M&E officer, they are sporadic and a greater effort should be made to systematically capture learnings both of successes and failures across the groups.

Value for Money

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

The Value for Money indicators for SADP cannot be assessed because the financial system has not been adapted to track the costs of each project output and the information required to revisit the EFA cannot be performed as the WB procedures do not require a value for money analysis during supervision missions. The Value for Money indicators have not been tracked since this is not a concept which was integrated into the IFAD M&E or management systems. In fact, the cost categories are specified and maintained on the basis of broad categories and this is what is traditionally tracked and reported upon.

Main issues

The tracking of value for money indicators would require close interaction between financial management and monitoring information to collect data on input costs and key physical outputs for each component. This would require that the PMU and implementing partners track the cost of each physical output and report both in terms of the unit cost and cost per capita. At this stage of the project's life cycle, it is not feasible to expect the project to adjust its monitoring and reporting frameworks to track the Value for Money indicators. An assessment of actual job creation and redistribution of benefits in the community should be investigated to evaluate the benefits.

Coherence between AWPB and Implementation

Rating: 5

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

The financial year in Lesotho starts in April, hence the mission came after a few weeks of implementation since the latest AWPB. After detailed discussions with the PMU/M & E, it is clear that the PMU has made strides in ensuring coherence between the AWPB and project implementation. In a number of instances, such AWPB targets have been partially achieved, such as Output 1.1. 'Innovative and viable agricultural business initiatives demonstrated' (planned, 1,400 and actual 1,114); whilst in other instances implementation has far exceeded what was planned in the AWPB. For instance, Output 5.1 'Effective awareness raising and communication campaigns to local stakeholders designed and Implemented' (planned 300, actual 858).

AWPB Inputs and Outputs Review and Implementation Progress

In consultation with the office of the Lesotho IFAD CPM, the PMU undertook extensive review and updating of the LASAP AWPB. This administrative requirement was new to the PMU; but success was achieved. Further, in the course of the AWPB review, the LASAP Project Implementation Manual (PIM) was also reviewed and updated, so as to ensure coherence with the AWPB.

When looking at progress made against the **LASAP AWP&B**, 24% of the planned demonstrations with new crop varieties have taken place. The reason why this is not greater is because trials started in December (already late for the season), seeds were not available in the country, there was a shortage of personnel and additional transport challenges. Under Subcomponent 2.2. of LASAP ("Innovative Practices, Technologies and infrastructures aiming to increase the efficiency and resilience to Climate change of smallholder Production") the trainings for extension service workers appear to be well under way, but the trainings for farmers are significantly lagging behind (so far, 22% of the target has been reached). In terms of "effective awareness raising and communication campaigns to local stakeholders" designed under Component 5 of LASAP, the project has progressed beyond the anticipated number of communication campaigns in the AWP&B.

When looking at progress made against the **SADP AWP&B**, and specifically at the activities aimed to increase the capacity of farmers to take a business approach to agriculture, the project is also faring well, with 90% of the target achieved (trainings conducted). On the other hand, demonstrations of innovative technology packages are lagging behind, with only 5 demonstrations implemented out of the 40 planned. Output 1.2 of SADP is to improve the linkages between agri-businesses and farmers. In this regard, the project is also faring very well- more enterprise-producer exchange events were held than planned (trade fairs and round tables).

Performance of M&E System

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

The M&E Specialist in the PMU is well capacitated and documents key data for the project in excel format. The reporting from benefiting farmers requires multiple steps and is time-consuming, causing the PMU-level information being dated. The excel-based approach has clear limitation for data entry and management, which a dedicated M&E system / Management Information System (MIS) could have avoided. It appears that currently data entry at field level is a challenge and adequate staffing / time allocation will be required for the remaining implementation period to ensure proper reporting before completion.

M&E System Review

The M&E system is updated with regularly collected data, however the reporting focuses mostly on outputs. In fact, the last information available at outcome level dates back to 2016. The M&E officer is currently drafting Terms of Reference for a project evaluation in order to collect up to date information at outcome level. The M&E systems reports on three different documents: The World Bank Results Framework (which replaces the Logframe), the IFAD Logical Framework and the RIMS indicators. Data is collected through simple word forms by Extension Officers at resource center level and then aggregated by the District Project Field Officer. The PFOs aggregate the data provided by the Officers and send soft copies to the M&E Officer. All information is gender-disaggregated. The M&E Officer has also developed a simple tracking sheet for sub-projects, including information on number of men/women participating to activities as well as the number of indirect beneficiaries that each sub-project reaches (e.g. the household members of sub-projects direct beneficiaries), however the tracking sheets had very little uptake.

The M&E officer visits the field to verify data roughly every three months, giving priority to the problem projects. It has come to the attention of the mission that a closer monitoring is needed to ensure that data is collected properly. With the approval of LASAP funding, an additional set of indicators (LASAP logframe) has been added to the existing frameworks that the project is using to collect information. The M&E officer expressed the need of technical support to operationalize these indicators into data collection tools considering her lack of expertise in climate-change related issues. The Climate Specialist has been recruited and is able to advise on how best to collect data on the LASAP activities. The M&E Officer should therefore be supported by subject matter specialists in the PMU to ensure that the correct indicators are tracked. The hiring of an Assistant M&E Officer improved sub-project monitoring in the field.

Overall, the multiple reporting mechanisms to the two donors increase the reporting complexity, at the expense of accuracy, and with duplication of information. While LASAP and SADP AF should maintain two separate Logframes as they have different objectives to outputs chain, there would have been scope to streamline the WB and IFAD results framework/RIMS. This is at this stage of the project no longer feasible, but is an important lesson for SADP-II. In addition, the M&E officer was provided with a simple excel database to record information about individual sub-projects, including need to access water and number of beneficiaries by gender and age. However, this database on the different sub-projects has not yet been filled, therefore this action remains valid. It is recommended that future missions incorporate one M&E specialist to support the PMU to improve the collection and organization of information.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Project Management | | |
| data base for all grants and other project information Provide the full data base for all grants and other project information to the IFAD-supported survey team | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Impact Screening Impact Screening all new sub-projects to be conducted prior to project approval | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Complete the IFAD Project Impact Assessment Complete the IFAD Project Impact Assessment | PMU/ IFAD | 12/2019 |

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

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

While some SECAP related documents are being produced (such as ESMPs) and are at a satisfactory level, they are not being implemented effectively by all sub-projects due to financial and capacity limitations. The PMU has made progress on information exchange concerning safeguards and negative externalities, but measures in place to facilitate stakeholder engagement are limited. Conflict resolution is not accounted for as no grievance redress mechanism is in place.

SECAP Review

While SECAP was not mandatory at SADP's design stage (allowing for shortcomings in social and environmental protection), great progress has been made since the mission's recommendations in 2017 to recruit an Environmental Safeguards Specialist to audit project activities and prepare an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and to train the M&E officer on safeguards. The previous mission noted that due to a shortage of funds, the specialist's input was reduced and therefore the safeguards requirements as per the Consultant's Terms of Reference were not entirely executed. Since February, the Consultant has been re-hired and attention to environmental safeguarding has been revamped.

The environmental specialist recruited with LASAP funds has screened all new sub-projects and has made recommendations on the handling of environmental risks. Retro-screening and ESMP preparation for sub-projects under rounds 1-7 have not yet been completed. Trainings and awareness raising activities have taken place both with extension staff and beneficiaries (such as on the use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)).

Whilst storage has been addressed with a number of sub-projects, the use of pesticides and insecticides is not regulated. The mission recommends that farmers be sensitised on the impacts of agrochemicals and trained on proper application.

Four climate smart officers have been recruited. All new rounds of grants (since the 8th round) must comply with the safeguards before funds are disbursed.

d. Financial Management & Execution

Disbursement by financier

| Type | Name | Current Amount | Disbursed Amount | Actual Rate |
|------------------------------|---|----------------|------------------|-------------|
| Domestic Financing breakdown | Beneficiaries | \$980,800 | | |
| | National Government | \$3,477,865 | | |
| Co-financing breakdown, | World Bank: International Development Association | \$9,997,315 | | |
| | GEF: Least Developed Countries Fund | \$4,330,000 | \$989,691 | 22.9% |

Acceptable Disbursement Rate

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 5

Justification of rating

Automated rating based on IFAD disbursement data

Main issues

- The project is unable to process WA for the 100% expenditures incurred under the CERC category (4). This is due to the revised/restructured financing agreement that states that the Bank will cover 50% of this category and IFAD has clearly stated that they are not financing the CERC component. The above restructuring has resulted in the overdraw for category 2 and 3.
- Under the IFAD financing, there seems to be incomplete processing of the category re-allocation in the Bank system. The restructuring was processed on the loan and the grant, but it seems only one line of financing was updated in the system. This results in errors of overdrawn categories when the project is processing the WA.
- The 33% disbursement rate will improve if the disbursement challenges mentioned above are resolved. The project has projects in the pipeline awaiting disbursement, but the Withdrawal Applications cannot be processed.

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|---|----------------|-------------|
| Financial Management & Execution | | |
| Timely submission of WAs Delays in submission of WA for replenishments | Accountant | |
| Restructure project The World Bank team has now prepared a request to restructure the project in order to resolve these disbursement challenges. This request will also modify some of the project indicators to make them easier to measure and use. The request will be submitted as soon as the World Bank team has the most recent data for the results framework, with the aim to complete restructuring and accelerate disbursement by June 30th, 2019. | | |

Fiduciary aspects

Quality of Financial Management

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

No changes, issues still pending

Main issues

- Need for an additional accounting staff to strengthen the oversight function of the project.
- Audit issues to be resolved

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Financial Management & Execution | | |
| Update chart of accounts Create account codes for exchange gains and losses | Accountant | 04/2019 |
| Utilise the Budget module in FMS Activate the module within TOMPRO accounting package | Accountant | 04/2019 |

| | | |
|--|------------------|---------------------------|
| Quality and Timeliness of Audit | Rating: 5 | Previous rating: 5 |
|--|------------------|---------------------------|

Justification of rating

The report was received timely and has been prepared in accordance with acceptable standards. The requirement as per IFAD guideline are substantially met. However the project is supervised by the WB and hence the Bank guidelines apply. It is noted not key pertinent issues with misappropriation of funds highlighted and will be followed up through the Cooperating Institution.

Main issues

- Misappropriation noted of grant funds to CGPs and AIPS totalling M 464,500 equivalent to USD 44,238
- Unaccounted funds to CGP beneficiaries amounting to M 700,500 equivalent to USD 66,714.29
- Omission of beneficiary contributions both cash and in kind
- uncleared staff working advances
- Low annual budget absorption

| | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Counterparts Funds | Rating: 4 | Previous rating: 5 |
|---------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|

Justification of rating

Government contribution over 70%

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Compliance with Loan Covenants | Rating: 5 | Previous rating: 5 |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|

Justification of rating

(i) Before the LDCF grant can become fully operational the following covenants need to be completed and submitted to IFAD for No Objection. These are:

- Designated banks account opened and names of signatories and specimen signatures supplies
 - Project Implementation manual, (manuals for the CGP and AIP) modified to reflect the conditions detailed in the annexes of the project design reports
 - Detailed Annual Work Plan and budget for 2018/2019 with appropriate narrative that details activities and has an accompanying procurement plan.
 - This should include the audit of the ongoing CGPs and AIPs detailing what adaptation interventions required. The LDCF is not a slush fund to supplement the gaps in the original SADP funding for the CGPs and AIPs
- The rating is satisfactory, as the above listed items (a,b,c, and d) have been correctly addressed and the IFAD has provided No Objections.

Main issues

the PMU is to remain focused and ensure that, in the pursuit of high disbursement targets.

| | | |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Procurement | Rating: 4 | Previous rating: 3 |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------|

Justification of rating

As a project with WB administered financing, no rating is provided for procurement on part of IFAD. However, the

following informs us on the status of procurement in SADP/LASAP:

F. Agreed Actions

| Agreed Action | Responsibility | Agreed Date |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Overview and Project Progress | | |
| enterprise-based business plans Proceed to immediately dissemination of sample enterprise-based business plans to the district teams to be used as blueprint to develop simple business plans for all new sub-projects to be funded under rounds 9 and 10 prior to disbursement of funds | PMU/PFOs | 12/2018 |
| PMU staffing The finalization of additional PMU staff, to increase technical and physical capacity, now that three additional districts are participating in the SADP-AF/LASAP | MAFS-HR/PMU | 01/2019 |
| Procurement Develop arrangements with local banks to establish a special joint signatory accounts for sub-grantees to procure local and international services and equipment only upon receiving co-authorization from district staff | PMU- Project Manager | 01/2019 |
| Permits Obtain water abstraction permits for all SADP subprojects that source water from a river, stream, shallow well or borehole PMU to assist SADP beneficiaries in obtaining water abstraction permits with the DWA | PMU | 04/2019 |
| Recruitment Proceed with the selection and implementation of small-scale irrigation scheme rehabilitation foreseen under sub-component 2.2, including hiring of irrigation consultants | PMU | 04/2019 |
| Provide the full data base for all grants and other projects Provide the full data base for all grants and other project information to the IFAD-supported survey team | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Environmental and Safeguard (ESS) audit report Finalize Environmental and Safeguard (ESS) audit report and communicate findings and recommendations | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Impact Screening Impact Screening of all on-going sub-projects to be conducted | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Impact Screening all new sub-projects Impact Screening all new sub-projects to be conducted prior to project approval | PMU | 06/2019 |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Increase Support for CGP beneficiaries Increase Support for CGP beneficiaries involved in pig and poultry production | PMU | 08/2019 |
| ESS training Roll-out ESS training sessions to all implementing agencies and project beneficiaries | PMU | 08/2019 |
| Finalize all payments for AIP and CGP Rounds 1-7 Finalize all payments for AIP and CGP Rounds 1-7 | PMU | 09/2019 |
| Complete Review and Impact Assessment Complete Review and Impact Assessment of all grant programs | PMU | 10/2019 |
| Project Exit Strategy Develop a Clear Project Exit Strategy and begin its implementation | PMU | 10/2019 |
| Finalize all payments for Rounds 8-10 Finalize all payments for Rounds 8-10 | PMU | 12/2019 |
| Project Impact Assessment Complete the IFAD Project Impact Assessment | PMU/IFAD | 12/2019 |
| monitoring and follow-up of all sub-projects Periodic monitoring and follow-up of all sub-projects to be done regularly | PMU | |
| Development Effectiveness | | |
| Staffing Appoint two additional technical climate experts to participate in project selection by the CGC | CGC chair | 12/2018 |
| Sustainability and Scaling up | | |
| Cooperation Cooperation with GOL ministries at national & district levels, as well as WAMPP should be more effectively in programming activities | SADP and WAMPP PMUs/ CPM to support | 03/2019 |
| Permits Obtain water permits for new and existing water sub-projects from Ministry of Water . | PMU/DAO, Service Providers, Suppliers | 04/2019 |
| Social Capital Mentoring consultancy to be contracted and start training activities PMU consider hiring a consulting firm, using resources from the AF, to continue this good work of fostering cooperation among farmers | PMU | 06/2019 |

| | | |
|--|-----------|---------|
| Disbursement Complete disbursement of current CGP & AIP sub-projects | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Environmental and Safeguard (ESS) audit report Finalize Environmental and Safeguard (ESS) audit report and communicate findings and recommendations | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Support for CGP beneficiaries Increase Support for CGP beneficiaries involved in pig and poultry production | PMU | 08/2019 |
| ESS training Roll-out ESS training sessions to all implementing agencies and project beneficiaries | PMU | 08/2019 |
| Project Exit Strategy Develop a Clear Project Exit Strategy and begin its implementation | PMU | 10/2019 |
| Review and Impact Assessment Complete Review and Impact Assessment of all grant programs | PMU/IFAD | 11/2019 |
| Project Management | | |
| Staffing Complete recruitment of the required PMU staff to ensure that the SADP-AF/LASAP is effectively implemented. | MAFS/PMU | 01/2019 |
| data base for all grants and other project information Provide the full data base for all grants and other project information to the IFAD-supported survey team | PMU | 06/2019 |
| Impact Screening Impact Screening all new sub-projects to be conducted prior to project approval | PMU | 06/2019 |
| payments for AIP and CGP Finalize all payments for AIP and CGP Rounds 1-7 | PMU | 09/2019 |
| Finalize all payments for Rounds 8-10 Finalize all payments for Rounds 8-10 | PMU | 12/2019 |
| Complete the IFAD Project Impact Assessment Complete the IFAD Project Impact Assessment | PMU/ IFAD | 12/2019 |
| Financial Management & Execution | | |

| | | |
|---|------------|---------|
| Update chart of accounts Create account codes for exchange gains and losses | Accountant | 04/2019 |
| Utilise the Budget module in FMS Activate the module within TOMPRO accounting package | Accountant | 04/2019 |
| Timely submission of WAs Delays in submission of WA for replenishments | Accountant | |
| Restructure project The World Bank team has now prepared a request to restructure the project in order to resolve these disbursement challenges. This request will also modify some of the project indicators to make them easier to measure and use. The request will be submitted as soon as the World Bank team has the most recent data for the results framework, with the aim to complete restructuring and accelerate disbursement by June 30th, 2019. | | |

Smallholder Agriculture Development Project

Logical Framework

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|-------------------|---|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Outreach | 1.b Estimated corresponding total number of households members | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Household members | | | 66 000 | | | | | | | |
| | 1.a Corresponding number of households reached | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Non-women-headed households | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Women-headed households | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Households | | | 15 000 | | | | | | | |
| | 1 Persons receiving services promoted or supported by the project | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Females | | | 7 500 | | | | | | | |
| | Males | | | 7 500 | | | | | | | |
| | Young | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Not Young | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Indigenous people | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Non-Indigenous people | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total number of persons receiving services | | | 15 000 | | | | | | | |
| | Groups receiving project services (RIMS) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Groups | | | 254 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|--|---|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------|----------------|---|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Project Goal Reduce rural poverty and enhance rural economic growth on a sustainable basis | Improvements in household asset index (R3) | | | | | | | Baseline and impact surveys; qualitative analysis, including gender equality and poverty targeting | | | |
| | Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Number of households with improved food security (R3) | | | | | | | Baseline and impact surveys; qualitative analysis, including gender equality and poverty targeting | | | |
| | Households | | | | | | | | | | |
| Development Objective Increase marketed output among project beneficiaries in Lesotho's smallholder agriculture sector | Household commercialization level (value of produce and products sold as percentage of total value of produce and products) | | | | | | | Baseline and impact surveys; project M&E records | | | Careful selection of farmers, commodities and investments will ensure a focus on profitable and competitive products. |
| | Value | 35 | 64 | | 76 | 152 | | | | | |
| | Number of direct project beneficiaries (66,000 and > 50% women) | | | | | | | Baseline and impact surveys; project M&E records | | | |
| | Beneficiaries | | | 66 000 | 55 365 | 152 659 | 231.3 | | | | |
| | Females | | | 33 000 | 23 253 | 80 656 | 244.4 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|--|---|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------|----------------|---|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Outcome 1. Agricultural market opportunities in the project area increased | Targeted beneficiaries recording better access to markets | | | | | | | 1) Baseline and impact surveys 2) Qualitative performance assessment | | | The proposed information and training activities will ensure that businesses and groups understand the grant project procedures, and prepare adequate proposals. Capacity building under the project will sufficiently address implementation capacity constraints. Provision made to train service providers and, if needed, source regionally, will be sufficient to overcome capacity constraints. The selection process, with approval at several levels, including various public and private sector representatives, and widely publicizing the results, will ensure a transparent process. |
| | Beneficiaries | 23 | 47 | 50 | 56 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|--|---|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------|----------------|---|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Output 1.1 Innovative and viable agricultural business initiatives demonstrated | CGP grants approved and implemented | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2)Grant evaluation reports | | | The proposed information and training activities will ensure that businesses and groups understand the grant project procedures, and prepare adequate proposals. Capacity building under the project will sufficiently address implementation capacity constraints. Provision made to train service providers and, if needed, source regionally, will be sufficient to overcome capacity constraints. The selection process, with approval at several levels, including various public and private sector representatives, and widely publicizing the results, will ensure a transparent process. |
| | Grants | 0 | 171 | 164 | 878 | 2 195 | 1 338.4 | | | | |
| | Value of CGP investments and matching grant support | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2)Grant evaluation reports | | | |
| | Investments | | | 2 370 | | | | | | | |
| | Innovative and viable agricultural businesses initiatives demonstrated with a minimum satisfactory rating | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2)Grant evaluation reports | | | |
| | Initiatives | | | 120 | | | | | | | |
| | Persons trained and duration of training, by type of training | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2)Grant evaluation reports | | | |
| | Males | | | | 14 543 | 48 664 | | | | | |
| | Females | | | | 20 692 | 40 706 | | | | | |
| | Training days | | | 11 200 | | | | | | | |
| | Training days for women | | | 5 600 | | | | | | | |
| | 2.1.6 Market, processing or storage facilities constructed or rehabilitated | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2)Grant evaluation reports | | | |
| | Processing facilities constructed/rehabilitated | | | 30 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|--|--|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------|----------------|---|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Output 1.2 Linkages between agri-businesses and farmers improved | Enterprise-producer exchange events held | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2) Baseline and impact surveys | | | The proposed information and training activities will ensure that businesses and groups understand the grant project procedures, and prepare adequate proposals. Capacity building under the project will sufficiently address implementation capacity constraints. Provision made to train service providers and, if needed, source regionally, will be sufficient to overcome capacity constraints. The selection process, with approval at several levels, including various public and private sector representatives, and widely publicizing the results, will ensure a transparent process. |
| | Events | 0 | 35 | 400 | 53 | 92 | 23 | | | | |
| | Trade partnerships between farmer groups and enterprises established | | | | | | | 1) Project M&E records 2) Baseline and impact surveys | | | |
| | Partnerships | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| | People in marketing groups formed/strengthened (RIMS) | | | | | | | 1) Project M&E records 2) Baseline and impact surveys | | | |
| | Males | | | 33 000 | | | | | | | |
| | Females | | | 33 000 | | | | | | | |
| | Marketing groups formed/strengthened (RIMS) | | | | | | | 1) Project M&E records 2) Baseline and impact surveys | | | |
| | Groups | | | 254 | | | | | | | |
| | Marketing groups with women in leadership position (RIMS) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Groups with women in leadership position | | | 254 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|--|--|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------|--|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Output 1.3 Access by farmers to market-related information improved | Farmers and traders in project districts who directly access public market information | | | | | | | Baseline and impact surveys | | | The proposed information and training activities will ensure that businesses and groups understand the grant project procedures, and prepare adequate proposals. Capacity building under the project will sufficiently address implementation capacity constraints. Provision made to train service providers and, if needed, source regionally, will be sufficient to overcome capacity constraints. The selection process, with approval at several levels, including various public and private sector representatives, and widely publicizing the results, will ensure a transparent process." |
| | Farmer and traders | 38 280 | 44 220 | 50 | 67 | 44 287 | 88 574 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|---|---|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------|----------------|--|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Outcome 2. Productivity and quality of market-focused crops and livestock from smallholders in the project area increased | Incremental net value of marketed production in the project area | | | | | | | 1) Baseline and impact surveys 2) Qualitative performance assessment | | | The project design will clearly define roles and responsibilities. The national task force, technical working group and PMU will improve interagency coordination. Adequate support for transparent and efficient management of public resources will be available. Outsourcing and capacity building under the project in combination with a strong PMU will secure sufficient implementation capacity. Government will adhere to commitments and strategy documents that encourage outsourcing some activities to private sector partners, which will work closely with government the extension service. Surveys on existing potential and the use of clear objective criteria will result in appropriate selection |
| | Value | | | 3 600 | | | | | | | |
| | Targeted beneficiaries who have adopted improved technologies/farming practices in targeted areas | | | | | | | 1) Baseline and impact surveys 2) Qualitative performance assessment | | | |
| | Beneficiaries | | | 7 000 | 338 | 677 | 9.7 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|-------------------|------------|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| | Females | | | 50 | 30 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|---|---|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------|----------------|--|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Output 2.1 Investments in productivity-enhancing technologies and NRM supported | Number of AIPs completed with satisfactory rating | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2) AIP evaluation reports 3) Qualitative assessment of effectiveness of training 4) Direct observation of status of natural resources | | | The project design will clearly define roles and responsibilities. The national task force, technical working group and PMU will improve interagency coordination. Adequate support for transparent and efficient management of public resources will be available. Outsourcing and capacity building under the project in combination with a strong PMU will secure sufficient implementation capacity. Government will adhere to commitments and strategy documents that encourage outsourcing some activities to private sector partners, which will work closely with government the extension service. Surveys on existing potential and the use of clear objective criteria will result in appropriate selection |
| | AIPs | | | 72 | 65 | 130 | 180.6 | | | | |
| | Group-based investments completed as per agreement | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2) AIP evaluation reports 3) Qualitative assessment of effectiveness of training 4) Direct observation of status of natural resources | | | |
| | Investments | | | 400 | | | | | | | |
| | Value of AIP investments and matching grant support | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2) AIP evaluation reports 3) Qualitative assessment of effectiveness of training 4) Direct observation of status of natural resources | | | |
| | Value | | | 7 560 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|-------------------|--|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------|----------------|-------------|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| | NRM activities completed by type | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2) AIP evaluation reports 3) Qualitative assessment of effectiveness of training 4) Direct observation of status of natural resources | | | |
| | Activities | | | 90 | | | | | | | |
| | Persons trained and duration of training, by type of training | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2) AIP evaluation reports 3) Qualitative assessment of effectiveness of training 4) Direct observation of status of natural resources | | | |
| | Males | | | 4 000 | 5 798 | | | | | | |
| | Females | | | 4 000 | 5 845 | | | | | | |
| | Training days | | | 160 000 | | | | | | | |
| | Village/Community plans formulated (RIMS) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Plans | | | 65 | | | | | | | |
| | Natural Resources Management groups formed/strengthened (RIMS) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Groups | | | 90 | | | | | | | |
| | Natural Resources Management groups with women in leadership position (RIMS) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Groups with women in leadership position | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| | People in natural resources management groups formed/strengthened (RIMS) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Males | | | 4 000 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|-------------------|--|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| | Females | | | 4 000 | | | | | | | |
| | Land under improved management practices | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Hectares of land | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|---|--|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------|----------------|--|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Output 2.2 Capacity of farmers to make business approach to agriculture increased | People in market-related groups supported | | | | | | | Programme M&E records Qualitative assessment of effectiveness of training | | | The project design will clearly define roles and responsibilities. The national task force, technical working group and PMU will improve interagency coordination. Adequate support for transparent and efficient management of public resources will be available. Outsourcing and capacity building under the project in combination with a strong PMU will secure sufficient implementation capacity. Government will adhere to commitments and strategy documents that encourage outsourcing some activities to private sector partners, which will work closely with government the extension service. Surveys on existing potential and the use of clear objective criteria will result in appropriate selection |
| | Males | | | 6 000 | | | | | | | |
| | Females | | | 6 000 | | | | | | | |
| | Peoples | | | 12 000 | 55 365 | 129 897 | 1 082.5 | | | | |
| | Persons trained and duration of training, by type of training | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Males | | | 3 000 | 2 334 | 4 509 | 150.3 | | | | |
| | Females | | | 3 000 | 3 062 | 5 861 | 195.4 | | | | |
| | Training days | | | 100 000 | | | | | | | |
| | Targeted beneficiaries who use market information in making production decisions | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|-------------------|---------------|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| | Beneficiaries | 15 | | 50 | 74 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|--|--|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------|----------------|--|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| Output 2.3 Improved capacity of agricultural service providers to support market-oriented production | Persons trained and duration of training, by type of training | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2) Qualitative assessment of performance | | | The project design will clearly define roles and responsibilities. The national task force, technical working group and PMU will improve interagency coordination. Adequate support for transparent and efficient management of public resources will be available. Outsourcing and capacity building under the project in combination with a strong PMU will secure sufficient implementation capacity. Government will adhere to commitments and strategy documents that encourage outsourcing some activities to private sector partners, which will work closely with government the extension service. Surveys on existing potential and the use of clear objective criteria will result in appropriate selection |
| | Males | | | 300 | 667 | 1 324 | 441.3 | | | | |
| | Females | | | 300 | 872 | 1 727 | 575.7 | | | | |
| | Training days | | | 9 000 | | | | | | | |
| | Demonstrations of innovative technology packages conducted | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2) Qualitative assessment of performance | | | |
| | Demonstrations | | | 40 | 5 | 20 | 50 | | | | |
| | Targeted clients (businesses and groups) satisfied with capacity of agricultural service providers | | | | | | | 1) Programme M&E records 2) Qualitative assessment of performance | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Results Hierarchy | Indicators | | | | | | | Means of Verification | | | Assumptions |
|-------------------|------------|----------|----------|------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|
| | Name | Baseline | Mid-Term | End Target | Annual Result (2019) | Cumulative Result (2019) | Cumulative Result % (2019) | Source | Frequency | Responsibility | |
| | Clients | 15 | | 50 | 89 | | | | | | |

Lesotho

Smallholder Agriculture Development Project

Supervision Report

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

Mission Dates: 18 - 29 May 2019
Document Date 23/08/2019
Project No. 1100001530
Report No. 5128-LS

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Appendix 2: Financial: Actual financial performance by financier; by component and disbursements by category.

| Table 5A: | Financial performance by financier | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Financier | Appraisal USD '000' | Disbursements USD '000' | % Disbursed |
| IFAD Loan/Grant | 10,000,000 | 8,880,000 | 89% |
| Government | 3,700,000 | 2,560,953 | 69% |
| Beneficiary contribution | 3,220,000 | | 0% |
| Total | 16,920,000 | 11,078,900 | 65% |

| Table 5B: | Financial performance by financier by component (USD '000,000') as at 30th June 2019 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Component | IFAD Loan/Grant | | | Government | | | Beneficiary contribution | | | TOTAL | | |
| Description | Appr. | Actual | % | Appr. | Actual | % | Appr. | Actual | % | Appr. | Actual | % |
| Agriculture Market Opportunities | 4.800 | 3.804 | 79.3% | 0.140 | 0.150 | 107.1 | 2.960 | 0 | 0 | 7.900 | 3.954 | 50% |
| Promotion of Agriculture Business | 4.510 | 3.454 | 76.6% | 0.120 | 0.148 | 123.3% | 2.960 | 0 | 0 | 7.590 | 3.602 | 46% |
| Market Linkage development | 0.290 | 0.351 | 121.0% | 0.020 | 0.002 | 10.0% | 0.000 | 0 | | 0.310 | 0.353 | 114% |
| Smallholder Market Oriented Production | 3.800 | 1.802 | 47.4% | 1.780 | 0.055 | 3.1% | 0.260 | 0 | 0 | 5.840 | 1.857 | 32% |
| Preparation and implimentation of AIPs | 3.290 | 1.648 | 50.1% | 1.780 | 0.055 | 3.1% | 0.260 | 0 | 0 | 5.330 | 1.703 | 32% |
| Technology Packages for Smallholders | 0.510 | 0.155 | 30.4% | 0.000 | 0.000 | | | | | 0.510 | 0.155 | 30% |
| Project Management and M&E | 1.400 | 1.201 | 85.8% | 1.780 | 2.222 | 124.8% | 0.000 | - | | 3.180 | 3.220 | 107% |
| Project Management | 1.310 | 1.100 | 84.0% | 1.700 | 2.222 | 130.7% | 0.000 | | | 3.010 | 3.322 | 110% |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | 0.090 | 0.102 | 113.3% | 0.080 | 0.000 | 0.0% | 0.000 | | | 0.170 | 0.102 | 60% |
| Grant total | 10.000 | 6.807 | 68.1% | 3.700 | 2.427 | 65.6% | 3.220 | 0.000 | 0.00% | 16.920 | 9.031 | 53.4% |

| Table 5C | IFAD loan/Grant disbursements (SDR, as at June 2019) | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Category Code | Category Description | Allocation | Disbursement | Pending W.A | Balance | % |
| 75084 | Designated account | | 1,002,752 | | (1,002,752) | |
| 120744 | Goods, works, non-consulting, services and consultants' services and training | 1,286,210 | 1,000,794 | 0.00 | 285,416 | 77.8% |
| 120745 | Operating costs for the project | 324,850 | 298,942 | 0.00 | 25,908 | 92.02% |
| 120746 | Goods, works, non-consulting, services, and consultants' serv. and training und. sub-grant | 4,153,104 | 2,977,609 | 698,836 | 476,659 | 88.52% |
| 120747 | Offset of preparation advance | 535,836 | 315,268 | - | 220,568 | 58.84% |
| | TOTAL: | 6,300,000 | 5,595,365 | 698,836 | (5799) | 100.00% |

Lesotho

Smallholder Agriculture Development Project

Supervision Report

Appendix 2: Physical progress measured against AWP&B

Mission Dates: 18 - 29 May 2019

Document Date 23/08/2019

Project No. 1100001530

Report No. 5128-LS

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Appendix 2.1: Physical progress measured against LASAP AWP&B

| Component/Outcome <i>Sub-component or Output</i> | | | | Period: 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019 | | | Cumulative Actual | Appraisal Target | % | Comments |
|--|---|---|--------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|-------|-------------------|------------------|-----|--|
| | | | | Indicator | Unit | AWP&B | | | | |
| Component / Outcome 1: Mainstreaming Adaptation in Local Level Agricultural Planning | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Sub-component / Output 1.1: Vulnerability Mapping, Analysis & related Adaptation Guidance</i> | Number of demonstrations conducted | Number | 17 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 17 | | Trials started in December which was already late, Seeds were not available in the country, shortage of personnel and transport challenges |
| | | Acres under demonstrations | Area | 17 | 13.6 | 80 | 13.6 | 26 | 52 | Trials started in December which was already late, Seeds were not available in the country, shortage of personnel and transport challenges |
| | | Number of irrigated vegetable demonstrations | Number | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | Not achieved because of delayed irrigation equipment |
| | Sub Total | <i>Payments for demonstrations</i> | Amount (LSL) | 1285000.00 | 157480.90 | | | | | |
| | | | Amount (USD) | 95185.19 | 11665.25 | | | | | |
| Component / Outcome 2: Increased adaptive Capacity of Small Scale Farming Systems | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Sub-component / Output 2.1: The adaptive measures introduced to minimise climate change impact on natural assets and sustainable agricultural production</i> | Number of awarded grants | Number | 100 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | The process is still on-going |
| | | Hold workshop session for Potential Applicants and Service Providers in eight project area and Maseru | Number | 7 | 3 | 43 | 3 | 7 | 43 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------|--|---------------|----------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------------------------|
| | | The number of participants in the information dissemination workshop | Number | 300 | 858 | 286 | 858 | 300 | 286 | |
| | | The number of Climate-proofed sub-projects implemented | Number | 64 | 35 | 55 | 35 | 64 | 55 | The amount disbursed = 35% |
| | Sub Total | Payments to previous grant winners | Amount (LSL) | 23202217.00 | 4013873.01 | | | | | |
| | | | Amount (USD) | 1718682.74 | 297323.93 | | | | | |
| | Sub-component / Output 2.2: Innovative Practices, Technologies and infrastructures aiming to increase the efficiency and resilience to Climate change of smallholder Production | Number of trainings conducted for extension | Number | 300 | 231 | 77 | 231 | 300 | 77 | |
| | | Number of trainings conducted for farmers | Number | 300 | 677 | 226 | 677 | 300 | 226 | |
| | | Number of trainings conducted for service providers | Number | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | |
| | | Number of trainings conducted for PMU | Number | 20 | 8 | 40 | 8 | 20 | 40 | |
| | Sub Total | Payments for trainings | Amount (LSL) | 6868800.00 | 2945637.15 | | | | | |
| | | | Amount (USD) | 508800 | 218195.34 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Component/Outcome Sub-component or Output | | Indicator | Unit | Period: 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019 | | | Cumulative Actual | Appraisal Target | % | Comments |
| | | | | AWP&B | Actual | % | | | | |
| Component / Outcome 3: Increased Knowledge and Understanding of Climate Variability and Climate Change Induced threats on Agriculture | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sub-component / Output 3.1 : Monitoring System in place to Disseminate Timely Climate Information related to Agriculture | The number of surveys completed | Number | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| | | Number of automated agro-climate stations conducted | Number | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | |
| | | Number of downscaled climate scenarios and production systems produced | Number | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| | Sub-component / Output 3.2 : Climate and Agro-Meteorological Information Including in | Number of automated weather stations | Number | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| | Agricultural Information System | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sub Total | Payments for trainings | Amount (LSL) | 1980000 | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | Amount (USD) | 146666.67 | 0 | | | | | |
| Component / Outcome 4: Strengthening Capacity of Government Stakeholders to reduce risks to Climate- Induced losses on agriculture | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sub-component / Output 4.1 : Capacity of meteorological services and MAFS staff on the links between climate change and agriculture strengthened | Number of scholarships | Number | 2 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 2 | 50 | The 2 nd scholarship was not offered because the number of years offered to complete was beyond the expected 2 years required by IFAD |
| | Sub Total | Payments for trainings | Amount (LSL) | 625000 | 304656.86 | | | | | |
| | | | Amount (USD) | 46296.30 | 22567.17 | | | | | |
| Component / Outcome 5: Awareness and Capacity of Local Actors | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Sub-component / Output 5.1 : Effective awareness raising and communication campaigns to local stakeholders designed and Implemented | Number of awareness raising for Climate Change, Resilience and Adaptation | Number | 300 | 858 | 286 | 858 | 600 | 143 | |
| | Sub Total | Payments for awareness raising | Amount (LSL) | 180000 | 28310 | | | | | |
| | | | Amount (USD) | 13333.33 | 2097.04 | | | | | |
| Component 6: Staff and Operational costs | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | L300A0 - Staff recruited | | | | | | | | |
| | | L300F0 - Operational costs | | | | | | | | |
| | | L300G0 - Procurement of Laptops and printers | | | | | | | | |
| | | L300H0 - Desks and Chairs | | | | | | | | |
| | Sub Total | Payments for Staff and Operational costs | Amount (LSL) | 2804460.00 | 649676.93 | | | | | |
| | | | Amount (USD) | 207737.78 | 48124.22 | | | | | |

Appendix 2.2: Physical progress measured against SADP AWP&B

| Component/Outcome Sub-component or Output | Indicators | Unit | Period: 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019 | | | Cumulative Actual | Appraisal Target | % | Comments |
|--|--|--------|--|--------|-----|----------------------|---------------------|-----|---|
| | | | AWP&B | Actual | % | | | | |
| Goal: Reduce rural poverty and enhance rural economic growth on a sustainable basis | Improvements in household asset index | Index | | | | | | | 1) 8.5% of the households own a tractor, with majority of them (75%) owning one tractor 2) 51% of the households own a plough, with most of them owning one plough per household (85%) 3) 24% of the households own a vehicle. 70% own one vehicle, 16% own two vehicles and the remaining 6% own more than two vehicles 4) 77% of the households own a wheelbarrow and majority (83%) own one wheelbarrow 5) 69% of the households own a land parcel, with majority of households owning between one and two land parcels (41% and 32% respectively) |
| | Number of households with improved food Security | Number | | | | | | | (18%) had food security problems throughout the 12 months prior to the survey |
| PDO: Increase in marketed output among project beneficiaries in Lesotho's smallholder agriculture sector and, in the event of an Eligible Crisis or Emergency, to provide immediate and effective response to said Eligible Crisis (Restructuring) | Household commercialization level (value of produce and products sold as percentage of total value of produce and products)* | Number | 40 | | | 76 | | | MTRS results, to be updated by upcoming Impact Survey 2019 and there are no actuals for current year |
| | Number of direct project beneficiaries (77,000 and > 50% women) | Number | 11000 | 12583 | 114 | 77000 | 55365 | 139 | 16939 multiplied by 4.4 household size from field data, includes Round 8 beneficiaries for two districts. Also there are 23,140 beneficiaries from FAO funding not included Decreased to 12583 x 4.4 |
| | | %women | 50 | 42 | | 42 | | | %Female for CGP is 49% and %Female for AIP is 69% and the average of the two is 59% |
| Outcome 1. Agricultural market opportunities in the project area increased | Percentage of targeted beneficiaries recording better access to markets (50%)* | % | 50 | | | 56 | | | MTRS results, to be updated by upcoming Impact Survey 2019 |
| Output 1.1 Innovative and viable agricultural | CGP grants approved and implemented (400) | Number | 100 | 150 | 150 | 757 | 600 | 126 | Round1&2 is 17, Round3&4 ,pilot is 30, Round 5 batch2R1 is 171 , Rournd6,batch2R2 is 466 and Round |

| business initiatives demonstrated | | | | | | | | | 7&8 and bathe3 is 607. Round 9 granted 150 sub projects |
|---|--|----------------|---------------------------------------|--------|-----|-------------------|------------------|-----|--|
| | Number of CGP projects completed that are commercially viable (restructuring)* | Number | 270 | | | 42 | | | 42of 55 groups evaluated. To be updated by CGP Evaluation Report 2019 (target was changed from 120-270 during restructuring) |
| | Number of persons trained (men/women) and duration of training, by type of training (11,200 training days in total, 50% women/days) | People trained | 1400 | 1114 | 80 | 35235 | 11200 | 314 | CGP information workshops for potential applicants and service providers and technology transfer events |
| | | Female trained | 700 | 678 | 48 | 20692 | 5600 | 185 | |
| | | Males trained | 700 | 436 | 31 | 14543 | 5600 | 129 | |
| Output 1.2 Linkages between agri-businesses and farmers improved | Number of enterprise-producer exchange events held (400) | Round Tables | 8 | 9 | 113 | 36 | 200 | 18 | Nine (9) round table meetings undertaken in 2018/19 |
| | | Trade Fairs | 4 | 5 | 125 | 17 | 200 | 9 | Five (5) Trade fairs undertaken in 2018/19 |
| Output 1.3 Access by farmers to market-related information improved | Percentage of farmers and traders in project districts who directly access public market information (50%)* | % | 50 | | | 67 | | | MTRS results, to be updated by upcoming Grant evaluation 2019 |
| | Linkages between agri-businesses and farmers improved(# of new business contracts between farmers group and the private sector as a result of the market facilitation activities)* | Number | 100 | | | 1025 | | | 20 formal Agreement and Informal from CGP Grant Evaluation report 2017 and Lessons Learnt Reports |
| Component/Outcome Sub-component or Output | Indicators | Unit | Period: 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019 | | | Cumulative Actual | Appraisal Target | % | Comments |
| | | | AWP&B | Actual | % | | | | |
| Outcome 2. Productivity and quality of market- | Targeted beneficiaries who have adopted improved | Number | 7000 | | | 338 | | | MTRS results, to be updated by upcoming Grant evaluation 2019 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-------|-----|---|
| | | Males trained | 500 | 455 | 46 | 5798 | 4000 | 72 | |
| Output 2.2 Capacity of farmers to take a business approach to agriculture increased | Number of people in market-related groups supported (6,000 men and 6,000 women) | Number | 11000 | 12583 | 114 | 77000 | 55365 | 139 | Round1&2 is 17, Round3&4 ,pilot is 30, Round 5 batch2R1 is 171 , Rournd6,batch2R2 is 466 and Round 7&8 and bathe3 is 607. Round 9 granted 150 sub projects |
| | Percentage of targeted beneficiaries who use market information in making production decisions (50%)* | % | 50 | | | 74 | | | To be updated by upcoming Impact Survey 2019 |
| | Number of persons trained (men/women) and duration of training, by type of training (3,000 men, 3,000 women/6000 people | People trained | 1000 | 422 | 42 | 5396 | 6000 | 90 | Business/marketing/management training courses per farmer group during the four-year AIP period. Business management Training for training of trainers were undertaken in five Districts . Butha Buthe planning to undertake trainings in May& June |
| | | Female trained | 500 | 263 | 26 | 3062 | 3000 | 51 | |
| | | Males trained | 500 | 159 | 16 | 2334 | 3000 | 39 | |
| Output 2.3 Improved capacity of agricultural service providers to support market-oriented production | Number of persons trained (men/women) and duration of training, by type of training (300 men, 150 women/9,000 training days) | People trained | 50 | 27 | 54 | 1539 | 450 | 342 | Livestock training . |
| | | Female trained | 25 | 17 | 34 | 872 | 350 | 194 | |
| | | Males trained | 25 | 10 | 20 | 667 | 150 | 148 | |
| | Demonstrations of innovative technology packages conducted (40)* | Number | 40 | | | 5 | | | 2 Green House & Irrigation Systems for Liphakoeng & Lenela in Butha-Buthe and Berea,1 Fodder production demonstration site at Berea & Mafeteng |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|--|--|----|--|--|--|
| | Percentage of targeted clients (businesses and groups) satisfied with capacity of agricultural service providers (50%)* | % | 50 | | | 89 | | | To be updated by upcoming Impact Survey 2019 |
|--|---|---|----|--|--|----|--|--|--|

* "Cumulative Actual Value" tentative, pending final Impact Assessment results later in 2019 to validate.

Lesotho

Smallholder Agriculture Development Project

Supervision Report

Appendix 3: Compliance with legal covenants: status of implementation

Mission Dates: 18 - 29 May 2019

Document Date 23/08/2019

Project No. 1100001530

Report No. 5128-LS

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Appendix 3 – Compliance with Legal Covenants:

WB as leading institution, during the SM mission May 2019, did not flag any issues.

Lesotho

Smallholder Agriculture Development Project Supervision Report

Appendix 4: Technical background analysis

Mission Dates: 18 - 29 May 2019
Document Date 23/08/2019
Project No. 1100001530
Report No. 5128-LS

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

| A. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION | |
|--|--|
| Country | The Kingdom of Lesotho |
| Region | Southern Africa |
| Grant Title | Lesotho Adaptation of Small Scale Agricultural Production (LASAP) |
| Associated GEF Programme or Framework | LDCF |
| Grant Type | FSP |
| Reference numbers | |
| PIR Number (1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 4 th , Final) | 1 st PIR |
| GEF ID Number | 4453 |
| IFAD Grant Agreement | IFAD Grant No. 2000000855 |
| IFAD ID Number (LGS) | IFAD Grant No. 2000000855 |
| GEF Focal Area and Programme | |
| GEF Focal Area | Climate Change (CCA-1) |
| GEF OP or SP | Food Security for Sub Sahara IAP |
| Critical milestones | |
| GEF Approval date | 17 January 2011 |
| IFAD Approval date | 1 May 2014 |
| Date of Project Effectiveness | 20 January 2017 |
| Date of Last Supervision | 18-20 May 2019 |
| Mid-term Evaluation | April 2014 |
| Grant start up (launched) | 21 March 2018 |
| Final Evaluation date | September 2019 |
| Estimated closing date | February 2020 |
| Grant Financing (USD) | |
| GEF PPG Amount | USD 117 340.00 |
| GEF Grant Amount: | USD 4 330 000.00 |
| Total Grant GEF Cost: | USD 4 447 340.00 |
| GEF Grant Disbursed | USD 989 690.73 (at 30 June 2019) |
| Proposed Co-financing | |
| Actual Co-financing secured | |
| Actual co-financing spent | |
| Amount Disbursed | USD 989 690.73 |
| Amount spent | USD 698 433.86 |
| Date of first disbursement | 23 July 2018 |
| Reporting tools used for the reporting period | |
| List of reports ¹ | SADP Implementation Manual (PIM) IFA D Supervision Mission Reports November 2018 & May 2019 Aide Memoire November 2018 & May 2019 PIR |
| Tracking tools ² | Multi Dimension Poverty Assessment Tool (MPAT) Logical Frame work Results Integrated Management System (RIMS) Radio Programme |

¹ Please list any relevant documentation being used as a reference to this report – if applicable.

² Please list and attached to this report relevant tracking tool (s) – if applicable.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

| Project contact | |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Name | Retsélisitsoe Daniel Pheko |
| Email | Pheko.daniel@gmail.com |

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

| B. CONTRIBUTIONS TO INNOVATION and LESSONS LEARNED Please briefly illustrate current and emerging initiatives – if applicable ³ | |
|--|---|
| 1. Institutional and policy dialogue processes influenced and/or improved | <p>The Project organized the workshop which was co facilitated by IFAD and Ministry of Development Planning of the Kingdom of Lesotho on the Country Strategy Opportunities Programme (COSOP) Results Review on the 7th August 2018.</p> <p>The Agriculture Development Project (SADP) is co-financing the development of the National Irrigation Master Plan, which will structure investments in the sector and has already attracted significant interest from Government and other donors. Irrigation Master Plan Strategy (IMPS) aims for a full, efficient and sustainable exploitation of both surface (runoff, rivers and lakes) and underground water resources by promoting irrigation in its various forms from ten district of Lesotho.</p> <p>Lesotho Millennium Corporation second Compact aims at unlocking equitable and sustainable economic growth in partnership with the private sector by loosening key constraints. One of potential investment is to strengthen Irrigation system in Lesotho by rehabilitating existing irrigation systems, improve on harvesting irrigated water and building dams.</p> <p>The expansion of SADP-AF/LASAP into three additional districts (Maseru, Mochale-Hoek and Quthing) has been greater knowledge sharing /collaboration and partnership building with other Government of Lesotho Ministries (such as FAO). Given the crucial role of business management and marketing in ensuring profitability and sustainability for the sub project the partnership with staff from the Ministry of Small Business Development, Cooperatives and marketing is crucial.</p> |
| 2. Communications and Knowledge Management products developed, including traditional knowledge (based on the knowledge management approach approved at CEO endorsement / approval) | <p>The project is using the National Broadcaster to inform smallholders about the rainfall patterns status, outbreak diseases, market prices, production patterns etc. and future plans (Agriculture radio Programmes) SADP Facebook wall informs smallholders about climate change issues, adaptation and resilience and Enterprise Whats app groups.</p> <p>Under LASAP information dissemination workshops were held bot for farmers in the seven districts and for extension staff in two districts; Quthing and Mochale Hoek. A Lessons Learnt workshop was held on the 9-11 October 2018 and was attended by 105 people. The Lessons Learnt have been drafted but the not yet disseminated. There is evidence that the project staff at central and district levels have a clear idea of what is working and what needs improvement and the lessons are used to rectify some of the issues emerging.</p> <p>The project do not have Knowledge Management plan/Strategy</p> |
| 3. Engagement in partnerships (including public-private) | <p>The project primarily engages with various Departments in seven Ministries (Ministry of Water Affairs, Department of Agricultural Research (DAR) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS) have implemented 13.6 acres of farm trials and demonstrations to determine yield potential of different varieties of different maturity groups. Also to and assess the performance of new different varieties under the changing climate conditions, and develop the crop modelling by 14 beneficiaries. And Ministry of Development Planning etc.)</p> <p>The project is collaborating with the UN agencies such as FAO, WFP and World bank as well as collaboration with producers' organizations to FastTrack the project Implementation.</p> <p>For over the years the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), Agricultural Research Centre (ARC), Southern African Beans Research Network (SABRN) and Pan African Bean Research Alliance (PABRA) has been collaborating with bean program in Lesotho through Department of Agricultural Research (DAR), to enhance seed varieties production and consumption.</p> |

³ If necessary, please expand to 1 or 2 additional pages.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>The Department of Agricultural Research is working in collaboration with different varieties seeds from different Seed Companies, PANNAR, Monsanto and a small emerging Mosotho woman seed company. One Master student in the University of Kenya perusing studies in Agro metrology</p> <p>Ministry of Small Business Development, Cooperatives and Marketing is engaged in training farmers on business, entrepreneurship, and marketing.</p> <p>The project is engaged with the Ministry of Energy & Meteorology under Lesotho Meteorology Services to assist by building Automated Whether Station and Downscaled climate models and production system simulations produced</p> <p>The project is also working with different private sector to create job opportunities, to increase capacity development and improve on innovative and technology infrastructure and share experiences and collaborate to avoid the duplication of efforts.</p> |
| <p>4.Engagement of Gender and/Indigenous Peoples mainstreaming, including information on progress on gender-responsive measures, indicators and intermediate results (as documented at CEO endorsement/approval in the gender action plan or equivalent)</p> | <p>Initiatives has been taken to working in collaboration with ministry of gender and youth, sports and recreation, project encourages the youth and women participation in all the information sessions. There 472 youth engaged in mostly protected agriculture, piggery and fruit drying.168 are women in leadership. women continue to benefit from all project activities also in the last round of CGPS as beneficiaries (54%), however they tend not to be main applicants (only 12% are women) .</p> <p>Women benefit from trainings on technical issues such as pest control management (50%), vegetable production under tunnel (60%) and with peaks of 92% of participants in piggery training and in business management (41%) as well as participants to round tables (56%), the gender balance is reflected also in the PMU where 50% of officers are women (M&E, procurement, CGP, accountant and assistant accountant) and 4 out of 7 project field officers too.</p> <p>Women are also well represented in training provided to officers. field observations highlighted that women are represented in a variety of enterprises, but mostly in poultry, piggery and vegetable production (much less in wool & mohair activities) as per traditional customs in Lesotho. While women are also well represented in CGPS, the bulk of older and less wealthy women are found in productive investments sub-projects. while women are well represented all across the variety of activities performed by this project, it is difficult to determine the actual benefits they are gaining in terms of status and wealth generation. This type of analysis should be included in the evaluation that will be carried in 2019.</p> <p>The M&E officer was also appointed as Gender Focal Point however she has not received specific training and has activities are limited to gather data on sex and youth disaggregated indicators. SADP collaborated with Ministry of Gender Youth and Sports Recreation to encourage both women and youth to apply for CGP grants. As a result advertisements for grants were placed in social media so that youth can access and apply, including a message saying ' Youth are encourage to apply"</p> <p>The project do not have Gender/ Youth and targeting strategy or Action plan</p> |
| <p>5. Information on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO endorsement/approval).</p> | <p>There are 255 individual household who have adopted protected vegetable production being shade net, plastic tunnel drip irrigation and seedling under the tunnel. 106 farmers have adopted improved pig production and 67 farmers have adopted improved poultry production and breeding with biogas digester systems.</p> <p>Since additional of the LASAP funding into SADP adaptation to climate change has been prioritize and efforts have been made to climate proof 95 sub projects such as protected vegetable production and improved piggery.</p> |

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

| | |
|--|---|
| 6. Innovations and scaling – up successful approaches and technologies | Technologies adopted: protected Vegetable production being tunnel or shade netting and irrigation systems, improved piggery production & poultry production with biogas digesters. |
| 7. Contributions towards GEF Focal Areas ⁴ | <p>The contribution of the project to GEF focal areas include CCA-1: Reduce the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change.</p> <p>94 sub projects were climate proof, 64 under round nine were protected vegetable production and 115 sub projects were under round ten under the window of climate adaptation and resilience sub components and in total 273 sub projects increase the resilience of small-scale agriculture to climate change impacts by promoting climate-proofed investments for agriculture-based development, as well as by enhancing the resilience of agriculture productivity under increased climate variability.</p> <p>There are 95 climate proof sub projects, round 9 has 100 and round ten 121 and total climate adaptation interventions are 316</p> |
| 8. Monitoring tools used for the reporting period ⁵ | <p>The M&E system is updated with regular collected data however MPAT was used to measure the baseline for social economic status for targeted beneficiaries’.</p> <p>Data is collected through simple word forms by Extension Officers at Resource centers level and then aggregated by the District Project Field Officers (PFOS). The PFOS aggregate the data provided by the officers and send soft copies to the M&E Officer. All information is gender-disaggregated by gender. The M&E Officer has also develop a simple tracking sheet for sub including information on numbers of men/women participating to activities, indirect beneficiaries.</p> <p>SADP in collaboration is underway to undertake the completion survey, two survey to be done: Qualitative to be done by SADP, TOR drafted and under procurement process and IFAD to undertaken Quantitative survey. Farm inventory data base to be compiled and Assessment of sub projects and Technology packages.</p> |
| 9. Others | SADP hopes to work with IFAD and GEF Secretariat for guidance on the requirement and reporting procedures of GEF |

⁴ For projects in the Climate Change Focal Area, please provide an overview table with numeric results for the appropriate indicators (provided in the tracking tool). In other words, for all projects there should be a column stating amount of CO2 reductions achieved, for energy efficiency projects a column with numbers for energy saved, etc.

⁵ Please briefly mention: i) how global environmental benefits are measured, ii) how project indicators are measured – and how national GEF focal point is involved in M&E – if applicable.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

| C. CRITICAL OPERATIONS BOTTLENECKS | |
|---|--|
| Please briefly provide any update of current or potential challenges that impede the correct project implementation – if applicable. Please include also brief recommendations for follow up | |
| Recommendations to follow up | <p>The Lessons learnt and experiences gained over the eight years of project implementation has informed: Trainings of Business management and social capital adopted during early stages of the project cycle</p> <p>Climate information has to be provided for farmer's business plan to incorporate the situation of the climate in terms of varieties to be used beforehand through Lesotho Metrology Services.</p> <p>Recruitment of the project is done by the Ministry Human Resources and it takes more time hence hinders the other activities</p> |
| IFAD's comments | |

| D. GEF - OVERALL PROJECT RATINGS ⁶ | |
|--|--|
| Please indicate overall rate for IP , DO and Risk following tables 1 and 2 below | |
| Implementation Progress (IP) Based on progress made for the given reporting period (HS/S/MS/MU/U or HU) | |
| Development Progress (DO) Based on the likelihood that by the end of the project, implementation will achieve its stated objectives (HS/S/MS/MU/U or HU) | |
| Risk Based on the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives (H/S/M or L) | |

⁶ As per GEF - SEC Results Based Management Reporting Guidelines for GEF Trust Fund and LDCF/SCCF
<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/Docs/AMR%20Reporting%20Guidelines%20-%202012.pdf>

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

Table 1
IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE - RATING CRITERIA

| | IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP) | DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE (DO) |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS): | Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as "good practice". | Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice" |
| Satisfactory (S): | Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that is subject to remedial action. | Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings. |
| Marginally Satisfactory (MS): | Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. | Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits. |
| Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU): | Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action | Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives. |
| Unsatisfactory (U): | Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. | Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): | Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. | The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits. |

Table 2
RISK RATING CRITERIA

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| High Risk (H) | There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks. |
| Substantial Risk (S) | There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks. |
| Modest Risk (M) | There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks |
| Lowest Risk (L) | There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks. |

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

| E. MEASURING PERFORMANCE | |
|--|--|
| Please briefly provide narrative justification for the previous GEF Overall Project Ratings ⁷ | |
| <p>Implementation Progress (IP)</p> <p>Achievements and impact to date – if applicable</p> | <p>1.1 Knowledge management & Lessons learnt Lessons learnt workshops for round nine & ten were under taken to share experiences and lessons for the seven districts in the project areas. Private sectors, NGOs, inputs suppliers and producers were invited to share the experiences.</p> <p>2.1 Project management Key stakeholders were recruited: four out of seven Climate Smart Officers, Assistant Accountant and Assistant Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. PIM was drawn as a guiding tool, Annual Work plan and Budget. Additional partnership arrangements have been established through MoU and sub contract with service providers. (LMS & MAFS)</p> <p>3.1 Framework for M&E resilience and social economic benefits MPAT tool was adopted and digital survey was used activity was done in conjunction with Wool and Mohair Promotional Project (WAMPP) second project in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security.</p> |
| <p>Recommendations to improve IP</p> | |
| <p>Development Progress (DO)</p> <p>Achievements and impact to date – if applicable</p> | <p>The project is on its second year of implementation and completion survey to be done in September 2019 and from the survey results will show.</p> |
| <p>Recommendations to improve DO</p> | |
| <p>Risk level</p> <p>List key risks and measures implemented to resolve it</p> | |
| <p>Recommendations to reduce risk level</p> | |

| | | | Project Target | AWPB 2018/19 Planned | AWPB 2018/19 Achieved | Comments | AWPB 2019/20 Planned | Total Achieved |
|--|--|--|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------------|
|--|--|--|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| F. MEASURING for RESULTS | |
| As defined to the Annual Work Plan (AWP) | |

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|----|----|--|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| | OUTCOME1: Mainstreamed Adaptation in Local level Agriculture Planning | | | | | | | | | |
| OUTPUT1: Vulnerability, Mapping, Analysis related Adaptation Guidance | Maize Demonstration on Farm &Station | Number | 6 | 3 | 1 | One district was demonstrated with six varieties, Human resource & time factor, (delayed for a month) was a challenge for the three demos thus why the block design was used | 3 | 1 | | |
| | Beans Demonstration on Farm & Station | Number | 4 | 2 | 1 | Human resource & time factor was a challenge for the three demos thus why the block design was used | 2 | 1 | | |
| | Sunflower Demonstration on Farm& Station | Number | 4 | 2 | 1 | Human resource & time factor was a challenge for the three demos thus why the block design was used | 2 | 1 | | |
| | Sorghum Demonstration on Farm | Number | 4 | 2 | 1 | Human resource & time factor was a challenge for the three demos thus why the block design was used | 2 | 1 | | |
| | Wheat Demonstration on Farm | Number | 4 | 2 | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | |
| | Potatoes Demonstration on Farm | Number | 4 | 2 | 0 | Lack of Human capacity ad time factor to start the potatoes. Not Achieved | 2 | 0 | | |
| | Irrigated Vegetable Demonstration on Farm | Number | 4 | 2 | 0 | Not achieved, Delayed procurement of Irrigation Equipment | 2 | 0 | | |
| | Land under Demonstration | Number | 26 | 13 | 13.6 | Achieved | | 13.6 | | |
| | | | | | | Project Target Focused end of project) | A W PB 20 18/ 19 Pl an ne d | AWPB 2018/19 Achieved | Comment | |
| OUTCOME2: Increased Adaptive Capacity of Small-Scale Farming System | | | | | | | | | | |
| OUTPUT2: Adaptive Measures Introduced to Minimize Climate Change Impacts on Natural Assets and Sustain Agricultural Production | CGP grants approved and implemented | | | | Number | 100 | 100 | 0 | Not achieved still process | |
| | Sub project climate proof | | | | Number | 94 | 60 | 54 | | |
| | | | | | Project Target Focus ed end of project) | AWPB 2018/ 19 Plann ed | AWPB 2018/1 9 Achiev ed | Comments | AWPB 2019/ 20 Plann ed | Cumulative Amount |
| OUTCOME2: Increased Adaptive Capacity of Small-Scale Farming System | | | | | | | | | | |

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------------|-----|-----|
| | Number of Extension trained (men/women) and duration of training, by type of training | Number | 100 | 100 | 353 | Not achieved still in process | 100 | 353 |
|--|---|--------|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------------|-----|-----|

| | | | Project Target Focused end of project) | AWPB 2018/19 Planned | AWPB 2018/19 Achieved | Comments | AWPB 2019/20 Planned | Cumulative Amount |
|--|---|--------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| OUTCOME3: Increased Knowledge and Understanding of Climate Variability and Climate Change induced threats on Agriculture | | | | | | | | |
| OUTPUT2.2: Innovative 1: Monitoring Technology Pilot to increase resilience to climate change Information Efficiency & Resilience Climate Change of Small | Completion Survey/Impact Assessment | Number | 1 | 1 | 0 | preparations since the climate proof sub projects have stated | 1 | 0 |
| | Regional Workshop for Eastern & Southern Africa | Number | 1 | 0 | 0 | Not attended | 1 | 0 |
| | Fundamental II & Impact Evaluation Training | Number | 3 | 1 | 1 | M&E attended the Fundamental I Training | 2 | 1 |
| | Automated Agro Climate Stations | Number | 4 | 4 | 0 | Not achieved LMS contribution to the project is minimal | | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|-----|-----|------|---|-----|------|
| | Number of Farmers trained (men/women) and duration of training, by type of training | Number | 300 | 300 | 1028 | Funds were disbursed and procurements are done for the sub project. | 300 | 1028 |
|--|---|--------|-----|-----|------|---|-----|------|

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) - GEF Project grants

GEF Fiscal Year 2019 (01 July 2018 - 30 Jun 2019)

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Downscaled climate scenarios & production system simulation produced for 2030,2050 &2100 | Number | 1 | 1 | 0 | Not achieved LMS contribution to the project is minimal | | 0 |
|--|--|--------|---|---|---|---|--|---|

| | | | Project Target Focused end of project) | AWPB 2018/19 Planned | AWPB 2018/19 Achieved | Comments | AWPB 2019/20 Planned | Cumulative Amount |
|--|--|--------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------|
| OUTCOME 4: Strengthening Capacity of Government Stakeholders' to reduce risks to Climate Induced losses on Agriculture | | | | | | | | |
| OUTPUT4: Capacity of Met Service and MAFS staff on the links between Climate Change and Agriculture Strengthened | Scholarship for Department of Agricultural Research on MSC on Agro Meteorology Continues | Number | 2 | 2 | 1 | DAR staff undertaking MSC in Agro Meteorology Service in Kenya for two years, to disseminate Agro Meteorology information to at least 25% of the beneficiaries | 0 | 1 |

| | | | Project Target Focused end of project) | AWPB 2018/19 Planned | AWPB 2018/19 Achieved | Comments | AWPB 2019/20 Planned | Cumulative Amount |
|--|--|--------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------|
| OUTCOME 5: Awareness and capacity of Local Actors | | | | | | | | |
| OUTPUT5.1: Effective awareness raising & communication campaign to local stakeholders designed & implemented | Creating Awareness for Farmers on Climate Change (men/women) and duration of Workshops/forums, by type | Number | 300 | 300 | 858 | Information Dissemination for climate proof investment for potential beneficiaries and service providers | 300 | 858 |

Lesotho

Smallholder Agriculture Development Project

Supervision Report

Appendix 5: Mission preparation and planning, TORs, schedules, people met

Mission Dates: 18 - 29 May 2019

Document Date 23/08/2019

Project No. 1100001530

Report No. 5128-LS

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Appendix 5: TORs, Mission preparation and planning documents, schedules, people met.

Terms of Reference for Consultants and other persons hired by IFAD to participate in missions under a non-staff contract

COUNTRY OF ASSIGNMENT/LOCATION:

Lesotho

MISSION NAME:

SADP/LASAP Supervision and Implementation Support Mission

MISSION START AND END DATES:

18-29 May 2019 (in-country)

REPORT TO:

Philipp Baumgartner, CPM, ESA

MISSION COMPOSITION:

Mr. Philipp Baumgartner, CPM, ESA
 Ms. Tiffany Minjauw, IFAD Climate Specialist, Mission Leader
 Ms. Eva Jordans, Institutions and Irrigation Specialist
 Mr. Justice Morena Mokoteli, Country Operations Analyst
 Mr. Motsoasele Leballo, Rural Development Specialist

BACKGROUND:

1. The Smallholder Agriculture Development project was approved by the board in November 2011 and is due to end in February 2020. In September 2017, additional financing was approved for the Lesotho Adaptation of Small-Scale Agricultural Production project (LASAP) which is designed to promote resilience in agricultural investments and to build the capacity of Lesotho smallholders and institutions to address climate change impacts on agricultural production. The LASAP is financed by a grant from the Least Developed Country Fund housed in the Global Environment Facility and responds to priorities identified in Lesotho's National Adaptation Programme of Action. As an add-on to the SADP, the LASAP sees climate resilience as a key factor of sustainability.

Table 1 : Key Project Data and Ratings

| Millstones | Original Financing | | Additional Financing | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Board Approval: | November 10, 2011 | | September 27, 2017 | |
| Effectiveness Date: | March 09, 2012 | | November 20, 2017 | |
| Closing Date: | February 28, 2020 | | February 28, 2020 | |
| Project Age: | 6 | | 1 | |
| Source of financing: | IDA | IFAD | IDA | IFAD (LASAP) |
| Signed Amount (in currency): | 6,300,000.00 | 6,300,000.00 | 7,200,000.00 | |
| Signed Amount (in USD) | 10,000,000.00 | 10,000,000.00 | 10,000,000.00 | 4,330,000.00 |
| Disbursed Amount (in currency) | 6,222,885.65 | 5,595,091.26 | 1,187,904.30 | 600,000.00 |
| Percentage Disbursed: | 98.7 | 88.8 | 16.4 | 13.9 |

Source: WB's Client Connection System, as of November 20, 2018

2. **Outreach, goal and development objectives:** The Project Development Objective (PDO) of the SADP is to increase, over a six-year period, marketed output among project beneficiaries in Lesotho's smallholder agriculture sector. The two main project outcomes are: (a) agricultural market opportunities in the project area increased; and (b) productivity and output of smallholder farming activities in the project area increased.

MISSION OBJECTIVES AND OUTPUTS:

3. The mission's objective is twofold: i.) to support the project management team in reviewing implementation progress and processes to allow for sustainable, timely and efficient project delivery in the remaining 11 months until completion; and ii.) to prepare and inform the completion mission planned for 2020. In this regard, the mission will support the now fully staffed PMU in critically reviewing the implementation procedures (namely the PIM), in light of the current status of the project on the ground and given the backlog of activities vis-à-vis the project's ambitions at appraisal. The mission will work closely with the project staff on reviewing what feasible actions are planned for the coming months and how to address the most urgent activities. The mission will also assess the challenges experienced during implementation, and incorporate these lessons into the design of the second phase of the project.

4. The mission will review the status of the project progress with respect to the annual work plan and budget (AWPB) and procurement plan (PP). Similarly, the mission will follow-up on recommendations and agreed actions made during the November 2018 supervision mission and in between.

5. The mission will produce four main outputs:

- i. A concise Aide Memoire (AM) to be presented at the wrap-up meeting on 27th May 2019 to the PMU. Following feedback from the PMU, the AM will be presented to Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security.
- ii. An action plan with concrete milestones up to completion, specifically regarding an exit strategy.
- iii. A full IFAD supervision report, including all mandatory appendices, ready for up-load in ORMS.
- iv. A draft GEF progress report for LASAP to be shared with the CPM 2 weeks after the mission.

6. To reach the above three outputs, the mission will rely on strong preparatory work and coordination with key partners. Relevant documents will be reviewed prior to and during the first days of the mission.

7. The mission will give concrete, actionable recommendations to the PMU to further strengthen implementation and prepare project exit.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITIES, EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND REQUIRED COMPLETION DATES

Mr. Philipp Baumgartner, CPM

The CPM will represent IFAD in meetings with the Government and appropriate follow-up with the project on agreed actions.

Ms. Tiffany Minjauw, Operational team leader

The Environmental and Climate Specialist will be responsible for the planning, budgeting, and logistics of the mission and will be responsible for the up-load of the final report in IFAD systems. She will also instruct the project on adequate up-date of LASAP, and guide the project to prepare the full GEF annual report in due time.

She will specifically contribute to the following parts of the ORMS and Aide Memoire:

- Mission objectives and key conclusions: Summarizing the mission objectives, places visited, key meetings, and formulate the main key mission agreements and main conclusions;
- Overview and Project Progress: Provide a summary of progress made since the last supervision mission, and summarize the most important steps that have been taken to improve project's performance;
- Adaptation to Climate Change: Assess the progress of work, whether adaptation measures are being implemented effectively, whether the resilience of livelihoods and systems is being addressed and being built;
- Environment and Natural Resource Management: Assess whether any negative externalities have effectively been minimized and whether there are positive externalities;
- Requirements of SECAP: Review progress towards meeting social and environmental safeguards and agreed actions. Assess progress made since the hiring of the recruitment of the 2 specialists;

- Knowledge Management: Review the progress made towards an adequate KM strategy and whether KM activities have contributed to project performance. Assess whether project results have been adequately documented and disseminated. Identify the potential relevance of lessons for country-level policy engagement;
- Procurement: The specialist will assist in the drafting of the ORMS ratings and justification of the ratings for the section on procurement by liaising closely with the procurement Consultant based in Rome and following up on agreed actions;
- Summary of lessons learned;
- Exit Strategy: Assess the project's plans for a sustainable continuation following the closure of the project;
- Summarize project results;
- Other tasks consistent with the role of mission lead and as requested by the CPM.

Ms. Eva Jordans, Senior Technical Specialist – Irrigation and Rural Institutions

The Senior technical specialist will support the mission with her experience on rural institutions, gender equality, and policy engagement.

She will specifically contribute to the following parts of the ORMS and Aide Memoire:

- Review agreed actions in the area of irrigation and related institutional strengthening and liaise with the TTL on potential next steps and ways to strengthen project exit;
- Institutions and Policy Engagement: Assess how far the project has addressed agreed recommendations and recommend practical final activities in line with AWPB and project objectives;
- Gender Equality and Women's Participation: Assess project's approach to gender equity and gender empowerment. Assess whether the project has contributed to expanding women's access to and control over fundamental assets and whether the project is implementing operational measures to ensure gender-equitable participation in (and benefit from) planned activities. Assess whether targeting has been appropriately conducted and if sex-disaggregated results and impact data is regularly collected;
- Partnership Building: In consultation with service providers and line ministries, review the PMU's progress in building partnerships and preparing for an exit strategy;
- Quality of Project Management: Review the project implementation arrangements, including the relationships and agreements between the multiple actors / ministries involved and suggest improvements / simplifications where appropriate and possible. Review the PMU internal management structure and discuss with the PD if/how this could further be strengthened;
- Performance of M&E system: Review project's AWPB and the project practices and their codification in the PIM on monitoring and reporting, including a thorough review of roles and responsibilities regarding data entry, validation, and its frequency;
- Review project progress towards recommendations in the area of monitoring;
- Targeting and Outreach: Assess the projects progress in developing a sound targeting strategy in line with IFAD good practice and national requirements. Assess project staff's understanding of targeting approach across all components and government hierarchies, i.e. also at district and village level. Review project reports and advise on improved reporting in the area of targeting and gender in line with IFAD standards;
- Effectiveness and Development Focus: in line with IFAD reporting and project progress write the report section on concerned aspects, and give project recommendations;
- Any other task as required by the CPM.

Justice Morena Mokoteli, Country Operations Analyst

The Country Operations Analyst will support the mission with his experience in the implementation of agriculture projects

He will specifically contribute to the following parts of the ORMS and Aide Memoire:

- Agricultural Productivity : To assess whether the project made an impact in terms of an increase in agricultural productivity
- Relevance: Review whether the Development Objective is still relevant in today's context and in line with IFAD's and country development strategies. Assess whether the project approach (technical proposal, implementation arrangement, target area and population) is still relevant to solve the development problem identified at design;
- Quality of beneficiary participation: Assess whether appropriate consultation methodologies have been used to target all groups within the community, whether community views have been integrated in

project planning and whether communities have had an opportunity to express their concerns, priorities and interests;

- Contribute to the mission AM as required;
- Support the IFAD mission leader in compiling some of the appendices for inclusion to the ORMS report;
- Any other tasks as requested by the CPM.

Mr. Motsoasele Leballo, Rural Development Specialist

- Quality of Service Providers: Review the progress made towards an adequate provision of services and whether the procured activities have contributed to project performance. Assess the performance and satisfaction of parties involved.
- Support the IFAD mission leader and consultants in compiling some of the appendices for inclusion to the ORMS report, especially on coherence between the AWP&B and implementation;
- Contribute to the mission AM as required.

DOCUMENTATION

The following documentation will be made available to consultants prior to the assignment:

- AWPB 2019/2020 (LASAP)
- Previous SM reports SADP & LASAP
- Design report SAP & LASAP
- Technical Annexes and Working Papers SADP & LASAP
- PIM SADO & LASAP
- FA and LtB of SADP & LASAP
- Latest Log frame
- MPAT Report
- SADP II Design Report

MISSION SCHEDULE:

| Activity | Sat 18 | Su 19 | Mo 20 | Tu 21 | We 22 | Th 23 | Fr 24 04 | Sa 25 | Su 26 04 | Mo 27 04 | Tu 28 04 | We 29 04 |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------------|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| IFAD mission members arrive. Meet with WB mission members to discuss activities, responsibilities, and mission plans | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meet with WB mission members to discuss activities, responsibilities, and mission plans | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Courtesy meeting with MAFS Meeting with PMU and Presentation of progress and presentation on exit strategy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meetings with service providers and specific counterparts | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Field Visit | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meetings with service providers and specific counterparts Workshop with PMU to discuss mission findings and agree on actions | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Report writing (IFAD ORMS & AM) with World Bank | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aide Memoire submitted to MAFS (morning) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wrap-up meeting with MAFS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Submission of IFAD documents (ORMS & AM) | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Clearance by COM if TORs include communication activities (see section 4.7(iii)):

Name:**Signature:**.....

Date:.....

Clearance by FMD if TORs include financial management responsibilities:

Name:**Signature:**.....

Date:.....

IMPORTANT NOTE:

IFAD will accept only reports that have been properly formatted by using the template, which will be provided separately. The team leader is responsible for preparing the main report and annexes in the required format, and ensuring that the working papers submitted by the individual team members are consolidated in one single document and in the correct format. He will compile the full report, including his own contributions and those of all the mission members into one consistent final and complete Report and submit it to IFAD on or before the agreed deadline.



**INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND WORLD BANK
 IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT MISSION PROGRAMME ON THE
 19th – 28th MAY 2019**

19TH MAY 2019, Sunday

09:00am – 17:00pm Arrivals by the Mission team

20TH MAY 2019, Monday

07:30 – 08:00 Courtesy call

09:00 – 12:30 Presentations by the Project Management Unit on
 Progress and achievements, challenges and way
 Forward – LASAP and SADP – Additional Financing

12:00 – 13:00 Lunch

13:00 – 14:00 Depart from Maseru to Berea

14:00 – 15:00 Field visit to Doxa Enterprises – Rehabilitation of the
 200-micron plastic and strengthening it with the shade
 nets under LASAP.

15:30 – 16:30 Field Visit to Lebina Poverty Reduction Association – Vegetable
 Production under plastic tunnels

15:30 -16:00 Field visit to trial and demonstration on sunflower at Mapoteng under
 LASAP.

16:50 – 17:50 Moghali Multipurpose Association – Ram Breeding

16:00 – 17:00 Field visit to Thuhloane – Installed solar powered Borehole under
 LASAP

18:00 – 07:00 Overnight stay at Mountain View Hotel in Leribe

21st May 2019, Tuesday

08:00 – 08:20

09:00 – 10:00 Courtesy call to the District Agricultural Office in Leribe
 Field visit to Sefali Farms (Pty) Ltd – CGP (Vegetable production under
 shade nets)

11:00 – 12:00 Field visit to DAFO – Ram Breeding

11:00 – 12:00 Field visit to the trial and demonstration site on beans at the Lesotho
 Agricultural College under LASAP

13:00 – 14:00 Lunch

14:30 – 15:30 Field Visit to Molapo Fresh Farm – Vegetable production under plastic
 tunnel

16:00 – 17:00 Field visit to Ha Re Thuseng Basotho Cooperative – CGP (Piggery
 Production)

18:00 – 19:00 Meeting with the District Irrigation Officers from Botha Bothe and Leri
 be to discuss the irrigation initiatives and potential sites to be funded
 under Additional Financing.

19:00 07:00 Overnight stay at Mountain View Hotel.

22nd May 2019, Wednesday

08:00 – 08:20 Courtesy call to the District Agricultural Office in Botha Bothe
 09:00 – 10:00 Field visit to Seana Marena Basali Ba Muela – Broiler Production
 10:30 – 11:30 Field visit to Mpiti Sehlabaka Farm Produce – Vegetable production under the plastic tunnel.
 10:30 – 11:30 Field visit to trials and demonstration sites on maize at Nqabene under LASAP
 12:00 – 13:00 Field visit to trials and demonstration sites on maize at Serutle under LASAP
13:00 – 14:00 Lunch
 14:30 – 15:30 Field visit to Tsepahalang Basotho Poultry Association
 18:00 – 07:00 Travel from Botha Bothe and Overnight stay at Mountain View Hotel in Leribe.

23rd May 2019, Thursday

09:00 – 10:00 Field visit to Makhakhe Daughters – Vegetable Production under shade nets.
 09:00 – 10:00 Field visit to the trial and demonstration sites on sorghum at Kolo under LASAP.
 11:00 – 12:00 Thabeng Fresh Produce – Vegetable Production under shade nets.
 11:00 – 12:00 Field visit to Farmtech Pty Ltd – Vegetable production under plastic tunnels, Drilled Borehole under LASAP.
13:00 – 14:00 Lunch
 14:30 – 15:30 Makaota Poultry Suppliers – Egg Sorting and Grading
 14:30 – 15:20 Tsehetsanang Cooperative Society – Vegetable production under shade nets/plastic tunnels, Drilled Borehole under LASAP.
 16:00 – 17:30 Travel from Mafeteng and overnight stay at Mountain View Hotel in Leribe.

24th May 2019, Friday

08:30 – 13:00 Implementors workshop to discuss progress, challenges and agreeing on the Action items for the next six months.
13:00 – 14:00 Lunch
 14:00 – 15:00 Depart Leribe to Maseru

25th and 26th May 2019, Saturday and Sunday

08:00 – 17:00 drafting of the aide memoire

27th May 2019, Monday

08:30 – 09:30 Presentation of recommendations by the Implementation Support Mission to MAFS Management.
 10:00 – 11:00 Meeting with the Competitive Grants Committee to discuss procedures, modalities and SADP 2.
 11:00 – 12:00 Meeting with the Ten beneficiaries funded under 9th round call of applications from Maseru.
 12:00 – 13:00 Meeting with implementing partners and service providers
13:10 – 14:10 Lunch
 14:20 – 15:20 Meeting between IFAD, World Bank teams and the Project Management Unit to discuss the key findings and agreeing on the action items for the next six months.

28th May 2019, Tuesday

10:00 – 11:00 Wrap up Meeting at the Ministry of Development Planning.

12:00 – 17:00

Mission Departure

LIST OF OFFICIALS MET (MINISTERIAL/SADP/LASAP, SADP II)

| Name | Organization and Position |
|------------------------|---|
| Ms Nthoateng Lebona | Principal Secretary Ministry of Development Planning (MDP) |
| Mr. Malefetsane Nchaka | Principal Secretary Ministry of Food Security and Agriculture (MAFS) |
| Ms. Mahtoriso Molumeli | Director Ministry of Food Security and Agriculture (MAFS)- Department of Planning and Policy Analysis |
| Ms. Mabolaoana Phakisi | Chief Planner Ministry of Food Security and Agriculture (MAFS)- Department of Planning and Policy Analysis |
| Ntitia Tuoane | Director Ministry of Food Security and Agriculture (MAFS)- Department of Field Services |
| Retselisitsoe Pheko | Project Manager |
| Lehlohonolo Mpholle | Agriculture Investment Officer |
| Tefo Taela | Agribusiness Management Officer |
| Ntlhonamo Bokaako | Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer |
| Malichaba Nkhethoa | Competitive Grant Officer |
| Mabusetsa Makau | District Agricultural Officer -Leribe |
| Limakatso Ngosa | Project Field Officer- Leribe |
| Malefetsane Lepota | District Extension Officer-Leribe |
| Mohau Motsotsoana | Agriculture Extension Officer-Leribe |
| Bereng Letuka | District Agricultural Officer -Maseru |
| Makamohelo Ramaili | Senior Economic Planner - Maseru |
| Maboe Phamotse | District Extension Officer-Maseru |
| Mofihli Motsetsero | District Agriculture Officer-Mafeteng |
| Tholang Nokotoa | Senior Economic Planner -Mafeteng |
| Lebohang Motlalane | District Nutrition Officer-Mafeteng |
| Monaheng Mohale | District Coordinator a.i Mafeteng |
| Matsoha Moletsane | District Agriculture Officer-Butha-Buthe |
| Malerato Lekhooa | District Extension Officer- Butha-Buthe |
| Mpholle Motete | Senior Economic Planner-Butha-Buthe |
| Tsiu Mphanya | District Agriculture Office- Mohale's Hoek |
| Mampho Makhaola | Project Field Officer - Mohale's Hoek |
| Mamokhoebo Mokuoane | District Extension Officer- Mohale's Hoek |
| Maphakamile Xingwana | District Agriculture Officer |
| Mapulatsana Topo | Project Field Officers |
| Keitumetsi Taka | District Extension Officer |
| Machaba Lekholoane | District Extension Officer |
| Lejane Moipatleli | Forester |