

## **Myanmar**

---

### **Fostering Agricultural Revitalisation in Myanmar Project**

### **Supervision Report**

### **Main report and appendices**

Mission Dates: 11-22 March 2019

Document Date: 02/05/2019

Project No. 1100001654

Report No. 5032-MM

Asia and the Pacific Division  
Programme Management Department

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

<b>AMD</b>	Agriculture Mechanization Department
<b>AWPB</b>	Annual Work Plan and Budget
<b>CDGS</b>	Community and Gender Specialist
<b>CIG</b>	Common Interest Group
<b>CRBF</b>	Community Rural Business Fund
<b>DoA</b>	Department of Agriculture
<b>ESAP</b>	Eastern States Agribusiness Project
<b>FA</b>	Financing Agreement
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization
<b>FARM</b>	Fostering Agricultural Agriculture in Myanmar
<b>FFS</b>	Farmer Field School
<b>FFS</b>	Farmer Field School
<b>HH</b>	Household
<b>IFAD</b>	International Fund for Agricultural Development
<b>ITC</b>	Irrigation Technology Center
<b>IWUMD</b>	Irrigation and Water Utilization Management Department
<b>JICA</b>	Japan International Cooperation Agency
<b>KC</b>	Knowledge Center
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MMK</b>	Myanmar Kyat
<b>MoALI</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation
<b>MoPF</b>	Ministry of Planning and Finance
<b>MTR</b>	Mid-Term Review
<b>NAG</b>	Network Activities Group
<b>NAIE</b>	National Agricultural Infrastructure Engineering
<b>NPSC</b>	National Project Steering Committee
<b>NPT</b>	Nay Pyi Taw
<b>O&amp;M</b>	Operation and Maintenance
<b>PCR</b>	Project Completion Review
<b>PCU</b>	Project Coordination Unit
<b>PLUP</b>	Participatory Land Use Planning
<b>RBF</b>	Rural Business Fund
<b>SDR</b>	Special Drawing Rights
<b>USD</b>	US Dollar
<b>WA</b>	Withdrawal Application
<b>WSAP</b>	Western States Agribusiness Project
<b>WUA</b>	Water User Association
<b>WUG</b>	Water User Group

## A. Project Overview

Region:	Asia and the Pacific Division	Project at Risk Status:	Potential problem
Country:	Myanmar	Environmental and Social Category:	B
Project Name:	Fostering Agricultural Revitalisation in Myanmar Project	Climate Risk Classification:	2
Project Id:	1100001654	Executing Institution:	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation
Project Type:	Irrigation	Implementing Institutions:	not available yet
CPM:	Alessandro Marini		
Project Director:	U Tun Win, Project Director, Department of Agricultural Land Management and Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Irrigation		
Project Area:	Naypyitaw Union Territory		

Approval Date	08/04/2014	Last audit receipt	28/11/2018
Signing Date	22/10/2014	Date of Last SIS Mission	23/03/2019
Entry into Force Date	22/10/2014	Number of SIS Missions	8
Available for Disbursement Date	18/03/2015	Number of extensions	0
First Disbursement Date	25/03/2015	Effectiveness lag	6 months
MTR Date	08/11/2017		
Original Completion Date	31/12/2020		
Current Completion Date	31/12/2020		
Financial Closure	not available yet		

## Project total financing

IFAD Financing breakdown	IFAD	\$18,726,034
	Asia and the Pacific Division	\$778,516
Domestic Financing breakdown	Beneficiaries	\$621,271
	Private sector local	\$2,402,435
	National Government	\$5,296,549
Co-financing breakdown,		
Project total financing		\$27,824,805

## Current Mission

Mission Dates:	11-22 March 2019
Days in the field:	8 days (3 sub-teams in 2 days, 2 subteams in another day)
Mission composition:	Mr Jerry Jing Pacturan/CPO, Mission/Team Leader; Mr Alessandro Marini/CPM, Agribusiness; Mr Yolando Arban, Project Management and M&E; Mr Prasun Das, Rural Finance; Mr Michele Pirazzoli, Rural Infrastructure; Mr Art Tantuan, Procurement; Mr Alvaro Fernandez, Finance; and, Ms Thiri Wai, IFAD Country Facilitator.
Field sites visited:	5 villages in Lewe Township, 5 villages in Tatkone Township, 5 villages in Pyinmana Township

## 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

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

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

<b>Relevance</b>	<b>4</b>
------------------	----------

## C. Mission Objectives and Key Conclusions

### Background and Main Objective of the Mission

1. An IFAD team visited Myanmar from 11-22 March 2019 to carry out a supervision and implementation support mission to assess the implementation of actions agreed during the 2017 Mid-Term Review (MTR) and in consonance with the agreement in the December 2018 IFAD implementation support mission to review the agreed milestones and determine the way forward for the FARM project.
2. In Naypyitaw, the mission met with senior officials of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation (MoALI), the Ministry of Finance (MoPF) and the FARM Project Coordination Unit (PCU). Field visits were undertaken to review project investments in land development, Knowledge Centres (KCs), common interest groups (savings and credit groups), and micro-enterprises, where the mission met with township staff, KC managers, extension agents and farming households.
3. The mission's main findings and recommendations were discussed with, and agreed with, the Government of the Union of Myanmar at a wrap up meeting held in Naypyitaw on 22 March 2019, which was chaired by U Kyaw Min Oo, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation (MOALI). The mission expresses deep appreciation for the collaboration and hospitality extended by the Government of Myanmar

### Key Mission Agreements and Conclusions

4. Project performance has considerably improved with substantial movement of procurement activities and disbursements on the irrigation schemes. Project management was able to achieve most of the key outputs as targeted in the AWPB and posting the highest disbursement in the history of project implementation (USD 2.16 million in 6 months). Component 1 has a 100% implementation of investments included in the minibudget period. Land consolidation has covered 1,142 acres and may reach 2,451 acres of Land Consolidation (98% of target) by end of September 2019. Component 2 has organized a total of 731 common interest groups (CIGs), 81% achievement of the revised target. All CIGs have already opened bank accounts and most of them are undertaking savings and relending activities. Maintaining the same momentum, the project may be able to achieve most of its targets and may have a strong likelihood to achieve its development objectives by end of project.

5. The key issues that remain to be addressed are:

- Component 1: (i) mixed performance on preventive O&M of tertiary level infrastructure; (ii) need for continued support to WUGs as key players for sustainability, (iii) crop diversification has been limited in land consolidation areas;
- Component 2.1: (i) capacity of KC Managers is limited by multiple demands, leading to excessive workload, and lack of training in some areas that are not in their core expertise. The project still shows modest achievements in value chain and market linkages, in areas such as commodity development, value chain upgrading, market access and fostering linkages with other value-chain actors, and access to financial resources;
- Component 2.2: (i) CIG savings are below the expected amount of savings required in order to receive the RBF assistance, (ii) no enforcement of savings and counterpart arrangement scheme allowing CIGs to receive first and second tranches of RBF assistance, (iii) membership in CIGs have dwindled;
- Project Management: (i) high staff turnover for both government-designated and contracted staff; (ii) implementation of approved procurement plans suffer from delays, poor planning and inadequate documentation; non-compliance with prior No Objection requirement before commencement of procurement activity; Contracts Register and logs not regularly updated;
- Disbursement is still low vis-à-vis time elapsed of 66% (loan fund disbursement is 52% and grant fund disbursement is 48%).

6. The Government of Myanmar represented by MOALI and IFAD agreed to:

- Earmark unallocated IFAD Loan funds to Civil Works which will compensate for exchange rate losses and bring back the budget available for irrigation works to some USD 9.0 million in aggregate[1];
- Amend the Financing Agreement to allow the use of the grant funds for capacity building activities of project staff and beneficiaries and improvement of the ministry's financial management system;
- Introduce the season-long Farmer Field School (FFS) with technical assistance from FAO;
- Engage service providers for formation of new and strengthening of the existing CIGs;
- Adjust the implementation approach of the RBF. For CIGs that have not received the first tranche, the RBF assistance of USD 1,500 will be released irrespective of their savings in the group account, provided that at least 15 members have been actively saving during the 6 months of project support; CIGs eligible for 2nd tranche should have a minimum savings of USD500 plus incremental increase as basis for 1:3 matching grants, and a business plan for collective business;
- Cancel the Commercial RBF and instead focus and consolidate the financing support to existing and new CIGs;
- Ensure continuity of project staff; and
- Start capturing project outcomes.

[1] Construction of KCs is to be claimed under the IFAD loan category iv-Goods, Services and Inputs as per point (b) iv.c of Schedule 2

## D. Overview and Project Progress

7. Project progress has considerably improved, especially in Component 1, during this period. Key to this better performance as compared at MTR was the attention provided by the project director with the assistance of a fulltime project management staff officer, a newly created post-paid from Government budget. Implementing partners such as NAIE, WUGS, and IWUMD also performed well in this period.

8. **Component 1: Agricultural Infrastructure** has improved considerably during the review period. Investments in infrastructure were implemented in full alignment with the work plan agreed at MTR, resulting in: (i) 100% implementation of investments included in the minibudget period (April-September 2018); and, (ii) ongoing investments in irrigation and land consolidation valued at about USD 3.5 million, i.e. 92% of the AWPB allocation[1]. The physical progress at the sites visited by the mission is in line with the civil works contracts work plans, which are generally aiming for completion by May 2019. The overall performance is rated as *satisfactory*, with good prospects of becoming highly satisfactory with the implementation of the agreed plans, which are fully on-track.

9. If the current implementation track record is sustained during the next AWPB (October 2019 to September 2020) there are good prospects for the Component to achieve and in some instances exceed the MTR-revised physical targets for area coverage (9,000 acres in total including land consolidation, irrigation system upgrading and drainage improvement) and for outreach (3,000 HHs with secured all year access to water) by project end. This performance is largely attributable to NAIE and WUGS who have established good communication and coordination function with the concerned departments of MOALI. The IWUMD performance in leading the PLUP process and securing own equipment for construction works during the review period is also commendable. The completion of the ongoing works is estimated to bring up the cumulative counterpart funding as indirect costs for the use of equipment and engineering services to some USD 1.6 million[2].

10. **Land consolidation.** Since the onset of the current construction season in November 2018 the project has initiated Land Consolidation works across five sites (four under the Paunglaung scheme and one under Sinthe scheme) covering an aggregate area of 1,142 acres (409 HHs). With the parallel mobilization of equipment both from the IWUMD Construction 5 and NPT maintenance department, physical implementation is progressing rapidly. Upon completion of the ongoing works, the project will reach 2,451 acres of Land Consolidation (98% of target) and will support the re-issuing of land titles to about 900 HHs[3] (125% of target). Farmers expressed overall satisfaction for the participatory design process and for the quality of works implemented. Across the areas where Land Consolidation has been completed, there is anecdotal evidence of increased yields for the rice crops and reduced post-harvest losses, particularly due to improved access provided by farm roads.

11. Demand for additional Land Consolidation to be undertaken during the 2019-20 AWPB period has been sounded by the PCU and preparatory steps for the PLUP process have been undertaken on some 720 acres across five sites under the Paunglaung and Sinthe schemes, mostly contiguous to those already implemented or under implementation. While IFAD Loan funds are still available and investments of this magnitude have proven to be feasible, investments in Land Consolidation are subject to i) availability of water for the dry season crop; and ii) location within the project area as defined in the FA. The ongoing procurement handled by the PCU for laser levelling equipment and planned cadastral mapping software and hardware will be instrumental to facilitating further expansion and improved quality of land consolidation works starting from this AWPB implementation period

12. **WUGs/Water management.** To date 42 WUGs with 505 members (42% of final target), have been formed[4] in the project areas where Land Consolidation was completed (1,309 acres). This indicates that: i) the WUGs formed are comparatively larger than anticipated at design; and ii) the project shall seek opportunities to form WUGs also in non-consolidated areas. The WUGs have consistently used materials (including visuals) and principles of the recently issued PIM manual for Myanmar developed with JICA support, which adopts the FARM model of informal WUGs along tertiary. In the new areas undergoing Land Consolidation the project has taken initiative to have PIC membership from all tertiary, facilitating the subsequent step of forming WUGs and increasing WUGs members' ownership. The mission commends the PCU proactive approach to identify one area under the Paukmyaing KC which will include nearly 800 acres of contiguous consolidated land to pilot the joint management of the common DY channel by a WUA encompassing all the concerned WUGs.

### 13. Component 1 key issues:

- IWUMD has relied on consolidated approaches and technologies; however, there are opportunities to introduce basic upgrades even in the planned works (e.g., identification of appropriate plant species for grassing drains side slopes, expansion joints for long brick lining sections). In addition, there is an envisaged need for capacity building on new technologies (including piped irrigation or use of alternative liners such as HDPE) which would be highly relevant for supporting the adoption in Myanmar of water saving technologies widely available in the region.
- mixed performance in carrying out routine preventive O&M of tertiary level infrastructure. The project will need to provide continued support to WUGs as key players for sustainability. As for WUGs in non-consolidated areas, farmers sharing a watercourse or a common outlet on a secondary channel need to be supported to: (i) improve on farm and off farm water management practices; (ii) consolidate demands and coordinate with IWUMD for scheduling both irrigation and maintenance; and, (iii) get access to the technologies and FARM financing for e.g.

- mobile surface pumps and drip irrigation pipes for farmers' groups with access to operational secondary channels.
- limited evidence of efforts made to foster crop diversification in the areas benefitting from Land Consolidation. This would ultimately undermine project impact in terms of increased farmers' incomes as a result of sub optimal crop rotation and management of available water during the dry season.
- successful implementation of the AWPB 2018-2019 investment plan in irrigation heavily depends on the continued availability of equipment from both construction 5 and NPT maintenance branches of IWUMD; thus, additional focus on drainage upgrading for the next AWPB will require securing a sizeable share of available equipment, mainly excavators.

**14. Component 2.1: Investing in Knowledge.** A total of 731 CIGs were formed (14,034 members of which 50% women) as of the mission out of a total target of 900 by project end (81% achievement). Landless CIGs reached 404 with CIG members receiving training and taking up entrepreneurship (e.g. in bakery, mushroom production, pig raising, other livestock, etc.). 327 Farmer CIGs have been formed and farmers received training on a number of technologies and agricultural practices through a total of 1,339 demonstration plots (89% of the overall target of 1,500) of which 360 were conducted during the period under review. Out of the 5,488 farmers trained (5,488), 2,195 farming households have benefited/adopted the technologies demonstrated by the 40 KCs, accounting for an adoption rate of 40% (against the targeted 60% by project end).

**15. Knowledge Centres (KCs).** Out of a target of 60 Knowledge Centres, 40 have been established and the remaining 20 are expected to be completed by June 2019 (procurement is at contract award stage). All established KCs are staffed with one KC manager seconded by DOA from among the extensionists at township level. Most KC managers have a diploma, while a few have a degree. All KCs are equipped with one laptop, one printer and one projector, some of which are not fully operational. Fifteen KCs out of the 40 operating are also equipped with a motorcycle. KC managers have been overall effective in mobilizing the CIGs; assisting them in the regular savings and credit operations; setting up demonstration plots and organizing field days for CIG farmer members; and, to some extent, organizing vocational training on off-farm income generating activities for CIG landless members. However, the capacity of KC managers is limited by a number of factors which are discussed under key issues.

**16. Demonstrations.** A total of 1,339 demonstrations have been undertaken till February 2019, of which 360 were conducted during the period under review. A total of 2,195 farming households have benefited/adopted the technologies demonstrated by the 40 KCs. KC managers have been implementing 1 demonstration plot per quarter on a number of technologies identified jointly with CIG framers, including good agricultural practices on a number of different crops; seed production for rice and other crops; use of agrochemicals and machinery; pest and disease control, etc. The demonstration plots, located at the farm of one of the CIG members, are visited three times during one season, through the organization of field days, led by KC managers.

**17. Component 2.2 Financing Growth.** All of the 731 CIGs have opened bank accounts and are undertaking savings and relending/credit activities. The 404 landless CIGs have savings amounting to MMK 201 million (USD 134,000[5]) and the project provided 1,138 million (USD758,666) of RBF funds. Of the 404 landless CIGs, 343 (covering 8,546 HHs) have received RBF assistance for livelihood activities and of the 327 agriculture CIGs (covering 5,488 HHs), 175 have received RBF. Savings among the CIGs are currently below its potential. Another 200 groups (120 farmers and 80 landless) are expected to be created by June this year with the establishment of the remaining 20 KCs. With a target of 900 CIGs, the project will likely overachieve the number of CIGs.

**18. Rural Business Fund (RBF).** Across 40 KCs, 518 CIGs received the RBF assistance for a total of USD 0.982 million. Landless and farming CIGs are using primarily these as revolving funds for on-lending to their members to finance a number of different micro/small enterprises as well as agricultural inputs/equipment/machineries respectively. A few of them have invested in group enterprises. Examples of investments include fertilizer trading, retail shops, hair dressing, metal works, basket making, broom making, primary food processing, mushroom production, pig rearing, machine repair, tailoring, planters, tractors/power tillers, combine harvesters, etc.

#### **19. Component 2 key issues:**

- *Capacity of KC Managers* is limited by a number of factors, including multiple demands on their time for project activities, leading to excessive workload; lack of training and capacity building in some areas that are not in their core expertise (e.g. farming as a business; financial services; brokering agreements between producers and private sector companies); and some constraints in terms of equipment availability.
- *Value chain and market linkages.* Limited results have been achieved by the KCs in areas related to commodity development, value chain upgrading, market access and fostering linkages with other value-chain actors such as suppliers, traders and processors (including the establishment of contractual arrangements such as forward contracts, contract farming and outgrower schemes); and access to financial resources through partnering with microfinance and/or rural finance institutions.
- *KC's sustainability.* MOALI is looking at the KCs as models for the provision of a range of services to farmers and off-farm micro-entrepreneurs to be replicated to other areas of the countries, including in IFAD-funded projects such as WSAP and ESAP. In this respect, it is important that MOALI reflect on how the KCs fit in the overall Ministry institutional framework at township level, to maximize the synergies with the existing financial and human resources in the township.



- *CIG Savings.* CIGs are saving on regular basis but below potential with average of MMK 2,000 per month for landless members and MMK 3,000 per month for farmers. CIG records show that average savings per CIG is less than USD 300 which is much below the expected amount of savings required to receive the RBF assistance. PCU did not enforce the savings and counterpart arrangement scheme of 25%-75%, allowing all CIGs to receive the first tranche of USD 1,500 without the required minimum USD 375 counterpart contribution by the CIGs, as well as the required USD 1,500 by the CIGs for the 40 CIGs that received the USD 2,000 second tranche.
- *CIG Membership.* The number of members per CIG at the time of the group formation is an average of 19; however, the membership has dwindled between 10-15 per CIG after some months, due to: lack of interest for some members to continue to participate and save, members do not want to borrow, CIGs with few members have merged, KC managers have difficulty facilitating group interest for individual and collective livelihood activities, among others. These manifest the weak approach carried out by the project relying on the overburdened KC managers and without the support of external expertise from NGOs and MFIs.

20. As a way forward for component 2, the following are recommended:

- *Enhanced PCU support to KCs.* In order to achieve the project's physical and financial targets, enhanced PCU support to the KCs will be required. It was agreed that: (i) PCU reviews KC assignments and workload of number of CIGs; (ii) mobilize Township level extension officers that can be deployed to support the project; and, (iii) re-train KC managers to familiarize with the tasks required in agricultural extension.
- *Farmer Field School (FFS):* Demonstrations of agricultural technologies and improved production system can act as a game changer of the farming HH in the project areas. In this connection, it was agreed that the introduction of season-long Farmer Field School (FFS) with technical assistance from FAO to implement the FFS techniques in the existing demonstration plots.
- *Formation and strengthening of CIGs:* The PCU should urgently engage service providers for formation of new and strengthening of the existing CIGs. The mission suggests that PCU finalizes the TOR and procure the service providers not later than May 2019 to provide sufficient time to implement the tasks required that will enable the PCU to deliver the sub-component targets as agreed in this mission.
- *Release of 1st tranche and matching arrangements for 2nd* For CIGs who have not received the first tranche, the RBF assistance of USD1,500 will be released irrespective of their savings in the group account, provided at least 15 members have been actively saving over the 6 months of project support. CIGs who intend to avail of the second tranche as relending for the group members should have at least 15 members continuing to save and generate savings above the USD500 per CIG, incremental savings will be matched with 1:3 ratio by the project.

[1] The balance is geared to cover possible variation orders, up to 10% of the contract sum.

[2] Indirect costs by Government estimated as 22% of total cost of irrigation works

[3] The reported outreach of 914HH needs to be corrected for double counting of farmers having land on contiguous blocks of land consolidated areas.

[4] The original target of 165 WUGs was reduced by the mission to 100 to re-align with the revised scope of works at MTR and with the average WUG membership; there is no legal framework for WUG formal registration

[5] 1 USD to 1,500 MMK

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Overview and Project Progress</b>		
<b>Engage service provider for CIG formation and strengthening</b>  Finalize the TOR and procure the service providers for strengthening of existing CIGs and formation of new CIGs	PCU	05/2019
<b>Partner with FAO for FFS</b>  The project will partner with FAO to finance the adoption of full FFS methodology for the KC managers in the project areas; demonstration plots will be used as training grounds for the FFS ToT. Other extensionists from the townships within the FARM, WSAP and ESAP project areas may participate;	PCU/DOA	10/2019

## E. Project implementation

### a. Development Effectiveness

#### Effectiveness and Developmental Focus

Effectiveness	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 4
---------------	-----------	--------------------

#### Justification of rating

Following the adjustments of the targets at MTR, there is significant accomplishment of outputs in component 1 and component 2, thanks to improved and more proactive project management. There is a strong likelihood that most of the outputs will be achieved by end of project. Reporting of outcome achievements is limited as no outcome survey was conducted during this period.

Some key outcome indicators (i.e. the increase in net income per acre) were not measured, although data from the demonstration plots show profit rates between 50-100%. Benefits for landless households from improved livelihood opportunities were shared during the field interactions, however these accounts are not systematically captured by project. More attention should be given on measuring and reporting the outcomes achieved.

#### Log-Frame Analysis & Main Issues of Effectiveness

There were changes introduced at MTR in the project logical framework (logframe) that reduced the appraisal targets. Total project outreach has been reduced to 34,000 hhs from an appraisal target of around 59,000 hhs.

The overall goal of the project is to improve the economic status of poor rural women and men in the project area. Its development objective is to increase the incomes of smallholder and landless households. The specific indicators of the DO are:

- 60% of farming beneficiary HHs with increased net income of USD 400/annum in real terms;
- 40% of landless households with increased average food expenditure of USD20/month

There was a baseline study conducted by Network Activities Group (NAG) in 2017 which showed that out of the total 4,485 households in 20 sampled villages 270 hhs are classified as Better-off (6%), 1036 hhs as Moderate households (23%), 1036 hhs as Poor (23%) and 1710 hhs as Very Poor (38%). At MTR, it was reported that of the total households reached 20% are very poor, 50% are poor and 30% are moderate and better-off households. Since there was no outcome survey conducted during the review period, it was assumed that the same percentage of socio-economic categorization of the households reached by project remains as is.

Progress: There are some anecdotal increases in incomes among farming and landless households due to project investments; however, these narratives could not be ascertained as there was no outcome survey conducted and the profiles of CIG members are not updated; thus, the mission refrained from reporting outcome figures. It was agreed during the mission that proper profiling, to include financial matters of CIGs and WUGs, be reported in the upcoming supervision mission. From the profiling, component outcomes can be reported in the next mission. Increase in net income and food expenditure will be covered through a systematic outcome survey towards the end of the project.

Progress as to outputs per component has already been reported on Section D.

#### Development Focus

Targeting and Outreach	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 4
------------------------	-----------	--------------------

#### Justification of rating

Project targeting follows the design. Those covered in the CIGs and WUGs are farmers and landless households residing within the targeted townships and within the coverage of the KCs. Based on the review of project documents and field validation, project services reached 15,554 households through the CIGs and WUGs or 46% of the revised target of 34,000 households. Apparently, there is reduction of outreach as compared to MTR (52% of the revised targets), but the project is more confident with the current number as it is backed by records. Outreach as of mission lags behind the project time elapse calculated at 66%.

#### Main issues

The main issue is the actual capacity of the project to reach the targeted number of households and individuals. The project is tracking those directly served by project, but not those other households in the project areas that indirectly

benefit from the project. In the revised logframe, outreach is calculated at 34,000 households. At mission, households reached through CIGs and irrigation development are only 15,554 or 46% of the total target. As projected, about 20,000 households will be provided with direct services (17,000 from 900 CIGs and 3,000 from irrigation development). The remaining 14,000 households are expected to be covered by services of the KCs; however, this is not tracked by project as of yet. The project needs to define the indirect beneficiaries (e.g. those benefitting from demonstration plots, from training like FFS, from use of the learning materials at the KCs) and start tracing them. It is expected that in the next supervision mission, number of indirect beneficiaries will be reported.

It is estimated that around 56,000 households (31,000 farming households and 25,000 landless households) reside in the target areas. Currently, of the total 15,554 households directly served by the project, 7,008 are farming households while 8,546 are landless households which is not reflective of the ratio between farming and landless farmers households in the project area. However as pointed out at MTR irrigation and land consolidation cost has limited the number of hectareage covered and thus lowering the number of farmers reached. With FFS to be implemented with FAO support, it is expected that farmers outreach will increase.

At design, project target group consists of 61% of households that are below the poverty line, 21% of which are vulnerable (to prevent them from slipping into poverty); and the 18% who are better off (under the inclusive targeting policy). The baseline study of NAG corroborated the design estimation as the study showed that 61% are poor and very poor while 23% are in moderate socio-economic status and 6% are better off. As there is limited number of households in the project sites, it is expected that project beneficiaries in the poor category will not go beyond 70% (or 23,912 of 34,160 which is 61% of 56,000).

The project is reaching equal percentage of men and women in CIGs. Overall 50% of the 14,034 CIG members are women (29% in 327 farmer CIGs, 63% in 404 landless CIGs). Youth participation is not consistently tracked in the project, thus, there are no youth data available.

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Development Effectiveness</b>		
<b>Tracking indirect beneficiaries</b>  Prepare a guide to account project's beneficiaries and start tracking them the soonest	PCU and KC staff	04/2019

#### **Gender equality & women's participation**

**Rating: 4**

**Previous rating: 4**

#### **Justification of rating**

Women participation in CIGs comes naturally without purposive intervention from the project. Women constitute 50% of the 14,034 CIG members, 29% in 327 farmer CIGs, 63% in 404 landless CIGs. Livelihood activities attract more women participation, but less in farming related activities and in WUGs. It was also observed that women members of landless CIGs are more vocal compared to the men.

#### **Main issues**

There is a need for the project to go beyond gender disaggregation in organization membership and training. The project needs to track women empowerment and inclusion in the leadership positions and economic activities supported by the project and the benefits they received. The current CDGS should prepare a gender action plan, specifically on women empowerment activities, for the next 21 months to address the issues of women (i) economic empowerment, (ii) equal voice and influence in CIGs and WUGs, and (iii) sharing of economic and social benefits resulting from participation in CIGs and WUGs.

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Development Effectiveness</b>		
<b>Women empowerment activities</b>  Identify gender related activities such as gender sensitivity training for CIG and WUG leaders (including PCU/KC staff); documentation of gender best practices for replication and dissemination within the project and others	CDGS	03/2019

<b>Agricultural Productivity</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>	<b>Previous rating: 5</b>
----------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

#### Justification of rating

Farmers met by the mission widely reported that investments in irrigation infrastructure are contributing to increasing productivity of the rice crops. However, such increases are supported only by anecdotal evidence. No quantitative assessments of yield increases arising both from investments in infrastructure as well as arising through demonstrations have been carried out since MTR. Furthermore, there is limited evidence of crop diversification.

#### Main issues

Potential gains in agricultural productivity may still be achieved by the project if investments in land consolidation are complemented by targeted supports for concerned farmers to develop appropriate cropping calendars and rotation schedules to sustain 300% crop intensity across the areas with access to irrigation water during the dry season. This will be addressed through the FFS.

Yield and cropping intensity increase (as well as reduction in crop losses due to improved drainage facilities supported by FARM) shall be properly quantified in the Outcome Survey to be undertaken prior to project completion.

<b>Nutrition</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
------------------	----------------

<b>Adaptation to Climate Change</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>	<b>Previous rating: 4</b>
-------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

#### Justification of rating

FARM investments in irrigation infrastructure directly contribute to adaptation to climate change as they: (i) provide additional opportunities for supplementary irrigation (main channel lining); (ii) reduce the flood risk (improved drainage capacity); and (iii) diversify crops (land consolidation). So far, the project has not fully capitalized on such investments, particularly in relation to crop diversification and shift to less water demanding crops. On the other hand, the planned implementation for improving drainage in areas prone to water logging has a great potential to support farmers' adaptation to climate change, in light of increasing rainfall intensities and risk of flooding. FFS with climate-smart agriculture curricula developed by FAO will greatly contribute in this respect.

<i>Agreed Action</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Agreed Date</i>
<b>Development Effectiveness</b>		
<b>Additional Engineering Services</b>  Strip survey for the design of drainage upgrading works to be implemented in 2019-20	IWUMD/NAIE	06/2019

## b. Sustainability and Scaling up

<b>Institutions and Policy Engagement</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>
---	------------------

#### Justification of rating

While the project does not have a specific focus on policy engagement (hence Institutions and Policy Engagement was not rated at MTR), some project activities have been effective at highlighting relevant areas of focus for policy makers. These include: i) formal mechanisms to support land consolidation requiring the agreement of a set majority of land owners; ii) formalization of groups (CIGs and WUAs); iii) discrepancies between previously issued land titles and cadastral surveys' findings; iv) re-assessment of the potentials of the KC model beyond its function as platform for agricultural extension; and v) the role of savings and credit groups for financial literacy and financial inclusion.

#### Main issues

Relevant learnings from FARM may not only inform the implementation of other IFAD financed projects in Myanmar (ESAP and WSAP) and in the region, but also union level policy making. However, relevant experiences are not systematically documented in the project reports. There is a pressing need to capture FARM's lessons to inform the implementation of ESAP and WSAP as well as, more broadly, to contribute to policies and programmes of the MOALI.

Agreed action related to policy engagement is included under the KM section.

<b>Partnership-building</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>	<b>Previous rating: 5</b>
-----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

#### Justification of rating

At MTR the KCs showed some promising dynamism in terms of partnering with private sector (e.g. 17 input suppliers undertaking 137 demonstration plots and related training courses at KCs for 4598 farmers; eight companies engaging some 457 farmers, serviced by the KCs, in contract farming; and four MFIs providing financial services to members of about 14 KCs). Unfortunately, very few of these partnerships were reported as ongoing. The main factor affecting this the capacity of the KC managers to properly support and facilitate the continuity of contracts.

#### Main issues

The limited capacity of KC managers to broker and facilitate such partnerships, coupled with the lack of support from the PCU due to the vacant position of Value Chain Specialist, largely explain the limited success in this area. It should further be noted that the service provider that was supposed to be supporting the KCs in this area have never been recruited by the project.

<b>Human and Social Capital and Empowerment</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>	<b>Previous rating: 5</b>
---	------------------	---------------------------

#### Justification of rating

CIGs (farming and landless groups) have started their savings and relented them to their members. Some groups have also started individual and group enterprises. While, there are signs of CIG members improving on their confidence, there is a need to improve the savings generation and strengthening of these groups. The WUGs have been formed only in the areas where Land Consolidation has been completed, implying major changes on water management at tertiary level. However, there are signs of mixed performance in carrying out routine preventive O&M in these areas and the project will need to provide continued support to WUGs as key players for sustainability.

#### Main issues

The long tradition of reliance on government support for maintenance (including tertiary level infrastructure) is hard to change and the progressive taking over of O&M responsibility up to secondary level remains a major challenge throughout Myanmar, also in light of the marginal incomes from the rice crops. The recently issued Participatory Irrigation Management manual for Myanmar developed with JICA support is a useful reference for forming WUGs, yet the consolidation of WUGs sharing a secondary channel into a formally registered WUA remains an activity that the context of FARM may be implemented only at a pilot level.

Another issue is related to the savings generation of CIGs and their relending policies. This is discussed under the section on exit strategy.

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Sustainability and Scaling Up</b>		
<b>WUGs in Land Consolidation areas</b>  WUGs in new Land Consolidation areas (1142 acres) formed and trained	PCU/IWUMD	10/2019
<b>Piloting WUA</b>  1 Pilot WUA established and trained (consolidated and non-consolidated areas)	1 Pilot WUA established and trained (consolidated and non-consolidated areas)	10/2020

<b>Quality of Beneficiary Participation</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>	<b>Previous rating: 4</b>
---	------------------	---------------------------

#### Justification of rating

Farmers participating in the PLUP process for Land Consolidation have actively participated and contributed to the design (e.g by identifying farm roads that would be used as inter-village connections), often resulting in the request for additional crossing structures that were subsequently included in the scope of works by IWUMD. The establishment of PICs is also deemed effective at increasing awareness and beneficiaries' ownership. PICs exercise their role in actual daily supervision of the works by appointing a member-on-duty for the day on a rotational basis. CIG members also were also active during the discussions in the field visits sharing their participation in the project. However, their contribution in terms of savings generation is far behind what was envisaged at design.

#### Main issues

The PLUP process failed to be conclusive in some areas in which the lack of cooperation by few farmers with easy access to the existing irrigation channels hampered the implementation of works on surrounding areas. Additional issues were experienced at the initial stages of the PLUP processes for land consolidation in the cases of major discrepancies between previously issued land titles and the updated cadastral survey, also resulting in some areas failing to reach the necessary consensus to proceed to land consolidation. Savings generation among CIGs is discussed under exit strategy.

#### Responsiveness of Service Providers

Rating: 5

Previous rating: 4

#### Justification of rating

The performance of IWUMD in carrying out designs, survey and construction works, securing technical capacity and own equipment has resulted in the successful implementation of irrigation works during the mini-budget period (April to September 2018) and in the considerable progress observed by the mission on the implementation of the 2018-19 irrigation investment plan to an unprecedented level of USD 3.5 million.

#### Main issues

The successful implementation of the AWPB 2018-19 investment plan in irrigation heavily depends on the continued availability of equipment from both construction 5 and NPT maintenance branches of IWUMD. While the indicative plan of USD 3.2 million is 91% of the plan currently being successfully implemented, the additional focus on drainage upgrading for the next AWPB will require securing a sizeable share of available equipment, mainly excavators.

<i>Agreed Action</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Agreed Date</i>
<b>Sustainability and Scaling Up</b>		
<b>Timely Completion of ongoing irrigation works by IWUMD</b> Completion of all works under the 2018-19 irrigation construction programme	IWUMD	05/2019
<b>Contracting IWUMD for 2019-20</b> Contract will include completion of PLUP process and the design of the irrigation construction programme	PLUP Team/IWUMD designers / NAIE/ WUGS	10/2019

#### Environment and Natural Resource Management

Rating: 5

Previous rating: 5

#### Justification of rating

Land consolidation works are designed to improve control of the water flow in the irrigated basins and may result in a number of environmental benefits including (i) increases in field level irrigation efficiencies; (ii) better control over the use of nutrients and pesticides; and (iii) reduced greenhouse (methane) emission (with regard to the practice of alternating submergence and drying of the rice basins). This was confirmed through multiple meetings with beneficiaries. Lining of primary and secondary channels does substantially reduce conveyance losses and improve overall irrigation efficiency.

#### Main issues

Many environmental benefits attributable to land consolidation heavily depend on the accuracy of levelling. The project has finally taken action to secure laser-controlled levellers to AMD to be used already in the areas where land consolidation works are ongoing. This calls for timely finalization of procurement and training of machine operators.

Concrete data and systemic analysis of the benefits of irrigation investments are not yet available. At this stage, the setup

of trial plots in land consolidation area to monitor impacts under controlled variables would not generate useful information at completion, hence most impacts will be assessed on a recall basis. For the case of the improved conveyance from main channel lining a water balance study can be still carried out.

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Sustainability and Scaling Up</b>		
<b>Precision Levelling</b>  Deliver Laser levelling equipment to AMD for Land Consolidation	IWUMD/AMD	04/2019
<b>Additional Engineering Services (2)</b>  Hydraulic assessment of Paunglaung channel sections (H-Q curves) to quantify improved conveyance	IWUMD/NAIE	06/2019

<b>Exit Strategy</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>	<b>Previous rating: 4</b>
----------------------	------------------	---------------------------

#### Justification of rating

Though there is no clear exit strategy by the project, there are indications of project continuity as the following have been instituted: (i) project leadership by the DOA; (ii) project's activities are mainstreamed into the MoALI's annual workplan and budget, (iii) KC managers are Ministry extension officers, and (iv) key features of the ESAP and WSAP design are scaling up of FARM investments. However, there are a number of issues which include the continuity of CIGs as savings and credit groups and in market linkages with their agricultural products; the need for WUGs to federate as an association to get registration from the government; the role of WUGs in assuring the O&M of the irrigation schemes; and the sustainability of KCs as providers of extension and advisory services.

#### Main issues

As the project is past MTR, it should start consolidating its experience and identify appropriate exit strategies especially on strengthening the KC centers, CIGs and WUGs. The issues are extensively discussed under the Component 2 section, Project Progress.

<b>Potential for Scaling-up</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>	<b>Previous rating: 6</b>
---------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

#### Justification of rating

The plot-to-plot irrigation system is still prevalent in Myanmar's irrigated lowlands. To this effect, the potential for scaling up of land consolidation is very high, yet hampered by several factors including: i) high investment costs; ii) difficult social mobilization; and iii) weak policy framework. The need to improve conveyance efficiency in primary and secondary irrigation channels is also widespread and capital intensive, yet some opportunities for applying alternative lining technologies remain untapped and still need to be supported through capacity building.

#### Main issues

Relevant learnings from FARM may not only inform the implementation of other IFAD financed projects in Myanmar which already provide opportunities for scaling up some the interventions implemented under FARM, but other development players as well. In this context more efforts shall be put into documenting and eventually revising the approaches implemented under FARM, e.g. through a dedicated inter-agency workshop (see section on "Knowledge Management").

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Sustainability and Scaling Up</b>		
<b>Capacity building for Irrigation upgrading</b>  Capacity building activities for MOALI staff ready for implementation (both for 2018-2019 and for 2019-20 AWPB)	PD/IWUMD/NAIE	07/2019

## c. Project Management



<b>Quality of Project Management</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>	<b>Previous rating: 4</b>
--------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

### Justification of rating

The NPSC and the PWC have been functioning, but limited to providing guidance in the preparation for the upcoming missions and in selection of staff. During this period, project management created two positions (both seconded from MOALI), a project management officer directly reporting to the project director) and a KC supervisor to coordinate KC activities. Though there was progress in accomplishing targets during the period under review, guidance and technical support to KCs needs improvement. High staff turnover, especially among contracted staff, poses a risk to seriously jeopardize project implementation.

### Main issues

There is high staff turnover for both government designated and contracted staff which has severely affected continuity of operations and delivery of targets. On average, PCU staff have been in the Project for six months, with only a few for a year or more. Government staff are assigned to the project up to 30 October 2020 but the hired staff are engaged on short-term contracts. Short contract duration for hired staff is a disincentive for continuity. With 21 months left to implement the project, it is compelling that management ensures continuity of hired project staff by extending the contracts of well performing staff up to end of project. This is critical to avoid: (i) gaps in key PMU positions; (ii) institutional memory losses in project direction, processes, and procedures, (iii) delays in project implementation. Averaging two years of assignment in the project, KC managers have exhibited better understanding of field level operations mainly gained from their involvement with the project.

At PCU level, knowledge of project processes and operating procedures is variable due to high turnover of staff. Staff have expressed the need for a uniform project orientation and regular meetings involving both PCU and KC level staff, and proper turnover for staff leaving the project. PCU is advised to conduct a regular general staff meeting to review targets, processes and procedures for the remaining project duration. General meeting should also be scheduled regularly. Job descriptions for both existing and new staff needs review and fine tuning to ensure clarity of individual targets and deliverables in the remaining project period.

KC managers have multiple functions: (i) administering the KC building; (ii) assisting the CIGs (provision of agricultural/livestock extension services, providing recordkeeping training, linking with technology providers and markets, facilitating meetings, monitoring CIG growth of their savings generation and livelihood implementation); and (iii) project data/information collection and reporting. PCU guidance and logistical support are obviously needed as also pointed out at MTR, however, PCU staff presence is hardly felt on the ground due to: (i) fast turnover of PCU staff, (ii) mobility inadequacies (only two vehicles and two motorcycles provided to PCU for field work and absence of travel expenses). It is recommended that the project rationalizes the use of project vehicles at the PCU level and provide field travel expenses to PCU staff.

Fifteen (15) KC managers were provided with motorcycles purchased with project funds while 25 use their personal motorcycles. Forty (40) KC managers were also provided with laptops, but most of these are either non-functional or have some functionality problems. As KC managers are critical in delivering the project targets, it is recommended, subject to availability of funds, that PCU replaces non-functional laptops and provide motorcycles to the 25 existing KC managers and the forthcoming 20 KC managers.

As the project is left only with 21 months of implementation PCU is advised to undertake an assessment of staff performance and capacity, gaps and needs in order to rationalize the staffing requirements and deployment and the required support at management level.



<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Project Management</b>		
<b>Competency assessment and capacity building to Project staff</b> Conduct a quick competency assessment of the PCU and KC staff vis-à-vis the requirements of a more focused project strategy and provide training to them using grant funds	PCU staff/KC managers	03/2019
<b>Job descriptions formulation and review</b> Prepare job descriptions for new positions at PCU and review the job descriptions of existing staff	PD/PM/PMSO	04/2019
<b>Extending terms of contract</b> Review and adjust the terms of contracts of PCU staff in the light of extending duration of service up to end of project	PD/PM/PMSO	04/2019
<b>Unified orientation to Project staff</b> Conduct a unified orientation to all project staff (PCU, KC) to reflect changes in the project logframe and strategies	Project management	04/2019
<b>Provision of sufficient logistical support to Project staff</b> Provide PCU and KC staff with logistical support (laptops, motorcycles, travel expenses)	PD/PM/PMSO	05/2019
<b>Hiring of VC specialist</b> Recruit immediately a VC Specialist with knowledge and experience in brokering partnerships between farmers and other value chain actors	PCU	06/2019

## Knowledge Management

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 4

### Justification of rating

KM has strong potential for FARM. The project has initiatives that should be documented and shared, such as (i) knowledge center establishment and management as a model for the provision of extension and advisory services; (ii) land consolidation processes, benefits, issues and challenges, (iii) WUG formation and management leading towards formation of water user association, (vi) savings and credit groups formation and strengthening. Lessons learned from this project can directly feed into ESAP and WSAP, as well as, more broadly, contribute to policy engagement at MOALI level.

### Main issues

There is no staff assigned to capture the processes and experiences in FARM. Current PCU staff has limited capacity and no incentives to document and package the initiatives FARM is undertaking. Together with ESAP and WSAP, it is recommended that the project, with technical support from ESAP project management advisor, conduct case studies of the above-mentioned FARM initiatives. The result of the studies should be shared in a learning session with the ESAP and WSAP management and staff and with MOALI management, particularly those departments involved in implementing the FARM project, ESAP and WSAP

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Project Management</b>		
<b>Conduct case studies of FARM initiatives</b> Prepare case studies of innovations/good practices by FARM: KC, WUG, CIG, Land Consolidation. and organize knowledge sharing sessions with upcoming IFAD supported projects (ESAP, WSAP).	Project Management	06/2019

#### **Value for Money**

**Rating: 4**

**Previous rating: 4**

#### **Justification of rating**

Many project activities have suffered delays, but they are now gradually catching up. Outreach is at about 45%, with slightly more than 50% of disbursements and 66% of the implementation period elapsed. The analysis of cost ratio of inputs to outcomes is overall moderately satisfactory and improving, although the key indicators at outcome (and project objective) level, i.e. measures of income per household reached and/or per acre, are not reported by the project monitoring system.

#### **Main issues**

The analysis by component shows for component 1 achievements of outcomes between 50-60%, with expenditures at about 60%. Similarly, output achievements are at 50% or above. Overall, cost-efficiency of infrastructure investment is satisfactory, being undertaken on 'force account' through the irrigation department, at lower costs than prevailing market rates.

For component 2, expenditures are at 26%. Measured outputs show relatively satisfactory achievements, above 50% and, in some cases around 80%. Nevertheless, on one side some outputs have been reviewed (and reduced) at MTR and the related activities (e.g. CRBF and RBF) have been cancelled and on another side key outcomes in terms of increased productivity and incomes are not measured. Observations and analysis in the field, though, shows that outputs under component 2 may translate only partially into the expected outcomes. This is due to the limited capacity (and effectiveness) by the project to deliver the required capacity building investment (extension, training and coaching of group members in linking to markets and financial services, etc.) with the necessary quality to accompany the hardware investment (irrigation infrastructure). With relatively important unit investment costs in irrigation infrastructure (USD 1600/acre), intensification, diversification and increased market integration are essential to reap the benefits of such investment and increase the value for money. Hence the importance of recruiting the expertise of service providers (for CIGs and FFS) to support the KC managers in deepening their advisory services to the target beneficiaries. This will eventually allow to maximize the overall impact with a relatively modest (but critical) investment of resources, to ensure best use of resources to achieve the goal of the project.

#### **Coherence between AWPB and Implementation**

**Rating: 5**

**Previous rating: 3**

#### **Justification of rating**

Contrary to previous years, in the two latest AWPBs (minibudget for April-September 2018 and AWPB 2018-19) investments in all components have been fully on track with AWPB targets. There is also an improvement in tracking the key outputs in the AWPB. The increase in physical and financial performance during this period is notable. The project's system of monitoring physical progress and financial progress needs to be improved however.

#### **AWPB Inputs and Outputs Review and Implementation Progress**

There were two AWPBs submitted to and provided with no objection by IFAD during the 2018-2019 period to align with the changes in the fiscal year of the Myanmar government. The first AWPB covered the period April – September 2018. The second AWPB is aligned with the new fiscal year of the Myanmar government (October 2018-September 2019). These two AWPBs reflect the reduction of targets suggested at MTR. With the findings of this mission on project strategies, it is recommended that immediately after the mission, the project reviews and adjust its October 2018-September 2019 AWPB to reflect the agreements reached in this mission.

As envisaged, the project AWPB shall emanate from KC AWPBs, however, the mission could not ascertain if KC AWPBs were prepared. For this period, it is recommended that each KC will come up with an action plan which includes concrete outputs based on the adjusted October 2018- September 2019 AWPB. This will be the basis for assessing the performance of each KC manager, and planning for the period October 2019-September 2020

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Project Management</b>		
<b>Adjustment of current AWPB</b>  Adjust the October 2018-September 2019 AWPB reflecting the agreed actions of this mission (with no objection from IFAD), and require each KC to prepare an action plan based on the adjusted AWPB	PCU staff/KC managers	04/2019

<b>Performance of M&amp;E System</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>	<b>Previous rating: 3</b>
--------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

#### Justification of rating

Reporting of progress and outputs has improved for the period in review. For this mission, the PCU presented physical accomplishment and disbursements per component in 2018 as well as cumulative data of accomplishment of key component outputs against the MTR targets. Data presented at the activity and output level bears inconsistencies due to absence of consolidated project data base. Outcome reporting for the report period cannot be ascertained without the outcome survey.

#### M&E System Review

The M&E specialist position was vacant from March to September 2018. In October 2018, the project seconded a DOA staff to act as project's M&E specialist. This staff received limited training through a training from an EU project with MOALI. The current project manager officer who is undergoing an IFAD M&E supported training is backstopping the M&E staff. Considering the M&E requirements for this project, it was agreed that the project continue the process of hiring the M&E specialist from the market and the current M&E staff be designated as assistant to the M&E specialist.

Monitoring of project progress at the KC is through the KC managers. Monitoring data are consolidated and summarized by the M&E specialist but the analytical process in linking the data/information gathered relation to the strategies and activities planned is missing. Other specialists also maintain data separately which are not loaded to a common database resulting in data inconsistency and duplication in accounting for project reach. It was agreed that the project establish a consolidated excel-based database system.

Submission of monthly report is not timely and verification of data is also not undertaken. This puts into question the reliability of data. The mission suggest that data collection and reporting can be delegated to KC assistants (after proper training) and functional laptops be provided.

Project needs to improve its evaluation system. A baseline study was prepared prior to project design, but this was not used during implementation. Another baseline study was conducted in 2017 by NAG, but results were not still reflected at MTR or referred to in the annual outcome report submitted during MTR. During the mission a review of the logframe was conducted and adjusted accordingly. The project is working on incorporating the results of the 2017 baseline study in the logframe, and envisaged that the results will be used in the next reporting period.

The project recently supported the initiative of EU/GOPA for evaluation of FARM project which started in September of 2018 and ended in January 2019. Results of this exercise are still to be finalized. It is recommended that future outcome study should refer to the revised logframe and be conducted at end of project as part of the project completion review (PCR) exercise.

To improve data collection and consistency of information, determine the exact number of project reach, and monitor emerging outcomes, it is recommended that the project profiles all organized CIGs and WUGs (including the soon to be organized CIGs and WUGs in the new 20 KCs) with data to be updated on a quarterly basis. The M&E specialist should prepare the format with inputs from other PCU specialists (e.g. CDG Specialist, WUG specialist, On Farm specialist, Rural Finance specialist).

It is also recommended that the project prepares an instrument to assess the organizational, financial, and entrepreneurial capacities of the groups which will guide the KC managers and specialists in providing appropriate interventions to these groups. The CDG specialist should lead in developing the instrument that will assess the maturity of the CIGs while the WUG specialist on the maturity of the WUGs.

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Project Management</b>		
<b>Profiling CIG/WUG</b> Prepare a profile for each CIG and WUG which will be updated on quarterly basis (excel form) which can be consolidated at the KC, Township and Project levels, and prepare simple maturity assessment of CIGs and WUGs	M&E Officer with PCU specialists/ KC Manager	04/2019
<b>Hiring of M&amp;E Specialist</b> Hire an M&E specialist (knowledgeable on Excel program) from the market. Include in his ToR to establish a one project database system	Project management	04/2019
<b>Outcome study</b> Conduct an outcome survey before the end of the project (December 2020)	PCU	10/2020

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

**Rating:**

#### **d. Financial Management & Execution**

##### **Disbursement by financier**

<b>Type</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Current Amount</b>	<b>Disbursed Amount</b>	<b>Actual Rate</b>
<b>Domestic Financing breakdown</b>	Beneficiaries	\$621,271		
	Private sector local	\$2,402,435		
	National Government	\$5,296,549		

**Acceptable Disbursement Rate**

**Rating: 3**

**Previous rating: 3**

##### **Justification of rating**

The project is on its 5th year of implementation with disbursement from the loan at 52 %, including the initial advance. The actual expenditure including the liabilities of USD 0.6 million and WAs not yet claimed from IFAD of USD 1.1 million is around 62%. The disbursement percentage for the grant, including the initial advance, is 48%. No WAs pending to be claimed nor liabilities have been reported for the grant.

##### **Main issues**

Lengthy procedures, cumbersome funds flow, and frequent turnover of Project staff affected the disbursement of project funds. Actions are discussed in the financial management section.

##### **Fiduciary Aspects**

**Quality of Financial Management**

**Rating: 3**

**Previous rating: 3**

##### **Justification of rating**

Shortcomings in the financial management of the project exist and have negatively affected implementation. With the new Finance Manager on board prompt resolution is likely to happen during this fiscal year.

## Main issues

During the mission, it was observed that the newly recruited Finance Manager was carrying out her responsibilities without proper handover and training. Her contractual situation and her permanence in the project were unclear during the mission.

Long-standing issues related to FM remain unsolved, the main one is the use and customization of the purchased accounting software, which together with the high turnover in the FM staffing is likely to remain unsolved until the end of the project if not acted upon. Mission recommends that the PCU coordinates with UNOPS to clarify the handover that UNOPS did to the project in respect to the accounting software and once the new Finance Manager is on board IFAD will provide technical support in customizing the software for the needs of the project.

The AWPBs preparation didn't consider an accurate understanding of the financial position of the project. The changes in the exchange rate between SDR and USD wasn't considered in the projections. Also, the difficulties in obtaining accurate reports due to the manual accounting environment led to misunderstandings during the discussions on physical and financial progress. The mission supported the project in obtaining the availability of funds, which at 16 March 2019 are approximately 8.5 million USD. The mission recommends to use this figure in the planning of activities until completion date.

The funds flow arrangements of the project is overly complex. Transfers from Other Accounts (OA) to Ministry Accounts (MD) for the release of payments hamper the implementation. Also, in practice the Minister's Office of MoALI approves project payments but with the PCU staff limited to preparing documentation for approval by the Minister's office. The Project Director's role to make operational decisions that are necessary in carrying out responsive management support to field operations has been diminished (e.g., approval of activities with corresponding approved budgets, reimbursement of justified expenses by staff, type of goods to be purchased, communication budget for field staff, etc.). PCU has shown evidence that some of the payments prepared by the PCU finance unit and endorsed by the Project Director have been arbitrarily modified, affecting the amount and purpose of the expense and in contradiction to the implementation budget line that the PCU must maintain in accordance with the approved AWPB .

This bottleneck affects the implementation of the project and is one of the causes of high turnover of project hired staff manifested in the resignation of the Finance Manager during the mission. The mission recommends to resolve these issues within MOALI and DOA and find a better arrangement to empower and make the PCU responsible and accountable for the management of project funds.

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Financial Management &amp; Execution</b>		
<b>Revise the FM manual to expedite the payment processes</b>	FARM	04/2019
<b>Customization and utilization of the purchased accounting software</b> Customization and utilization of the purchased accounting software. This can be done by establishing a cut-off date of financial reporting. PCU to coordinate with UNOPS for the copy of the accounting software. IFAD will provide technical support to customize the software for the project	FARM	04/2019
<b>Prepare monthly reports of availability of funds for decision making and preparation of the AWPB</b>	FARM	
<b>Update and monitoring of the fixed asset inventory</b>	FARM	

**Quality and Timeliness of Audit**

**Rating: 4**

**Previous rating: 3**

## Justification of rating

The audit report was submitted late and incomplete. The Financial Statements were submitted after the audit report.

## Main issues

The audit report was submitted two months after the due date. Due to an oversight, the Financial Statements were

submitted only in March 2019. The auditor is not complying with standards acceptable to IFAD (not ISSAI, ISA, or a National standard). The Auditor is not following the IFAD Handbook for Financial Reporting and Auditing. The Financial Statements need to include Sources and Uses of Funds Statement and the Statement on Fixed Assets.

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Financial Management &amp; Execution</b>		
<b>The project to comply with IFAD Handbook for Financial Reporting and Auditing</b>	FARM	
<b>The auditor needs to comply progressively with International Standards on Auditing</b>	FARM	
<b>The Financial Statements need to include Sources and Uses of Funds Statement and the Statement on Fixed Assets.</b>	FARM	

#### Counterparts Funds

Rating: 5

Previous rating: 4

#### Justification of rating

As per the amendment of the Financing Agreement of February 2018, the Government counterpart funding comprises: (i) Machinery for works under Component 1; and (ii) Government staff salaries. Of the total 59 staff currently working for the project, 83% is from the Government. Considering the progress of the irrigation work and the works that will be completed at the end of the current AWPB, a cumulative of 1.6 million USD can be calculated as counterpart funding. An additional USD 1 million will need to be considered for the implementation of the AWPB 2019 – 2020, if the investment plan of USD 3.2 million is achieved.

#### Main issues

There is a need to improve the reporting mechanism of the Government counterpart, the private sector and beneficiary contributions as they are not currently maintained properly. The project is calculating the Government contribution based on the official letters of salary being paid to Government staff assigned to the project. The statement of cost for use of construction equipment is provided by the IWUMD. The contribution of the private sector is calculated based on amounts reported by the KC Managers and the staff of the private sector. Contribution for rural business fund based on the business proposal at the beginning of the project instead of actual expenses incurred and manpower used. Farmer's contribution is calculated based on an estimate of contribution provided by the farmers after harvesting, and steering committee meetings.

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Financial Management &amp; Execution</b>		
<b>The project should develop a system of recording total expenditures funded Government, beneficiaries and the private sector systematically</b>	FARM	

#### Compliance with Loan Covenants

Rating: 5

Previous rating: 3

#### Justification of rating

In general, the project is compliant with most covenants that have become due. Limited compliance with some covenants (Schedule 1, Para 13 – formation of grievance committee; and Schedule 3, Para 4 – provision of support to project beneficiaries, farming and landless households to obtain proper identification documents to meet the requirements of financial institutions) do not significantly affect project implementation or violate IFAD's statutory requirements.

#### Procurement

#### Procurement

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

#### Justification of rating

Though procurement has moved after MTR especially those related to works and goods, there are still procurement of works, goods and services in the 2018 mini budget unmoved. Procurement of the KC Center started without IFAD NO at the time of publication of the invitation to bid. Further, contract management remains weak.

## Procurement Review

Procurement is hindered mainly by poor planning and to some extent non-observance of required processes as stipulated in the LTB (e.g. IFAD no objection requirement).

The mission noted that procurement of land development contracts has moved. However, procurement of such contracts remained significantly delayed in relation to the project design timelines. After the MTR, the mission noted that 2 land consolidation and 1 cadastral irrigation system improvement works contracts were procured. No significant procurement was undertaken under the Procurement Plan for the 2018 mini budget for the period April-September 2018. Procurement of land development resumed in November 2018 to February 2019. Since the Project Completion Date will be on 31 December 2020, the PCU is strongly urged to prioritize procurement of remaining civil works.

Procurement is likewise hampered by poor planning. Procurement packages for works and goods identified as early as the 2017-2018 Procurement Plan have been successively moved unprocured to the current 2018-2019 Procurement Plan. The contract packages for the purchase of drone and GIS software and GPS have been repeatedly carried over from the 2017-2018 procurement plan, 2018 minibudget procurement plan and remain unprocured under the current 2018-2019 procurement plan due to failure of the project to finalize the technical specifications. Also, the procurement of pick-up trucks under the 2018-2019 Procurement Plan has not commenced due to delays in finalizing the technical specifications.

As part of procurement planning, the reasons for unsuccessful procurement should be identified so that tender requirements may be readjusted to reflect available market sources while ensuring competition among prospective offerors. Market scanning of qualified potential contractors, suppliers or consultants should be conducted before initiating procurement activities. Aside from publication in a newspaper, procurement may then be targeted by sending invitations to bid to these qualified potential bidders to increase the possibility of successful procurement.

Mentoring during the mission was provided to the newly hired Procurement Specialist who was requested to update the 2018-2019 Procurement Plan to: (1) specify the different specific contract packages in three (3) different sites for land consolidation; (2) complete the selection method for the procurement of individual consultants reflecting the appropriate selection method based on the approved project Procurement Manual; (3) reclassify as non-consulting services the procurement of training and study tour because they do not involve the procurement of service providers and; (4). include procurement of motorcycles and laptop computers.

It was observed that the procurement of the KC Main Center started without prior IFAD No Objection at the time of the publication of the invitation to bid. Failure to comply with the prior no objection requirement increases the procurement risk of being declared ineligible or a mis-procurement under the IFAD Project Procurement Guidelines.

Contract management remains weak. As observed during the MTR up to this mission, the contract registers and logs have remained not adequately updated. IFAD recommends that contract registers and logs are updated regularly from the start of the project, and submitted to IFAD on a quarterly basis.

<b>Agreed Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agreed Date</b>
<b>Financial Management &amp; Execution</b>		
<b>APP updating</b> Update the APP and submit to IFAD for No Objection	pcu	03/2019
<b>Finalization of specifications for IFAD NO</b> Finalize specifications of 4 WE pick-up vehicles, drone, GIS software, GPS and send to IFAD for No Objection	PCU	04/2019
<b>Contract register updating</b> Continually update the contract register	PCU	04/2019

## F. Relevance

Relevance	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 5
-----------	-----------	--------------------

### Justification of rating

FARM's development objectives are overall aligned and consistent with IFAD and Government policies and priorities, but some delays in implementing the soft part of the investment (capacity building for increased agricultural productivity, agricultural diversification and microenterprise development) affect their relevance to the needs of the target groups. The related outcomes are achieved only to a moderately satisfactory extent, which risks to affect the overall relevance of the project approach. The adjustments agreed at MTR are gradually being introduced, with increased and promising dynamism over the last few months. Further efforts are needed to fully prove the relevance of some of the key piloted approaches (e.g. KCs, savings and credit groups, land consolidation, etc.).



## G. Project Modifications

Responsibility	Modification Type	Description
PCU and IFAD	Logical Framework	The project logframe was reviewed and revised. The logframe at design included 53 indicators that required tracking. At MTR the mission carefully reviewed the list of indicators to streamline the logframe with on-going activities, and the most important outputs and outcomes that requires tracking to validate the theory of change proposed by the project. In this context, the MTR recommended dropping 20 indicators that were not relevant. This revision will make it possible for the PCU to focus data collection activities on the most important outputs and outcomes. The indicators at goal and DO level were retained as at design. The revised logframe is herein attached.

## H. Lessons Learned

### Lesson #1

The project has been successful at finding appropriate operational arrangements for activities that are not yet fully mainstreamed and regulated by dedicated policies, namely land consolidation and formation of water user groups. For the case of land consolidation, the lack of formal mechanisms based on the agreement by a set majority of land owners; did obviously hamper overall implementation in some areas, due to the lack of cooperation by few and relatively better off farmers with easy access to the existing irrigation channels, ultimately resulting in the project often falling short of targets and operational inefficiencies. Nevertheless, the project has applied a genuinely consultative consensus-based process of Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) which de facto relies on the facilitation of customary practices of negotiations amongst farmers, in line with Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC). For the case of WUGs, lacking the legal basis for group registration, FARM supports the setup of informal groups including all water users along a tertiary in land consolidated areas as a natural development of the PICs established during implementation of the works. The physical link (the common tertiary channel) and the sense of ownership built through the PICs provide solid grounds for such WUGs to be building blocks of WUAs along secondary channels. While the government has set up the legal framework allowing for the registration of WUAs, major challenges remain on their establishment as sustainable entities to handle the handover of infrastructure traditionally managed by IWUMD.

### Lesson #2

The annual allocations for each project activity under FARM are included in the relevant departments budgets with a corresponding heading from the national budgetary system. Given the Government budget preparation cycle and approval process, amendments to the approved budget are reportedly extremely complex, often leading to deferring the implementation of unforeseen activities to the following AWPB. In this context, the identification of appropriate and possibly broad categories for expenditures to be included in the Government budget is essential to ensure the necessary degree of flexibility during implementation.

### Lesson #3

The KC model of FARM is a pioneering initiative for the MoALI. With almost four years of implementation there are enough experience and lessons that can be learned: (i) with weak agricultural and agribusiness development institutions in the country, the KC model fills-in such gap and appears to have potential for finetuning and scaling up of the model within MOALI that will also benefit ESAP and WSAP; (ii) KC model can be improved as a platform for a combined public-private extension approach; (iii) more private sector involvement can be enhanced if government plays its role in providing responsive and market-driven agricultural extension support; (iv) with scaled-up production and increased market demand and stronger CIGs, the KC will serve as a vehicle for attracting financial services from public and private rural financial institutions.

## I. Agreed Actions

<i>Agreed Action</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Agreed Date</i>
<b>Overview and Project Progress</b>		
<b>Engage service provider for CIG formation and strengthening</b>  Finalize the TOR and procure the service providers for strengthening of existing CIGs and formation of new CIGs	PCU	05/2019
<b>Partner with FAO for FFS</b>  The project will partner with FAO to finance the adoption of full FFS methodology for the KC managers in the project areas; demonstration plots will be used as training grounds for the FFS ToT. Other extensionists from the townships within the FARM, WSAP and ESAP project areas may participate;	PCU/DOA	10/2019
<b>Development Effectiveness</b>		

<b>Women empowerment activities</b>  Identify gender related activities such as gender sensitivity training for CIG and WUG leaders (including PCU/KC staff); documentation of gender best practices for replication and dissemination within the project and others	CDGS	03/2019
<b>Tracking indirect beneficiaries</b>  Prepare a guide to account project's beneficiaries and start tracking them the soonest	PCU and KC staff	04/2019
<b>Additional Engineering Services</b>  Strip survey for the design of drainage upgrading works to be implemented in 2019-20	IWUMD/NAIE	06/2019
<b>Sustainability and Scaling Up</b>		
<b>Precision Levelling</b>  Deliver Laser levelling equipment to AMD for Land Consolidation	IWUMD/AMD	04/2019
<b>Timely Completion of ongoing irrigation works by IWUMD</b>  Completion of all works under the 2018-19 irrigation construction programme	IWUMD	05/2019
<b>Additional Engineering Services (2)</b>  Hydraulic assessment of Paunglaung channel sections (H-Q curves) to quantify improved conveyance	IWUMD/NAIE	06/2019
<b>Capacity building for Irrigation upgrading</b>  Capacity building activities for MOALI staff ready for implementation (both for 2018-2019 and for 2019-20 AWPB)	PD/IWUMD/NAIE	07/2019
<b>WUGs in Land Consolidation areas</b>  WUGs in new Land Consolidation areas (1142 acres) formed and trained	PCU/IWUMD	10/2019
<b>Contracting IWUMD for 2019-20</b>  Contract will include completion of PLUP process and the design of the irrigation construction programme	PLUP Team/IWUMD designers / NAIE/ WUGS	10/2019
<b>Piloting WUA</b>  1 Pilot WUA established and trained (consolidated and non-consolidated areas)	1 Pilot WUA established and trained (consolidated and non-consolidated areas)	10/2020
<b>Project Management</b>		

<b>Competency assessment and capacity building to Project staff</b>  Conduct a quick competency assessment of the PCU and KC staff vis-à-vis the requirements of a more focused project strategy and provide training to them using grant funds	PCU staff/KC managers	03/2019
<b>Job descriptions formulation and review</b>  Prepare job descriptions for new positions at PCU and review the job descriptions of existing staff	PD/PM/PMSO	04/2019
<b>Extending terms of contract</b>  Review and adjust the terms of contracts of PCU staff in the light of extending duration of service up to end of project	PD/PM/PMSO	04/2019
<b>Unified orientation to Project staff</b>  Conduct a unified orientation to all project staff (PCU, KC) to reflect changes in the project logframe and strategies	Project management	04/2019
<b>Adjustment of current AWPB</b>  Adjust the October 2018-September 2019 AWPB reflecting the agreed actions of this mission (with no objection from IFAD), and require each KC to prepare an action plan based on the adjusted AWPB	PCU staff/KC managers	04/2019
<b>Profiling CIG/WUG</b>  Prepare a profile for each CIG and WUG which will be updated on quarterly basis (excel form) which can be consolidated at the KC, Township and Project levels, and prepare simple maturity assessment of CIGs and WUGs	M&E Officer with PCU specialists/ KC Manager	04/2019
<b>Hiring of M&amp;E Specialist</b>  Hire an M&E specialist (knowledgeable on Excel program) from the market. Include in his ToR to establish a one project database system	Project management	04/2019
<b>Provision of sufficient logistical support to Project staff</b>  Provide PCU and KC staff with logistical support (laptops, motorcycles, travel expenses)	PD/PM/PMSO	05/2019
<b>Hiring of VC specialist</b>  Recruit immediately a VC Specialist with knowledge and experience in brokering partnerships between farmers and other value chain actors	PCU	06/2019
<b>Conduct case studies of FARM initiatives</b>  Prepare case studies of innovations/good practices by FARM: KC, WUG, CIG, Land Consolidation. and organize knowledge sharing sessions with upcoming IFAD supported projects (ESAP, WSAP).	Project Management	06/2019

<b>Outcome study</b> Conduct an outcome survey before the end of the project (December 2020)	PCU	10/2020
<b>Financial Management &amp; Execution</b>		
<b>APP updating</b> Update the APP and submit to IFAD for No Objection	pcu	03/2019
<b>Finalization of specifications for IFAD NO</b> Finalize specifications of 4 WE pick-up vehicles, drone, GIS software, GPS and send to IFAD for No Objection	PCU	04/2019
<b>Contract register updating</b> Continually update the contract register	PCU	04/2019
<b>Revise the FM manual to expedite the payment processes</b>	FARM	04/2019
<b>Customization and utilization of the purchased accounting software</b> Customization and utilization of the purchased accounting software. This can be done by establishing a cut-off date of financial reporting. PCU to coordinate with UNOPS for the copy of the accounting software. IFAD will provide technical support to customize the software for the project	FARM	04/2019
<b>The project to comply with IFAD Handbook for Financial Reporting and Auditing</b>	FARM	
<b>The auditor needs to comply progressively with International Standards on Auditing</b>	FARM	
<b>The Financial Statements need to include Sources and Uses of Funds Statement and the Statement on Fixed Assets.</b>	FARM	
<b>The project should develop a system of recording total expenditures funded Government, beneficiaries and the private sector systematically</b>	FARM	
<b>Prepare monthly reports of availability of funds for decision making and preparation of the AWPB</b>	FARM	
<b>Update and monitoring of the fixed asset inventory</b>	FARM	

## Fostering Agricultural Revitalisation in Myanmar Project

### Logical Framework

Results Hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
Outreach	1.b Estimated corresponding total number of households members							RIMS survey	Twice during implementation	PMU	
	Household members			153 000	41 453	105 537	69				
	1.a Corresponding number of households reached							RIMS report	Annual	PCU	
	Non-women-headed households			30 000	10 714	24 955	83.2				
	Women-headed households			4 000	500	4 000	100				
	Households			34 000	11 214	28 955	85.2				
	1 Persons receiving services promoted or supported by the project										
	Males			10 000	19 879	48 717	487.2				
	Females			10 000	21 574	56 820	568.2				
	Total number of persons receiving services			20 000	41 453	105 537	527.7				
Goal Economic status of poor rural women and men in the project area improved	Child nutrition standards improved							UNICEF	start; mid-term and endline surveys	PCU	
	Improvement in child nutrition standards	31.5									
	HHs expenditure increased above the poverty line							UNDP	start; mid-term and endline surveys	PCU	
	Increase in HH expenditure	31.6									

Results Hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
<b>Objective</b> 34,000 households in 5 townships of Nay Pyi Taw Union have higher incomes and improved nutrition	Percentage of farming HHHs with increased income of USD400/annum in real terms							RIMS survey, focus group discussions	Annual	PCU	Programme successes are replicated, scaled-up; Public sector governance is improved.
	Households			60							
	Percentage of landless households with increased average food expenditure of USD20/month							RIMS impact survey	Annual	PCU	
	Landless HHHs			40							
	Shift in relative asset ownership for 2 poorest quintiles (RIMS relative measure)							RIMS survey, focus group discussions	Annual	PCU	
	Shift in relative asset ownership for 2 poorest quintiles			20	0	8	40				
<b>Outcome</b> 1.1 Land and water resources sustainably managed	Access to water all year secured water-user HHHs							RIMS survey, focus group discussions, HH survey	Annual	PCU	Farmers with free crop choice
	Households			3 000	275	505	16.8				
	Field to roadside haulage costs reduced by 15%							RIMS survey, focus group discussions, HH survey	Annual	PCU	
	Reduction in field to roadside haulage costs			15	0	75	500				
<b>Output</b> Improved water availability and management in 9000 acres	Lining of primary and secondary canals							NGO progress reports, ID/MOAI records GPS and satellite pictures	Annual	PCU	NGO recruited to assist in adopting PLUP & FPIC approaches Risks: Lack of skills, equip. for land consolidation; Land confiscation by GoM Political interference in land consolidation works.
	length of canals			19							
	Out of 3642 ha of farmland, 1012 ha are land consolidation area							NGO progress reports, ID/MOAI records GPS and satellite pictures	Annual	PCU	
	Hectares of land			1 012	337.55	529.95	52.4				

Results Hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
	2.1.5 Roads constructed, rehabilitated or upgraded							NGO progress reports, ID/MOAI records GPS and satellite pictures	Annual	PCU	
	Length of roads			50	21.23	36.46	72.9				
	Out of 3642 ha of farmland, 1456 ha are area under improved drainage							NGO progress reports, ID/MOAI records GPS and satellite pictures	Annual	PCU	
	Hectares of land			1 456	0	0	0				
	1.1.2 Farmland under water-related infrastructure constructed/rehabilitated								Annual	PCU	
	Hectares of land			850	337.55	529.95	62.3				
	Out of 3642 ha of farmland, 1174 ha are area under lined primary and secondary canals							NGO progress reports ID/MOAI records, GPS and satellite pictures	Annual	PCU	
	Hectares of land			1 174	688	688	58.6				
	1.1.1 Persons whose ownership or user rights over natural resources have been registered in national cadasters and/or geographic information management systems							Settlements and Land Records Department (SLRD) records	Annual	PCU	
	Males			600	0	190	31.7				
	Females			200							
Outcome 1.2 Water Management Organizations functional	Functional Water User Groups/Associations (WUG/WUA)							WUGs admin. Records	Annual	PCU	
	WUG			70							
	WUA			1	23	42	4 200				
	People in groups managing productive infrastructure							WUGs admin. Records	Annual	PCU	
	Males			952	173	378	39.7				



Results Hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
	Females			238	57	127	53.4				
<b>Outcome</b> 2.1 Skills of farming HHs enhanced and relevant value chains upgraded	Increase in net income per acre							Surveys, SMEs records, Rural businesses records	Mid-term	PCU	
	increase			15							
	1.2.2 Households reporting adoption of new/improved inputs, technologies or practices							Surveys, KC records	Mid-term	PCU	
	Households			60	15	45	75				
	Number of Knowledge Centres established and functional							project report	Annual	PCU	
	KCs			60	0	40	66.7				
	Rural businesses (farming related) financed by RBF operating at end of project										
	Rural Business			20							
	Percentage of SCGs (farmers) have a PAR less than 5%										
	SCGS			30							
<b>Output</b> Value chains strengthened	Value chain analyses undertaken							NGO progress reports	Annual	PCU	SMEs/entrepreneurs interested in contract farming with farming HHs.
	Value chain analyses undertaken			6	2	3	50				
	1.1.4 Persons trained in production practices and/or technologies							NGO progress reports	Annual	PMU	
	Men trained in crop			7 500	1 586	6 483	86.4				
	Women trained in crop			1 500	1 220	3 661	244.1				
	Total persons trained in crop				2 806	10 144					
	Number of demonstrations undertaken							KC records	Annual	PCU	

Results Hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
	demonstrations			1 500	248	1 215	81				
	Number of farming CIGs formed							KC records	Annual	PCU	
	farming CIGs			400	95	327	81.8				
	Number of farmers in contract arrangements							KC records; progress reports	Annual	PCU	
	farmers in contract arrangements			600	2	474	79				
	Business plans (farming CIGs) developed and financed										
	Business plans			45							
<b>Outcome</b> 2.2 Skills of landless HHs enhanced and employment opportunities improved	Households benefit from livelihood opportunities							KC records; surveys, SMEs records	Annual	PCU	NGOs engage to assist landless entrepreneurs in NPT
	HHs			9 000	1 337	8 546	95				
	Rural businesses (non-farming related) financed by RBF operating at end of project										
	Rural Business			40							
	Percentage of SCGs (landless) have a PAR less than 5%										
	SCGS			50							
<b>Output</b> Rural businesses for landless entrepreneurs sustainably implemented	Number of landless CIGs formed							KC records; CIGs records	Annual	PCU	MFI and commercial banks agree to finance rural businesses and SMEs to complement project grant
	CIGs			500	51	404	80.8				
	Number of training courses for landless CIGs							KC records; CIGs records	Annual	PCU	
	training courses			4	4	8	200				
	Business plans (landless CIGs) developed and financed							KC records; CIGs/SME records	Annual	PCU	
	business plans			105	52	343	326.7				

Results Hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
<b>Outcome</b> 2.3 Financial environment for creation/expansion of sustainable and profitable rural businesses improved	1.2.5 Households reporting using rural financial services							MFI records	after mid-term annually	PCU	Commercial banks and MFIs have resources to lend to beneficiaries. Financial institutions are actively targeting FARM villages
	Households			70	0	60	85.7				
	Rural businesses and SMEs operating after 3 years							rural business & SMEs records	after mid-term annually	PCU	
	SMEs			80	0	10	12.5				
	rural businesses			60	0	20	33.3				
	Percentage of SCGs have a PAR less than 5%							MFI records	after mid-term annually	PCU	
	SCGs			80		0	0				
<b>Output</b> Rural businesses and SMEs access sustainable financing	Landless entrepreneurs financed							MFI records	Annual	PCU	MFI and commercial banks agree to finance rural businesses and SMEs to complement project grant
	Males			200	0	3 374	1 687				
	Females			1 800	0	4 327	240.4				
	Entrepreneurs financed for processing SMEs							MFI records	Annual	PCU	
	Entrepreneurs financed			7		0	0				
<b>Output</b> Microfinance outreach extended to at least 5,000 HHs	No. of Savings and Credit Groups (SCGs) formed							SCG records	Annual	PCU	NGO willing to promote Savings and Credit Institutions Risk: lack of sufficient capitalization to reach sustainability
	SCG			750	150	733	97.7				
	1/3 of SCGs members are women							SCG records	Annual	PCU	
	Males			9 900	1 150	7 048	71.2				
	Females			5 100	1 391	6 986	137				

## **Myanmar**

---

### **Fostering Agricultural Revitalisation in Myanmar Project**

#### **Supervision Report**

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

Mission Dates: 11-22 March 2019  
Document Date: 02/05/2019  
Project No. 1100001654  
Report No. 5032-MM

Asia and the Pacific Division  
Programme Management Department

Country MYANMAR  
Project FARM Project  
Supervision mission dates: 11-22 March '2019

Appendix 1: Disbursement by financier, financial performance by component and disbursement category  
As of.... 2014-13 March '2019

Table 1A: Disbursement by financier

Financier	Appraisal	Disbursement in USD	Per cent disbursed
IFAD loan	18,726,000	8,453,949	45% *
IFAD Grant	778,500	117,287	15%
Government	5,296,600	1,274,240	24%
Private Sector	2,402,400	259,391	11%
Rural HH	621,300	659,419	106%
<b>Total</b>	<b>27,824,800</b>	<b>10,764,285</b>	<b>39%</b>

\* Including the initial advance

Table 1B: Financial performance by component and by financier (actual expenditure)

Component	IFAD loan			IFAD Grant			Government			Private Sector			Rural HH			Total		
	Appraisal	Actual	%	Appraisal	Actual	%	Appraisal	Actual	%	Appraisal	Actual	%	Appraisal	Actual	%	Appraisal	Actual	%
Component 1	8,736,200	5,606,576	64%	283,900	71,852	25%	3,808,400	849,345	22%				341,300		0%	13,169,800	6,527,772	50%
Component 2	7,883,600	2,106,775	27%	357,500	16,650	5%	775,100	351,851	45%	2,402,400	259,391	11%	280,000	659,419	236%	11,698,600	3,394,086	29%
Component 3	2,106,200	740,598	35%	137,100	28,785	21%	713,100	73,044	10%							2,956,400	842,427	28%
<b>Total</b>	<b>18,726,000</b>	<b>8,453,949</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>778,500</b>	<b>117,287</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>5,296,600</b>	<b>1,274,240</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>2,402,400</b>	<b>259,391</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>621,300</b>	<b>659,419</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>27,824,800</b>	<b>10,764,285</b>	<b>39%</b>

Table 1C: Loan Financial performance per disbursement category

Category	Category Description	Appraisal	Actual	Actual Balance	Per cent spent including
		Allocation	Expenditure		
<b>Cat I:</b>	Civil Works	7,736,998	5,519,665.1	2,217,332	71%
<b>Cat II:</b>	Equipment & Materials	369,896	160,857.2	209,039	43%
<b>Cat IV:</b>	Goods, Services and Inputs	3,498,602	436,601.0	3,062,001	12%
<b>Cat V:</b>	Grants & Subsidies	2,882,109	863,111.4	2,018,997	30%
<b>Cat VI:</b>	Operation Cost	2,373,501	1,473,713.8	899,787	62%
	Unallocated Budget	1,864,894		1,864,894	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>18,726,000</b>	<b>8,453,949</b>	<b>10,272,051</b>	<b>45%</b>

Table 1C: Grant Financial performance per disbursement category

Category	Category Description	Original	Actual	Actual Balance	Per cent spent including
		Allocation	Expenditure		
<b>Cat III:</b>	Consultancies	778,500	117,287	661,213	15%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>778,500</b>	<b>117,287</b>	<b>661,213</b>	<b>15%</b>



## **Myanmar**

---

### **Fostering Agricultural Revitalisation in Myanmar Project Supervision Report**

#### **Appendix 2: Physical progress measured against AWP&B**

Mission Dates: 11-22 March 2019  
Document Date: 02/05/2019  
Project No. 1100001654  
Report No. 5032-MM

Asia and the Pacific Division  
Programme Management Department

## Appendix 2: Physical progress measured against AWP&B, as of March 2019

### FARM AWPB: April 2018 to September 2018

Component/Outcome Sub-component or Output	Indicator	Period: April 2018 to September 2018			
		Unit	AWP&B	Actual	%
Component 1/Output					
	Chaungmange- Irrigation Upgrading ( canal extension Lining, drainage and hydrological strucutre improvement)	Acre	400	400	100%
	Paung Laung- Irrigation Upgrading ( canal extension Lining, drainage and hydrological strucutre improvement)	Acre	285	285	100%
	Balance payment 20% for 2017-2018 Land development(Pauk Myaing & Pyan Chi Irrigation Works at Tertiary Level - Direct costs)	Acre	821.3	821.3	100%
	Trainings for WUGs/x	Times	8	2	25%
	Workshop for WUGs/x	Times	1		
	Monthly meeting/training of WUGs and CIG's ELF/y		36	36	100%
Component/Outcome Sub-component or Output	Indicator	Period: April 2018 to September 2018			
		Unit	AWP&B	Actual	%
Component 2.1/Output					
	Initial Training of Trainers /i	Training	1		
	Technical Training Support for New KCMs/I (Including Computer Training)	Training	1		
	Farmers Demonstration Plots /m	Demo	88	124	141%
	Farmers Demonstration Plots ( Private Sector)	Demo	88	5	6%
	Training (Private Sector)	Training	2		
	Farmer Field Visits /n	per Visit	40	12	30%
	Regional study tour for Exellent KCM	per person	10		
	Study tour for KCM &Community Representative	Trip	2		



	Training of Simple booking, drawing business plan to KCM & N / 1	Training	1		
	Training of Simple booking , drawing business plan to ELF/ELE /2	Training	30		
	Training of SME to KCM & N /3	Training	1		
	Training of SME to ELF/ELE 4	Training	10		
	M&E Training with KCMs	Training	1		
	Consultant Support to CIG/WUG (CDGS Consultant)	Person Month	6		
	Training on Operation and maintenance of Farm Mechinery	Training	1		
	HHM Tool introduction to CIG	Training	40		
	Agricultural related training for ELFs and farmers by KCMs	Training	90	34	38%
	Agricultural related training for ELFs and farmers by Service providers	Training	2		
	Ortganizational and Financial Management training for CIG Representative	Training	20		
	Vocational training of entrepreneurs CIGs/ab	Training	2		
	Value Chain Analysis	Study	0		
	Market Promotion /s	Lump Sum	0		
	Monthly KC Board Meeting	Meetings	6		
	Linkage event at the KC	Meetings	6		
	KC and Village Level participatory planning workshop	Meeting	6		
Component/Outcome Sub-component or Output	Indicator	Period: April 2018 to September 2018			
		Unit	AWP&B	Actual	%
Component 2.2. Output					
	RBF for landless CIGs &RBF for farmer CIG	CIG	47.50	129	272%
	Investments Made by Private Sector /d	Lump Sum	0.11		
	Matching Grant Fund - Agribusiness /e	Partner	1.00		
	Matching Grant Fund for IGAs /h	CIG	48.00		

**FARM AWPB: 2018-19 Fiscal Year (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)**

**Component 1. Agricultural Infrastructure**

			Plan					Actual
			Quantity					
Ref.	Activity	Unit	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	Total
	Investment Costs							
<b>1</b>	<b>Land consolidation</b>							
1.'1.1	Land consolidation	Acres	0	500	620		1120	1142.23 (on going)
1.'1.2	Cadastral survey	Acres	2250				2250	2250
1.'1.3	Topographic survey	Acres	1750	0			1750	1750
1.'1.4	Land reallocation, Land registration	Acres	0	0			0	
1.'1.5	Machine operation and maintenance	Lump sum	0.5	0.5			1	1 (on going)
<b>2</b>	<b>IT Equipment</b>							
1.'2.1	GIS,GPS Softwares	Set	1			0	1	On-going
1.2.2	laser leveler	2 set		2			2	On-going
<b>3</b>	<b>Irrigation system improvement</b>							
1.'3.1	Drone procurement for survey	set	0	0	1		1	On-going
1.'3.2	Drainage Channel Excavation ( earth work)	Sud	5000	40000	16278		61278	24000
1.'3.3	Drainage Channel Excavation ( structure)	no	0	12	10	0	22	19
1.'3.4	Irrigation system maintainance and canal lining (for land consolidated areas completed in previous year)	Acres	100	500	0		600	600
1.'3.5	Canal Lining for main and secondary canal (for non land consolidated area) -Structure	No	1	8	5	0	14	12
1.'3.6	Main Canal Lining	Feet	800	9000	2430	0	12230	12800
1.'3.7	Secondary Canal Lining	Feet	1000	3500	3115	0	7615	7000
1.'3.8	remaining balance for upgrading system of Paunglaung )	lumpsum	1	0	0	0	1	1
<b>4</b>	<b>Training and Study Tours</b>						0	
1.'4.1	Cadastral staff technical skill improvement training (15 staffs 80 days) DSA+ transport+ school fee	Lumpsum	1				1	

1.'4.2	Irrigation staff techncial skill improvement training (15 persons x 80 days) DSA+Transport+school fee	Lumpsum	1				1	
1.'4.3	Irrigation canal lining technolgy regional study tour(10 KC managers, staffs, farmers)	Tour	1				1	
1.'4.4	WUG Training (refreshment, transportation cost)	Training	2	2	2	2	8	
1.'4.5	WUG Operation manual	Copies	500		500		1000	
1.'4.6	Land consolidation Regional Study Tour (10 persons x 10 days) Plup team members	Time	1				1	
1.'4.7	PLUP Training for the PLUP team (20 persons x 2 days)	Training	1		2		3	
5	<b>PIC</b>						0	
1.'5.1	PIC Meeting cost	Meeting	10	10	10	10	40	3
6	<b>WUG</b>						0	
1.'6.1	WUG Meeting (refreshment, transportaiton cost)	Meeting	10	10	10	10	40	3
7	<b>PLUP</b>						0	
1.'7.1	PLUP Meeting (refreshment, stationary)	Meeting	10	10	10	10	40	2

#### Component 2 Agriculture and Business Services - Investing in Knowledge

			Plan					Actual
			Quantities					
Ref.	Activity	Unit	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	
	Investment Costs							
1	<b>KC Supports</b>							
2.1.1	Construction of 19 KCs	KC		19		-	19	Tender On-going
2.1.2	Construction KCM Center	KC	1				1	Tender On-going
2.1.4	Audio viusal equipment for KCs	Lot	1			-	1	
2.1.5	Office furnitures	Lot		0.3	0.4	0.3	1	
2.1.6	Computers and printers for KCs	Lot			0.5	0.5	1	
2.1.7	KC Library supports	Set	60				60	
2.1.8	Improvement of 40 KC	KC		20			20	
2.1.9	Agricultural Tools and Equipment (Soil testing kits, Moisture meters, Seed testers, etc.)	KC	1	-		-	1	On-going

2.1.10	Connecting Electricity to KC (Gridline installation)	KC			1		1	
2	<b>Training and Study tours</b>						-	
2.2.1	TOT training for the KCMs	Lumpsum	1			2	3	1
2.2.2	Vocational training for the beneficiaries	Lumpsum	7	5	5	8	25	
2.2.3	seed production awareness campain	Training		1			1	
2.2.4	value chain analysis workshorp	W/H	1				1	
2.2.5	Machinery and Equipment (Extension materials )	Lumpsum	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	1	
2.2.6	KCM Orientation training (FARM Project profile, KC Objectives and operation, TOR of KCM, Coordination and collaboration with other components and activities.	Training	1			-	1	
2.2.7	Farmer field visit	Visits	50	50	50	50	200	39
2.2.8	Domestic study tour for KCMs & Farmers	Visits	2	2	2	2	8	
2.2.9	Seed Inspector Technacial Training	Training	1	1	1	1	4	
2.2.10	Training on Survey Methods and Data entry for KCMs	Training	1		1	-	2	
2.2.11	Refresher training to KCM about Household Methodology, PRA, SWOT	Training	1	1	1	1	4	
2.2.12	KC Board Study Tour (Domestic)	Tour	1			2	3	
3	<b>Crop trial and demonstration</b>						-	
2.3.1	Crop trial and demonstration (pre-moon soon)	Plots	40			-	40	20
2.3.2	Crop trial and demonstration (Moon soon)	Plots	30		20		50	
2.3.3	Crop trial and demonstration (Post Monsoon)	Plots	30			20	50	55
2.3.4	<b>Agro- Technical Training</b>		1	1	2	1	5	2
2.3.5	Farmer field days (participatory monitoring and evaluation)	Felddays	25	25	25	25	100	55
2.3.6	Training on the trial and Demonstration protocol (for KC Managers)	Training	1			1	2	
2.3.7	Farmer Field School and field practices	Lumpsum	1			1	2	2
2.3.8	Crop trials and demonstration supported by the Private sectors	Lumpsum	1			1	2	
4	<b>Seed production supports</b>						-	
2.4.1	Rice Seed or other crops seed production supports (Six seed villages)	Acres		30	30	30	90	
2.4.2	Soybean seed or other seed production supports ( 3 villages)	Acres		40		-	40	

5	<b>Value chain</b>						-	
2.5.1	Value chain training	Training	1			1	2	
2.5.2	Value chain data collection and analysis (domestic travel, enumerators)	Lumpsum	1			1	1	
6	<b>Plant Health System Strategy Support</b>						-	
2.6.1	Development of plant health system	Training	1				1	On-going
8	<b>Operation cost</b>						-	
2.8.1	KC Monthly meetings	Meeting	3	3	3	3	12	5
2.8.2	Project meetings as required by PCU	Meeting	15	15	20	20	70	15
2.8.3	KC Board Meeting (refreshment, stationery) 40 KC boards	Meeting	120	120	120	120	480	200

### Component 3: Agriculture and Business Services - Finance for growth

			Plan					Actual
			Quantities					
Ref.	Activity	Unit	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Total	
	Investment Cost							
1	Common Interest Groups/Saving and Credit Groups Supports							
3.1.1	Village meetings (Allowance for the village heads and refreshments)	Village	75	75	75	75	300	200
3.1.2	Landless CIG fund supports (Allowable total investment USD 5000)	CIGs	50	50	50	50	200	9
3.1.3	Farmer CIG Fund supports (Allowable investment total USD 5000)	CIGs	50	50	50	25	175	17
3.1.4	Vocational training for the CIGs	Training	5	5	5	5	20	3
3.1.5	RBFCConcept Operation System training for the KC Managers	Training	1	-	-	1	2	
3.1.6	RBF Concept Operation System Information campaign by the KC Managers (40 KCs x three meetings)	Village meetings	80	-	-	-	80	
3.1.7	CRBF Matching Grant Supports to the CIGs, Individuals, SMEs (Average support fund) Allowable investment total 30,000 USD	Package	30	30	30	20	110	
3.3.2	CIG Domestic Study Tour	Tour	1	-	-	2	3	1
3.3.3	RBF appraising committee Meeting (Refreshment, stationery)	Meeting	5	5	5	5	20	5

## **Myanmar**

---

### **Fostering Agricultural Revitalisation in Myanmar Project**

### **Supervision Report**

### **Appendix 3: Compliance with legal covenants: status of implementation**

Mission Dates: 11-22 March 2019  
Document Date: 02/05/2019  
Project No. 1100001654  
Report No. 5032-MM

Asia and the Pacific Division  
Programme Management Department

### Appendix 3: Compliance with legal covenants: status of implementation

Section	Covenant	Target/Action Due Date	Compliance Status/Date	Remarks
<b>Sec. 7.01(b)(ii), General Conditions</b>	AWPB to be submitted to the Fund, for its review and comments		Complied	
<b>Sec. 8.03(b), General conditions</b>	A Mid-Term Review (MTR) to be carried out jointly by the Borrower and IFAD.		Complied	
Schedule 1, Para 13, Financing Agreement	Formation of grievance committee		Not complied	
Schedule 1, Para 17.3- Financing Agreement	Formation of savings and credit institutions via NGO/MFI contracted by PCU		Not complied	Formation of CIGs (savings and credit groups) were facilitated directly by Project staff. Service provider will be tapped to assist the formation and strengthening of the project in the next 21 months.
Schedule 3, Para 4 – Financing Agreement	Provision of support to project beneficiaries, farming and landless households		Not complied	This is related to farming and landless households obtain proper identification documents to meet the requirements of financial institutions. This will be included in the task of the service provider when applicable.

## **Myanmar**

---

### **Fostering Agricultural Revitalisation in Myanmar Project Supervision Report**

#### **Appendix 4: Technical background analysis**

Mission Dates: 11-22 March 2019  
Document Date: 02/05/2019  
Project No. 1100001654  
Report No. 5032-MM

Asia and the Pacific Division  
Programme Management Department



## Appendix 4: Technical background analysis for FARM investments in irrigation

1. **Selection of areas for Land Consolidation:** Demand for additional Land Consolidation to be undertaken during the 2019-20 AWPB period has been sounded by the PCU and preparatory steps for the PLUP process have been undertaken on some 720 acres across 5 sites under the Paunglaung and Sinthe schemes, mostly contiguous to those already implemented or under implementation. While IFAD Loan funds are still available and investments of this magnitude have proven to be managed successfully, the mission emphasises that **investments in Land Consolidation are subject to i) availability of water for the dry season crop; and ii) location within the project area as defined in the FA.** To this effect, for the specific case of Sinthe scheme, the areas eligible for investments are limited to the upstream sections of the main channels in the Takton Township, where they effectively complement World Bank supported investments in channel lining. The planned procurement handled by the PCU for laser levelling equipment and cadastral mapping software and hardware will be instrumental to facilitating further expansion and improved quality of Land Consolidation works starting from this AWPB implementation period.
2. **Main channel systems upgrading:** The upgrading works for the Paunglaung irrigation scheme have been introduced as eligible investments under FARM since MTR and have been implemented both during the minibudget period (about USD 270,000) and continued during the current AWPB (about USD 1.6 million). The expected incremental area under irrigation during the dry season in connection with the reduction of water losses is about 2,000 acres (69% of final target) belonging to 1015 HHs. Benefits from the lining works in terms of water availability are yet to be properly quantified with a dedicated assignment to be undertaken by the hydrology department of IWUMD during this AWPB period. The assignment will involve **the computation of Head-Discharge (HQ) curves** at selected sections along the main channels, mainly in correspondence to hydraulic structures. This will allow: i) a re-assessment of the increased hydraulic capacity of the main channels in connection with a reduced roughness coefficient due to lining; and ii) the measurement of discharge upstream and downstream the sections to be lined during the 2019-20 season. The repeated measurement and water balance computation upon completion of the works will support the estimate of the reduction of water losses attributable to lining, through direct measurements and extrapolations on previously completed sections.
3. The works completed to date include 21,870 ft of lining works (35% of final target) as well as the construction of water control structures and reshaping of drains. The mission field visits underlined the relevance of these investments, particularly those geared to reduce the negative impacts of inadequate drainage capacity which used to undermine the high development potential of the Paunglaung scheme. For instance, the additional discharge point into the Sittaung river for the “sugarmill Drain” which is serving both the Ngalaik and Paunglaung command areas is expected to result in considerable benefits over a wide area. The scope of works for the last phase of the upgrading works for the 2019-20 AWPB is mostly already defined and estimated to USD 1.6 million, which would allow reaching the targets set at MTR. In this context, for the detailed design of interventions for drainage improvement, IWUMD is recommended to keep focus and due attention to **side slope stabilization (through grassing or bamboo poles and mats) and to the excavation of additional discharge channels** to the nearest recipient water body, reducing the drains catchment areas.
4. **Drainage improvement:** The upgrading works for drains across the project area (besides the Paunglaung scheme) have been introduced as eligible investments under FARM since MTR. Such investments were assessed to be highly efficient in terms of cost/benefit ratio. During the review period the project has informed KCs about the opportunity for FARM financing of drainage improvement works to be identified in consultation with IWUMD. The mission field visits to two potential sites confirmed the technical feasibility and the obvious benefits that will be delivered by such investments. However, the finalization of the investment programme for drainage improvement to be included in the 2019-20 AWPB (indicatively to a level of USD 400,000) would require the prompt mobilization of IWRUD surveyors to undertake strip surveys along the selected drains. A comprehensive approach will have to be applied including a **verification of the bottom slopes and discharge point levels.** This shall also include the verification of the adequacy of the hydraulic sizing of structures and stabilization of the side slopes, particularly in the frequent cases in which land ownership issues do not allow for widening the trapezoidal section, calling for support poles and mats on the steep sides.

5. **WUGs/Water management:** To date, the WUGS has focused capacity building efforts for WUGs on the areas benefitting from Land Consolidation, where the new systems imply major changes on water management at tertiary level while providing opportunities to ease the O&M burden that historically has been solely on IWUMUD. To date 42 WUGs with 505 members (42% of final target, have been formed in the project areas where Land Consolidation was completed (1.309 acres). This indicates that: i) the WUGs formed are comparatively larger than anticipated at design; and ii) the project shall seek opportunities to form **WUGs also in non-consolidated areas**. Relevant areas of capacity building for farmers sharing a watercourse or a common outlet on a secondary channel in non-consolidated areas include: i) improved on farm and off farm water management practices; ii) consolidated demand and improved coordination with IWUMUD for scheduling both irrigation and maintenance; and iii) access to the technologies and FARM financing for e.g. mobile surface pumps and drip irrigation pipes for farmers' groups with access to operational secondary channels
6. Even if most WUGs are only at the initial stage of operations, there are signs of mixed performance in carrying out routine preventive O&M of tertiary level infrastructure in consolidated areas. The project will need to provide continued support to WUGs as key players for sustainability. The long tradition of reliance on government support for maintenance (including tertiary level infrastructure) is hard to change and the progressive taking over of O&M responsibility up to secondary level remains a major challenge throughout Myanmar. In this respect, the mission commends the PCU proactive approach to identify one area under the Paukmyaing KC which will include nearly 800 acres of contiguous consolidated land to **pilot the joint management of the common DY channel by a WUA** encompassing all the concerned WUGs.
7. The key materials (including visuals) and principles to be followed for capacity building and institutional development of WUGs are included in the recently issued **Participatory Irrigation Management (PIM) manual for Myanmar** developed with JICA support, which adopts the FARM model of informal WUGs along tertiaries. In the new areas undergoing Land Consolidation the project has taken initiative to have PIC membership from all tertiaries, facilitating the subsequent step of forming WUGs and increasing WUGs members' ownership.
8. **Capacity Building for upgraded technologies:** For the implementation of all FARM supported irrigation infrastructure interventions, IWUMUD has relied on consolidated approaches and technologies. However, there are opportunities to introduce basic technical upgrades in the standard works being undertaken under FARM. These include, for instance, the identification of appropriate plant species for grassing drains side slopes. Relevant experiences in the region include use of **vetiver grass and guinea grass** that people can harvest for stock feed (<http://www.vetiver.org/ICV4pdfs/BA24.pdf>), preventing overgrowth on the side slopes. In these cases, woven bamboo matting and mini timber stake groynes are used as initial toe protection, while ultimately after the bamboo has decayed, the deep rooting characteristics of the vetiver provide protection to this zone. As for the **prevention of seepage from cracks on the plastered brick masonry lining**, the primary problems are poor quality mortar and inadequate compaction of the fill on which the channel is built, resulting in differential settlement and cracking. The lime mortar used earlier was plastic in consistency, facilitating full imbedding of bricks, and had low shrinkage. The straight Portland cement/sand mortars currently in use, unless with very well graded sand, are likely to be harsh and non-plastic. In long sections with continuous rigid channel lining plastic or bituminous transversal joints are also to be considered.
9. In addition to the basic upgrades noted above, there is an envisaged need for capacity building on the design and use of **new technologies (including pressurized piped irrigation networks or use of alternative liners such as Geotextiles and High Density Polyethylene sheets)** which would be highly relevant both for the IFAD financed ESAP and WSAP as well for supporting the adoption in Myanmar of water saving technologies widely available in the region (e.g. India and China). The mission notes that in spite of a sizeable AWPB allocation of about USD 60,000 none of the training activities has been implemented, and reiterates the MTR recommendation that relevant MOALI departments prioritize their needs and develop detailed costed proposals for e.g.: i) training courses undertaken at the MOALI's Irrigation Training Centre in Bago by international experts on irrigation development; ii) regional study tours including exchange visits to government counterparts or participation to trade fairs for MOALI officials to share experiences and foster the application of new technologies and approached to irrigation development. As a principle, IFAD Grant funds may be used to source TA in this context.

## **Myanmar**

---

### **Fostering Agricultural Revitalisation in Myanmar Project**

#### **Supervision Report**

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

Mission Dates: 11-22 March 2019  
Document Date: 02/05/2019  
Project No. 1100001654  
Report No. 5032-MM

Asia and the Pacific Division  
Programme Management Department

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

### **Terms of Reference Supervision and Implementation Support Mission**

**COUNTRY OF ASSIGNMENT/LOCATION:** Myanmar

**MISSION START AND END DATES:** 10-23 March 2019

**REPORT TO:** Alessandro Marini, Country Programme Manager, APR / PMD

**MISSION COMPOSITION:**

IFAD Staff:

Alessandro Marini, Country Programme Manager  
Jerry Pacturan, Country Programme Officer  
Alvaro Fernandez, Finance Officer

Consultants:

Michele Pirazzoli, Infrastructure Specialist  
Yolando Arban, Co-Team Leader / Project Management and M&E Specialist  
Arthur Tantuan, Procurement Specialist  
Myat Thiri Wai, Country Programme Facilitator

**BACKGROUND:**

The Fostering Agricultural Revitalization in Myanmar (FARM) Project aims to introduce regional and global best practices to develop a sustainable and scalable model for smallholder agriculture and rural development across Myanmar's central dry zone. It supports land consolidation and development, productive infrastructure, agricultural and business services, flow of knowledge and capacity building to promote an inclusive development model in this zone.

The FARM project is supported by IFAD through a loan of USD 18.8 million, on highly concessional terms, and a grant of USD 0.8 million. The project is being co-financed by the Government, with a contribution of USD 5.3 million, a private sector contribution of USD 2.4 million and beneficiary contribution of USD 0.6 million. FARM was approved by the IFAD Executive Board in April 2014 and become officially operational in October 2014.

FARM has two main components:

Component 1: Agricultural Infrastructure: under this component the project will contribute to the ongoing expansion of irrigated areas under the command of MOAI primary and secondary canals, with complementary investments in land development identified through a participatory process;

Component 2: Agricultural and Business Services. This component includes two sub-components: investing in knowledge and financing growth.

- (i) Subcomponent 2.1: Investing in Knowledge. The project will promote a conducive environment for rural households to access services and technologies which enable them to improve their productive and economic activities. It will support: (i) the creation of a pluralistic participatory extension service platform which provides support to farming households; and, (ii) services to

landless entrepreneurs to start/develop rural micro-businesses. The expected outcomes are enhanced skills and increased incomes of farming and landless households.

- (ii) Sub-component 2.2: Financing Growth. The project will foster enabling conditions for the growth of sustainable rural micro-businesses and SMEs. Two competitive grant funds will be established, the first in support of rural businesses operated by landless households, and the second in support of value chain integrators (the latter to be replaced by a PPPP modality when producers' organisations are developed). Access of smallholders and the landless to financial services will be improved by attracting MFIs to the area and by promoting contract farming; and financial intermediaries such as savings and credit groups will be fostered.

**Mid-Term Review (MTR).** The MTR was conducted in November 2017. In consultation with MoALI, the MTR recommended that the remaining three years of the project should concentrate on activities that are proven to be implementable, provide real economic benefits to the target groups, ensure appropriate levels of investment and disbursement, and ensure achievement of the project goal and objective. Based on project experiences, emerging developments, and institutional capacities, the mission and MoALI agreed to make adjustments in the following areas:

- (i) land consolidation;
- (ii) irrigation infrastructure in rain-fed areas;
- (iii) expansion of project sites within the five project townships;
- (iv) contracting of service providers for the PLUP process;
- (v) contracting of service providers for rural finance activities;
- (vi) configuration of TA support; and,
- (vii) corresponding loan reallocations across categories.

More specifically, the following changes were agreed at MTR:

- (i) reduce land consolidation target to 2,500 acres;
- (ii) line primary and secondary canals benefitting 2,900 acres in the Paunglaung command area;
- (iii) upgrade drains and related hydraulic structures, on demand basis, benefitting 3,600 acres in selected areas with KCs that have not benefitted from land consolidation activities;
- (iv) develop strategic investment plans for each of the 55 KCs;
- (v) expand the Rural Business Fund (RBF) to farmer common interest groups (CIGs), and introduce a two-pronged approach (a window for micro-enterprises, with a ceiling of USD 5,000, focused on women and youth; and a window for small and medium enterprises, with a ceiling of USD 30,000 for farmer CIGs implementing group investments);
- (vi) discontinue the proposed ABF support to agribusinesses;
- (vii) further improve the flow of funds by assigning a finance officer from Minister's Office to the PCU; and,
- (viii) organise systems for annual performance evaluations of PCU staff and KC managers.

**Supervision and Implementation Support Missions of 2018.** In Q4 of 2018, the supervision of IFAD operations in Myanmar was decentralized to the Philippine Country Office, hence several missions were conducted by IFAD staff based in the Philippines Country Office. While the project has been classified as a problem project at MTR, in the second half of 2018 there was renewed dynamism in moving component 1 (irrigation civil works) and the submission of request for staff hiring to fill vacant positions. It was also observed that considerable progress was made on the irrigation civil works, while component 2.2 on common interest groups (CIGs) has achieved important results and shows great potential, and would benefit from an increased emphasis on the consolidation of the CIGs.

During the December 2018 implementation support mission, the following were agreed with MoALI:

Immediate actions for December 2018:

- a) PMU to submit withdrawal application of USD 1.7 million for the Paung Laung irrigation civil works by 17 December 2018;

- b) PMU to submit request for IFAD no objection for the bidding documents (including the design, BoQ and budget) for the 20 Knowledge Centers (KC) by 17 December 2018;
- c) PMU to submit complete and realistic Annual Work Plan Budget (AWPB) and Procurement Plan (PP) for 2018/2019 by 31 December 2018; and,
- d) PMU to submit request for IFAD no objection for the land consolidation target sites not later than 17 January 2019 (see Annex 1 for timeline).

Milestone actions for March 2019:

- a) PMU to complete the Paung Laung irrigation civil works according to the schedule in Annex 2; this will demonstrate the capacity to absorb additional funds for component 1, which could be reallocated from component 2 (see Annex 1 for timeline);
- b) PMU to complete the land consolidation work not later than 15 May 2019 (see Annex 1 for timeline);
- c) PMU to submit for IFAD no objection review the evaluation report of the KC civil works by 28 February 2019 with the aim to complete the construction work not later than July 2018; and,
- d) PMU to develop Terms of Reference (ToR) and bidding documents for the recruitment of a service provider to operationalize the Commercial Rural Business Fund (CRBF) by end of February 2019.

### **Mission objectives**

Classified as a problem project during the MTR, this assignment is a critical mission in order for government and IFAD to determine its way forward. It will assess to what extent the project has improved its operations based on the agreements of the 2017 MTR and the 2018 supervision missions. This will be conducted from 10-23 March 2019 in close consultation with key stakeholders (Government, beneficiary groups, implementing partners and private sector). The mission will undertake consultations in the capital and field visits to Project target areas to review and validate Project activities and to consult with local stakeholders.

The two main outputs of the mission will be (i) an aide-memoire documenting the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the mission to be discussed with the Government during the wrap-up meeting; and (ii) a supervision mission report to be submitted to IFAD's management at the conclusion of the assignment, in the required format.

### **Responsibilities**

#### **Jerry Pacturan, Mission / Team Leader**

He will have overall responsibility for guidance and management of the mission's work. The Mission Leader will be responsible for debriefing the Government of Myanmar during the wrap-up meeting, and will ensure that all deliverables are met in a timely manner and comply with IFAD's required formats and quality standards. He will coordinate the preparation of the aide memoire and MTR report. Specifically, the mission leader will:

- Lead the team's meetings with Government counterparts and partners throughout the mission;
- Coordinate mission activities, review the assessment of the overall project performance and quality of implementation and synthesise the findings and recommendations;
- Assess the overall quality of project management and coordination;
- Together with the supervision team, review, the overall implementation progress of each component since project effectiveness;

- Review, together with the team, the physical/financial progress of the project to date since effectiveness;
- Provide overall implementation support as required to PCU and MoALI and recommend action plan for the remaining years of the project;
- Lead the drafting of the Aide Memoire before submission to the Government.

#### **Alessandro Marini, Rural Finance / Agribusiness Specialist**

The Agribusiness Specialist will be responsible for reviewing the progress of the project activities specifically under Component 2: Agricultural and Business Services. In particular, the Agribusiness Specialist will:

- Assess the progress and success of activities;
- Assess the physical progress in achievement of targets under KCs since effectiveness;
- Review the efficiency of the set-up of governance structures for the Knowledge Centres, including recruitment of KC Managers and adequacy of capacity building trainings provided to KC Managers;
- Review the 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 workplan of the KCs including capacity building activities for farmers; contracting of service provider for activities related to landless households;
- Agree on the criteria for location selection for the remaining KCs with a view to maximise outreach also in the rain-fed areas;
- Assess the progress made in implementation and expansion of the Rural Business Fund to agriculture CIGs and the SMEs, including, formation of grant committees, contracting of service provider for capacity building of landless entrepreneurs and SMEs;
- Assess the progress made in rural finance activities pertaining to the strengthening of MFIs in the project area;
- With regard to both sub-components 2.1 and 2.2, assess the adequacy of implementation arrangements, revise targets and recommend actions for the remaining years to ensure targets are achieved;
- Prepare written contribution to the relevant sections of the mission Aide Memoire.

#### **Yolando Arban, Co-Team Leader / Project Management and Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Specialist**

The expert will do the following::

- Assess the overall Project management and M&E performance and quality of implementation in line with the defined result objectives;
- Review institutional arrangements and performance;
- Review staffing set-up, organigrams and performance;
- Propose ways to improve the performance and delivery of the project;
- Assess the progress and implementation performance of Programme's components against 2018/19 AWPBs and logical framework of the project;
- Assess the relevance and effectiveness of technical assistance and training given to primary stakeholders and staff in relation to design objectives, and the extent to which they have been given based on needs assessment and followed up on to determine their impact;

- Assess the progress of project interventions in the field of general management and make time-bound recommendations to ensure knowledge and best practices are systematically captured and shared;
- Undertake an overall assessment and rating of the performance of M&E system;
- Review the baseline survey report and the outcome report;
- Conduct the assessment and rating of the performance of M&E system and related MIS;
- Summarize the overall programme implementation progress of the M&E and institutional aspects and make recommendations to improve program performance;
- Assess the progress of programme interventions in the field of knowledge management and make time-bound recommendations to ensure knowledge and best practices are systematically captured and shared;
- Review and update the first and second level RIMS indicators and overall project log frame;
- Preparation of the Appendices “Updated logical framework” and “Physical progress measured against AWPB” (including RIMS indicators);
- Review and update the logframe and retrofit RIMS indicators with the new Corporate indicators within the ORMS;
- Review and update the yearly results and include them in the logframe;
- Support mission team and project staff in selecting and agreeing on relevant Corporate Indicators (Cis);
- Prepare written contribution to the relevant sections of the mission Aide Memoire and to the report including data, annexures, field observations, project results, findings and recommendations, within the deadline set by the Team Leader; input the mission report to the ORMS;
- Assess the M&E systems and staff capacity of the two other IFAD projects ESAP and WSAP and provide recommendations to government implementing partners and IFAD; and
- Any other tasks assigned by the Team Leader.

### **Michele Pirazzoli, Infrastructure Specialist**

The Infrastructure Specialist will be responsible for reviewing the physical and qualitative progress of the project's infrastructure works, particularly under those under Component 1. The Specialist, in particular, will:

- Review the infrastructure work plan for the project period and progress made on physical works and review NOLs requests (5 days additional);
- Assess the quality and cost effectiveness of the infrastructure design and works undertaken as part of expansion of irrigated areas under the command of primary and secondary canals under selected irrigation schemes, including land consolidation and land titling, land levelling, construction of tertiary canals, the drainage networks, farm roads and small hydraulic structures;
- Assess the extent of outputs achievable under the component in the remaining years, revise targets accordingly and assess the viability of expansion of irrigation works in upland and lowland rain-fed areas;
- Assess the extent of community participation involved in the design and supervision process the infrastructure components of the project;
- Assess the progress made with regard to establishing a participatory water management systems in the project areas;



- Identify implementation challenges and provide clear recommendations on how to address them in the remaining duration of the project;
- Prepare written contribution to the relevant sections of the mission Aide Memoire and to the report including data, annexures, field observations, project results, findings and recommendations, within the deadline set by the Team Leader;
- Assess the staff capacity and technical systems of the other two IFAD projects ESAP and WSAP and provide recommendations to government implementing partners and IFAD;
- Carry out any other relevant assignment as may be determined by the Team Leader.

### **Arthur Tantuan, Procurement Specialist**

The Procurement Specialist will be responsible for reviewing and assessing the arrangements for procurements of goods, services and works financed under FARM. Specifically, the Procurement Specialist will:

- Assess if the PCU has established a transparent procurement and contracting system, and if they meet IFAD's procurement standards;
- Review the PCU's procurement manual and identify foreseeable challenges;
- Review the PP and the documentation of procured goods and services under the 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 AWPB.
- Provide recommendations for adoption of best practices that will allow PCU to efficiently manage the procurement activities of the project;
- Assess the need for on-demand technical assistance for preparation of tender documents;
- Orient the PCU on the IFAD No Objection Tracking System (NOTUS);
- Provide overall implementation support as required to PCU and MoALI;
- Prepare written contribution to the relevant sections of the mission Aide Memoire and to the report findings and recommendations, within the deadline set by the Team Leader.
- Assess the staff capacity and systems of procurement of the other two IFAD projects ESAP and WSAP, provide orientation on IFAD procurement guidelines and prepare recommendations to government implementing partners and IFAD.; and,
- Any other relevant assignment as determined by the Team Leader.

### **Alvaro Fernandez, Financial Management Specialist**

The Financial Management Specialist will handle all matters related to financial management, including disbursement performance. Using the IFAD FMAQ as the basis to collect the relevant information, the Financial Management Specialist will assess the strengths and weaknesses of financial management systems, internal controls and financial reporting systems relating to financial management and financial administration of project funds in order to ensure that they satisfy IFAD's fiduciary requirements and comply with the Financing Agreement and LTB. Specifically, the expert will:

- Review financial management progress for FARM, identify constraints in disbursements and expenditure programming; propose solutions where appropriate. Assess physical and financial project implementation progress against appraisal targets and Annual work plans and budgets. Identify actual, emerging or potential problems, constraints and bottlenecks in project implementation;
- Identify risks arising from material deficiencies and propose practical recommendations for improving financial management functions and/or staffing for financial operations needed to mitigate risk;

- Review the financial reporting systems, including Government reporting requirements. Assess the functionality of the accounting software used, highlight duplications with manual/ Excel reporting and make recommendations, if any, to customise the software in order to enhance its usefulness for project reporting purposes;
- Review the operation of the FARM's designated account, and project accounts (OA, MD). Assess the efficiency of the established fund-flow system and whether advances are appropriate for the projected expenditure needs for FARM;
- Assess regularity of WA preparation. Recommend concrete measures to ensure faster and more efficient disbursements. Assess the project's treasury planning; analyse adequacy of DA authorised allocation, with respect to projected expenditure requirements;
- Review SOEs prepared since the last field review to verify adequacy, completeness and validity of claims by selecting on a sample basis expenditure items from each category of expenditures and performing a system 'walk-through'. Document findings on individual SOE items, noting down any ineligible expenditures. Provide recommendations on any internal controls weakness noted. Assess the adequacy of the project's filing of financial records;
- Review contractual and payment procedures (as well, assess (for quality, timeliness) and identify any capacity gaps in contractor/IP/SP preparation of documentation for payment of works, financial reports, etc.); check contract register, usage of contract monitoring forms, register of advances; highlight outstanding advances (ageing analysis); verify compliance with audit requirements foreseen in contracts/ MOUs, if applicable;
- Review status of counterpart funding, including checking if the Borrower/Lead Project Agency has made available financing proceeds to the Project, as planned and in line with the Financing Agreement;
- Review key internal controls in project expenditure management, assess number of days required for payment approvals;
- Assess compliance with financing agreement, LTB and applicable guidelines, including PIM;
- Review internal audit arrangements provided by MoALI, document findings of internal audit reports;
- Discuss findings of FY 2016 audit report with finance team, describe planning for addressing audit observations;
- Discuss the status of preparation of the next annual financial statements, including impact of upcoming change of Myanmar financial year on annual reporting and audit processes;
- Discuss Mission recommendations with the PCU and relevant stakeholders and agree on a plan of action; based on above work, assign FM performance ratings to the projects, and update FM risk assessments, following CFS guidelines;
- Provide overall implementation support as required to PCU and MoALI;
- Assess the staff capacity and financial management systems and provide one-day financial management training to the other IFAD projects ESAP and WSAP;
- Prepare written contribution to the relevant sections of the mission Aide Memoire and to the report findings and recommendations, within the deadline set by the Team Leader.

### **Myat Thiri Wai, Mission Facilitator**

The Mission Facilitator will be responsible for providing overall support to the supervision team and ensuring logistical arrangements to carry out the planned mission activities. Specifically, the Mission Facilitator will:

- Liaise between the mission and the concerned government agencies and officials;

- Support the supervision team's field visits and meetings with Government entities (at all levels);
- Provide inputs for drafting mission's Aide Memoire;
- Any other relevant tasks requested by the Mission / Team Leader.

## Documentation

The following documentation will be made available to the team for undertaking the assignment:

1. FARM Project Development Report and Cost Tables
2. FARM Working Papers
3. Financing Agreement and Letter to the Borrower
4. AWPB and Procurement Plan (PP) 2017/2018 and 2018/2019
5. Mid-Term Review (MTR) Report
6. Other relevant project documents that will be requested from the PCU.

## Mission schedule

10 March	Mission team arrival in NPT
11 March	Kick-off meeting with MoALI and MoPF
12-15 March	Field visits and meetings
16-17 March	Review of Documents, Drafting of Report
18/19 March	Field visits (if needed) and meetings
19-21 March	Report Preparation
22 March	Wrap-up Meeting
23 March	Departure

## FARM Mission Itinerary and Persons Met

Date	Day	Time	Meeting	Person Met
11 <sup>th</sup> March	Monday	1:00 pm	Kick-off meeting	1. U Kyaw Swe Linn (DG, DOP) 2. Dr. Ye Tint Htun (DG, DOA) 3. Daw Khin Mar Oo (Director, DOP) 4. Daw Khin Nyo Theint (Assistant Officer, Treasury, MOPF) 5. Dr. Win Htut (Director, DALMS) 6. Dr. Tin Tin Aung (Assistant Director, DOP) 7. U Kyaw Zaw (Director, IWUMD) 8. U Tun Win (PD, FARM) 9. U Zarni Hlaing (M&E, FARM) 10. U Aung Thiha (Assistant Director, IWUMD) 11. U Zaw One (Assistant director, IWUMD) 12. U Aung Zaw Phyo (officer, DOP)
12 <sup>th</sup> March	Tuesday	9:30 am	Meeting with FARM	1. U Tun Win (PD) 2. U Win Oo (PM) 3. Daw Tin nandar Khine (FM) 4. Dr. Yadanar Khin Latt (Agri) 5. U Ye Htut (CDGS) 6. U Kyaw Thura (Proc.) 7. U Aung Pyay Soe (RFF) 8. U Phyo Yarzar (RFF)

				9. U Naing Linn Htoo (RFF) 10. U Sithu Htun (WUGS) 11. U Min Aung Than (Irri Eng) 12. U Zarni Hlaing (M&E) 13. U Thaung Htein (KC Supervisor) 14. U Kyaw Min Htun (KC Supervisor) 15. U Aung Thiha (Assistant Director, IWUMD) 16. U Zaw One (Assistant director, IWUMD)
13 <sup>th</sup> -15 <sup>th</sup> March	Wednesday-Friday		Field visit	KC managers, CIG leaders and members, WUG members
14 <sup>th</sup> March	Thursday	9:30 am	Meeting with WSAP team	1. U Khant Zaw (DG, DRD) 2. U Myo Naing Aung (Dy DG, DRD) 3. Daw Nyo Nyo Win (DY DG, DRD) 4. U Maung Win (Dy Dg,DRD) 5. Dr. Zarni Minn (Director,DRD) 6. U Kyaw Swar Aung (Director, Procurement,DRD) 7. Daw Su Su Than (Director, Finance,DRD) 8. U Aung Zay Hlaing (Dy Director,DRD) 9. Daw Myat Su Aung (Assistant Director,DRD) 10. Dr. Tin Tin Aung (Assistant Director, DOP) 11. Daw Khaing Khaing Htwe (researcher, DAR) 12. Daw Aye Aye Mon (Assistant Director, AMD) 13. Dr. Phyo Thu Aung (Assistant Director, Livestock)
15 <sup>th</sup> March	Friday	10:00 am	Meeting with ESAP (IWUMD)	1. U Kan Chun (Dy Director) 2. Dr. Mu Mu Than (Dy Director) 3. U Soe Htun Aung (assistant Director, Procurement) 4. Daw Yu Yu Win (Assistant Director, Finance section)
		3:00 pm	Meeting with WSAP	1. U Khant Zaw (DG, DRD) 2. U Myo Naing Aung (Dy DG, DRD) 3. Daw Nyo Nyo Win (DY DG, DRD) 4. U Maung Win (Dy Dg,DRD) 5. Dr. Zarni Minn (Director,DRD) 6. U Kyaw Swar Aung (Director, Procurement,DRD) 7. Daw Su Su Than (Director, Finance,DRD) 8. U Aung Zay Hlaing (Dy Director,DRD) 9. Dr. Mu Mu Than (Dy Director, IWUMD) 10. U Than Lwin (Dy Director, DALMS) 11. Daw Myat Su Aung (Assistant Director,DRD) 12. Daw Yu Yu Win (Assistant Director, IWUMD) 13. Dr. Tin Tin Aung (Assistant Director, DOP) 14. Daw Khaing Khaing Htwe (researcher, DAR) 15. Daw Aye Aye Mon (Assistant Director, AMD) 16. Dr. Phyo Thu Aung (Assistant Director, Livestock) 17. Daw Khin Nyo Theint (Assistant Director, Treasury) 18. Daw Nyein Kyi Thein (Officer, IWUMD) 19. Daw San San Aye (officer, DOA) 20. Daw Khaing Sabai Oo (Dy Officer, DOA) 21. Ms. Pam Flowers (Assistant Country Director, Care International) 22. Daw Nilar Shwe (Program Director, Care international)

18 <sup>th</sup> March	Monday	10:00 am	Meeting with ESAP (IWUMD)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dr. Zaw Lwin Tun (Dy DG and PD)</li> <li>2. U tint lwin (Director, Procurement)</li> <li>3. U Tun Tun Oo (Director, Shan State)</li> <li>4. U Kan Chon (dy director)</li> <li>5. Dr. Mu Mu Than (Dy Director, IR)</li> <li>6. U Soe Htun Aung (Assistant Director, Procurement)</li> <li>7. Daw yu yu win (Ass Director, Finance)</li> <li>8. Daw mi mi tun (officer, finance)</li> <li>9. U Khun Sein Min (Officer, Hopone Township)</li> <li>10. U Thant Zin Swe (officer, Taunggyi township)</li> <li>11. U Htike Htike Aung (Sesei Township)</li> <li>12. daw su thazin phyo (dy officer, IR)</li> </ol>
18 <sup>th</sup> March	Monday		Meeting with FARM	Other team members met with FARM specialist
19 <sup>th</sup> March	Tuesday	10:00 am	Meeting with FAO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mr. Jitendra P. Jaiswal (Climate Smart Agriculture Specialist, Int.)</li> <li>2. Daw Khin San New (Climate Smart Agriculture Specialist, National)</li> </ol>
19 <sup>th</sup> march	Tuesday		Meeting with FARM	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. U Tun Win (PD)</li> <li>2. U Win Oo (PM)</li> <li>3. Dr. Myo Kyaw Thu (PMO)</li> <li>4. Daw Tin nandar Khine (FM)</li> <li>5. Daw Lin Lin Latt (Accountant)</li> <li>6. Dr. Yadanar Khin Latt (Agri)</li> <li>7. U Ye Htut (CDGS)</li> <li>8. U Kyaw Thura (Proc.)</li> <li>9. U Aung Pyay Soe (RFF)</li> <li>10. U Phyto Yarzar (RFF)</li> <li>11. U Naing Linn Htoo (RFF)</li> <li>12. U Sithu Htun (WUGS)</li> <li>13. U Min Aung Than (Irri Eng)</li> <li>14. U Zarni Hlaing (M&amp;E)</li> <li>15. U Thaung Htein (KC Supervisor)</li> <li>16. U Kyaw Min Htun (KC Supervisor)</li> <li>17. U Aung Thiha (Assistant Director, IWUMD)</li> <li>18. U Zaw One (Assistant director, IWUMD)</li> </ol>
20 <sup>th</sup> March	Wednesday	10:00 am	Meeting with MEDA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Saw Say Htoo – M&amp;E Coordinator</li> <li>2. Ne Lin Htet – Sr. Financial Services Coordinator</li> </ol>
21 <sup>st</sup> March	Thursday	10:00 am	Meeting with WSAP, ESAP and MOPF	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. U Khant Zaw (DG, DRD)</li> <li>2. Daw Nyo Nyo Win (DY DG, DRD)</li> <li>3. U Kyaw Swar Aung (Director, Procurement,DRD)</li> <li>4. Daw Su Su Than (Director, Finance,DRD)</li> <li>5. Daw Yi Yi Win (Director, DALMS)</li> <li>6. Daw Su Su Aye (Dy Director, Treasury)</li> <li>7. U Aung Zay Hlaing (Dy Director,DRD)</li> <li>8. Daw Aye Mar Pe (Assistant Director, IWUMD finance)</li> <li>9. Daw Myat Su Aung (Assistant Director,DRD)</li> <li>10. Daw Yu Yu Win (Assistant Director, IWUMD)</li> <li>11. Dr. Tin Tin Aung (Assistant Director, DOP)</li> <li>12. Dr. Paung Shint Kam (researcher, DAR)</li> <li>13. Daw Aye Aye Mon (Assistant Director, AMD)</li> <li>14. Dr. Phyto Thu Aung (Assistant Director, Livestock)</li> <li>15. Daw Lay Thant (Assistant Director, Livestock)</li> <li>16. Daw Khin Nyo Theint (Assistant Director,</li> </ol>

				Treasury) 17. Daw San San Aye (officer, DOA) 18. Daw Le Le Win (Officer, DALMS) 19. Daw Aye Khaing (Officer, IWUMD) 20. U Kyaw Hlaing Win (Dy Officer, DALMS) 21. U Tin Aung Thein (Accountant, DOA)
21 <sup>st</sup> march	Thursday	10:00 am	Meeting with DRD procurement	1. U Kyaw Swa Aung (Director) 2. Daw Su Yee Phyu (Staff Officer)
21 <sup>st</sup> March	Thursday	3:00 pm	Meeting with Minister Office	1. U Kyaw Min Oo (Permanent Secretary) 2. U Tun Win (PD, FARM) 3. U Ko Ko Naing (Dy Director, Minister's officer Finance)
22 <sup>nd</sup> March	Friday	10:00 am	Wrap up meeting	1. U Kyaw Min Oo (Permanent Secretary) 2. U Kyaw Swe Linn (DG, DOP) 3. Daw Khin Mar Oo (Director, DOP) 4. Daw Su Su Aye (Dy Director, Treasury) 5. Dr. Win Htut (Director, DALMS) 6. U Win Naing (Director, AMD) 7. U Kyaw Zaw (Director, IWUMD) 8. Dr. Tin Tin Aung (Assistant Director, DOP) 9. U Tun Win (PD, FARM) 10. Dr. Myo Kyaw Thu (PMO, FARM) 11. U Zarni Hlaing (M&E, FARM) 12. U Aung Thiha (Assistant Director, IWUMD) 13. U Zaw One (Assistant director, IWUMD) 14. U Aung Zaw Phyo (officer, DOP)
25 <sup>th</sup> March	Monday	10:00 am	Meeting with DRD finance	1. U Tin Oo (Dy Director) 2. Daw Myat Su Aung (Assistant Director) 3. Daw Haymarn Win Aung (Dy officer) 4. Daw Pan Sabai (Dy Officer) 5. Daw Myo Thiri (Dy Officer) 6. Daw Toe Toe Aung (Dy Officer) 7. Daw Theint Thinzar Maung (senior clerk) 8. Daw Khin Thuzar Win (Senior clerk)