

## Project Completion Report Validation

### Al-Mahara Rural Development Project (AMRDP)

Republic of Yemen

Date of validation by IOE: November 2014

## I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m)		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	NEN	Total project costs	17.80			
Country	Yemen	IFAD loan and percentage of total	12.24	68.8	13.9	
Loan number	528-YE	Borrower	0.56	3.1		
Type of project (subsector)	Rural development	Cofinancier 1 (domestic financial institutions)	2.43	13.7	1.58	
Financing type	Loan	Cofinancier 2				
Lending terms <sup>a</sup>	Highly concessional	Cofinancier 3				
Date of approval	09 December 1999	Cofinancier 4				
Date of loan signature	11 November 1999	Beneficiaries	1.90	10.7		
Date of effectiveness	26 July 2000	Other sources (UNDP)	0.66	3.7	0.0	
Loan amendments	One	Number of beneficiaries	6,750 households (direct)			
Loan closure extensions	One					
Country programme managers	Abdalla Rahman Mohamed Hassani Omer Zafar	Loan closing date			31 March 2010	
Regional director	Kahlida Bouzar (current)	Mid-term review			18 October 2003	
Project completion report reviewer	Ernst Schaltegger	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)			94.6	
Project completion report quality control panel	Avraam Louca; Ashwani Muthoo	Date of the project completion report			Sept 2009	

Source: Project Status Report Project 1095 [528] 2010-07.

<sup>a</sup> There are four types of lending terms: (i) special loans on highly concessional terms, free of interest but bearing a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75%) per annum and having a maturity period of 40 years, including a grace period of 10 years; (ii) loans on hardened terms, bearing a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75%) per annum and having a maturity period of 20 years, including a grace period of 10 years; (iii) loans on intermediate terms, with a rate of interest per annum equivalent to 50% of the variable reference interest rate and a maturity period of 20 years, including a grace period of 5 years; (iv) loans on ordinary terms, with a rate of interest per annum equivalent to one hundred per cent (100%) of the variable reference interest rate, and a maturity period of 15-18 years, including a grace period of three years.

## II. Programme outline

1. AMDRP was approved in December 1999 and became effective in July 2000 with an effectiveness lag of only 7.7 months. Al-Mahara is an arid, sparsely populated and isolated part of one of the poorest countries on earth<sup>1</sup>. Its agricultural resource base is very poor because of water scarcity, and its isolation is limiting the marketing prospects of the area's relatively rich fish resources. Al-Mahara is the easternmost Governorate of Yemen. The project was expected to reach about 6,750 households, representing almost half of the 88,000 (2004) people living in the Governorate<sup>2</sup>. Beneficiaries were small artisanal fishermen, small farmers and pastoralists, included in the project as part of their communities.
2. The overall project goal was to improve the well-being of participating smallholder households and rural communities by encouraging their active involvement in managing their social needs and a more productive and sustainable use of their natural resource bases. To help achieve this goal, project investments aimed to: (a) support the development of more self-reliant communities and strengthen the partnerships among all stakeholders in the economic development of Al-Mahara; (b) strengthen the capacity of male and female farmers and fishermen and their communities, particularly disadvantaged groups, to determine access to and use of appropriate resources, technology and financial services for agriculture, fisheries and livestock development; and (c) build knowledge and capacity in public and private institutions and enterprises in Al-Mahara to deliver equitable, sustainable and profitable financial and technical services to the rural community.
3. Progress in the first years of project life was sluggish. The PCR<sup>3</sup> acknowledges that the project encountered a number of difficulties and setbacks since its effectiveness in 2001, most of which were during the period extending from 2001 to 2006. According to the PCR Digest<sup>4</sup>, performance was hampered by the project's slow start as well as by its very unstable management until 2007 when the project implementation began to manifest effectiveness, versatility and flexibility. As a consequence, the loan closure date was postponed by two years, from 31 March 2008 to 31 March 2010.

## III. Review of findings

### A. Programme performance

#### Relevance

4. IFAD's strategy in Yemen at project design, articulated through a country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP) in early 1997, recognized that despite the progress of the last decade, the country still faced considerable challenges in developing its agricultural and rural institutions<sup>5</sup>. The President's Report makes the case that *"physical and political isolation, rugged terrain, harsh climate, poor resource base, sparse population and cohesive social environment are the elements that, over time, have shaped life and opportunity in Al-Mahara, while also constraining development support to the region. This historic scenario, however, will change rapidly in the next decade as new road and air connections and cellular communications link communities and resources within Al-Mahara and with the outside world. While this process will bring the benefits of technology, services and markets to the Mahari people, it will also strongly challenge their culture, values and resource bases. To take advantage of these new opportunities, Mahari*

<sup>1</sup> IFAD. Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board on a Proposed Loan to the Republic of Yemen for the Al-Mahara Rural Development Project, Rome, 9 December 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Population figures are conflicting. The same source also indicates 128,000 as inhabitants of Al-Mahara.

<sup>3</sup> IFAD. Republic of Yemen Al-Mahara Rural Development Project (AMRDP), Project Completion Report IFAD Loan 528-YE, Rome, April 2010.

<sup>4</sup> IFAD. Al-Mahara Rural Development Project, PCR Digest, Rome, 2011.

<sup>5</sup> IFAD. Republic of Yemen, Country Strategic Opportunities Programme, Rome, 1997.

*communities will need to evolve social structures that broadly represent their interests and that will enable them to negotiate effectively with both government and market operatives”.*

5. Indirectly (and retrospectively) referring to AMRDP, the 2007 COSOP<sup>6</sup> states that IFAD-supported interventions in Yemen have allowed the Fund to develop particular expertise and insights in a number of areas, such as community development and institutional capacity-building, resource management, including agriculture and fishery resources, environmental protection and credit. The IFAD comparative advantage lied in its ability to work at the grass-roots community level.
6. The PCR presents only a very short assessment of project relevance and emits mixed signals: While the strategy and approach of the project were fully appropriate, the (PCR) mission nevertheless thought that the design process made simplistic assumptions about the implementation of the credit component and extension services, underestimated the risks and overlooked the need of a clear exit strategy. This critical assessment is also partly reflected in the Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) of 2012<sup>7</sup>. In this regard, the PCR notes that this was more the responsibility of IFAD and UNOPS that should have assisted the project in the preparation of an exit and sustainability strategy. The PCR Digest concurs by observing that some of the priorities established in the appraisal report did not fully reflect the real needs of the communities. Thus, several changes and adjustments were introduced to adjust and adapt the course of project implementation to reflect field realities, respond to emerging and pressing demands by the beneficiaries and/or to address some imperfections in project design. In view of the above evidence, project relevance is rated *moderately satisfactory (4)*.

### **Effectiveness**

7. According to the PCR, *“the original logical framework of the appraisal report covers one page, and includes one goal (overall objective) with three indicators; one purpose (immediate objectives) with five indicators and six outputs with 8 indicators. Activities and inputs are aggregated with very little detail regarding content and indicators. The logical framework of the project was reviewed. The revised logical framework covers five pages. The details at the goal and the purpose level remained basically the same. At the level of the outputs, although significant improvements were introduced, many of the selected indicators were composite indicators, difficult to measure, and collinear (measuring the same things) and without benchmarks against which the results achieved could be compared”.* These are pertinent remarks pointing not only at quality flaws at entry but also highlighting the difficulties of assessing project effectiveness.
8. Moreover, changes introduced during project implementation (Paragraph 6) further blurred comparisons between planned and achieved magnitudes. These changes were recommended by the MTR in 2003<sup>8</sup>. They included: (i) a relaxation of the community selection criteria and of financial beneficiary contributions from 20 to 10 percent, (ii) an increase of the per capita allocation for sub-projects from US\$ 100 to US\$ 150, (iii) the restructuring of the Credit Agricultural Cooperative Bank (CACB), which resulted in new orientations, a significant slowdown in the implementation of credit and subsequently to the reallocation of funds earmarked for rural credit to other components , and (iv) the extension of the project completion date and the loan closing dates.
9. Despite these difficulties, the PCR is in a position to report a number of facts and figures on achievements in the community development component: As of March

---

<sup>6</sup> IFAD. Republic of Yemen, Country Strategic Opportunities Programme, Rome, 13 November 2007.

<sup>7</sup> IFAD: Republic of Yemen, Country Programme Evaluation, Rome, December 2012.

<sup>8</sup> Compared to many other IFAD operations, the AMRDP MTR was fielded relatively early, i.e. before mid-term. This did however not mark a decisive turnaround in implementation progress until 2007.

2010, 42 communities were brought into the project progressively since 2001. Within the selected communities, 42 Community Development Committees (CDCs) have been established (38 women's CDCs; 39 men's CDCs; one mixed CDC and 2 agricultural societies acting as CDCs), with a total of 49,777 inhabitants representing about 56% of the total resident population of Al-Mahara Governorate estimated at 88,594 (2004). The selected communities account for an estimated 8,634 households, 28% higher than the appraisal estimates of 6,750 households.

10. At completion, 150 community schemes in nine development fields have been selected, implemented and handed over to the communities. Among the community schemes, 52 (35 %) are for water supply and sanitation, 18 (12%) are in the fishery sector, 10 (7%) are in education and training, 26 (17%) are in electricity, 9 (6%) are in rural roads, 6 (4%) are in the agricultural sector (including irrigation) and 21 (14%) are for income generating activities, in addition to five markets (3%) and three health units (2%). The number of beneficiaries from the community sub-projects is estimated at 13,875 households, against an appraisal target of 8,638 for this component. The above figures can be seen as proxies for the first specific objective of AMRDP, i.e. more self-reliant communities, in the absence of direct and verifiable indicators (Paragraph 7).
11. The PCR also refers to achievements towards the second specific objective. With the support of the project, flood control works along the wadis for 137 ha of fertile land were carried out. In the realm of animal production, interventions covered many more households. 6 veterinary doctors or technicians, supported by 44 para-veterinarians, assured the treatment and vaccination of about 50,000 and 132,000 animals, respectively, belonging to 11,345 households. The AMRDP still showed more significant change with regards to fishery: the number of artisanal fishing boats has increased during the project (2000-2008) from 1,800 to 2,965 boats, and the total number of direct beneficiaries increased from 8,200 to 11,860 households.
12. Within the third specific objective, the provision of financial services was the weakest link (Paragraph 8). The overall performance of the rural credit component in terms of outreach is far below the appraisal target. With respect to amounts disbursed, only 32% of the appraisal target has been achieved, and a little over 25% of the planned number of beneficiaries has been reached. The pilot microfinance initiative under the UNDP community-based regional development did not materialise, therefore contributing negatively to the relatively modest performance of rural credit. All in all, project effectiveness is rated as *moderately satisfactory* (4).

### **Efficiency**

13. The PCR has a dedicated section of efficiency. On the positive side, it may be noted that it revisits the cost-benefit analysis made at appraisal and concludes that the Economic Return Rate at completion was likely to be in the range between 14 and 27 percent, compared to the ERR of 17 percent estimated at appraisal.
14. At the outset, the short effectiveness lag of 7.7 months (Paragraph 1) would have provided for an excellent start. However, and differently from what reported in the PCR, the project's efficiency has been low due to several factors. The project had a slow start and low implementation rate for the majority of its implementation period, i.e. seven years out of nine (PCR Digest). This is reflected also in a supervision report rating, as late as 2008, in which not a single indicator was rated problem-free<sup>9</sup>.
15. The PCR also includes a table calculating the total project cost per beneficiary household, per component and at project level. The result is, for all components together, US\$ 1,610 per household. In IFAD projects being implemented in areas

<sup>9</sup> UNOPS. Al-Mahara Rural Development Project, Supervision Mission, 3 July – 07 August 2008, September 2008.

of difficult access and with dispersed population, such per household costs are typically in the range of US\$ 100-200. The Project Management Unit (PMU) registered a 56 percent cost overrun. This resulted from considerable salaries and allowances, which were incurred by the project from 2001 to 2006, as well as from the recurrent costs of the project during the two years extension period (2007-2009). Finally, project's efficiency was hampered by the high number of staff which on yearly average amounted to 48 people. Considering all of the above, both PMD and the PCRV rate project efficiency as *moderately unsatisfactory (3)*.

## **B. Rural poverty impact**

16. According to the PCR, the assessment of rural poverty impact was based partly on the M&E database, the baseline survey of 2000 and the impact study of 2008. This is commendable, but the PCR lacks precise reference related to this supporting documentation, for instance in a bibliography. Thus, the PCR and PCR digest are the only sources of impact assessment, which are not verifiable in detail.
17. **Household income and assets.** The PCR limits the analysis of this impact domain on fishery households. As far as agricultural and livestock trials and demonstration, the adoption rate by farmers has not been recorded and is therefore not possible to assess impact on income. About 30 percent of the fishermen have rehabilitated their boats and/or have changed off-board motors. The average per capita value of physical assets of nearly 1,800 fisherman was about USD 1,288 at completion. In addition, eleven fully equipped fish landing sites are owned and operated by the fisheries' societies, equivalent to a value of US\$ 439,000. The operation and maintenance of these landing sites are handled by the fisheries' societies by means of charges paid as a percentage of the landed fish. The number of artisanal fishing boats has increased from 1,800 to 2,965 boats during the period from 2000 to 2008, and the total number of direct beneficiaries increased from 7,200 to 11,860 households. While landings of lobster, shark and cattle fish has decreased over the past three to four years, the landing of demersal (bottom dwellers) and pelagic species (dwellers above the sea bottom) shows a slight increase. The gross value of the average fish landing per boat in 2000 and 2007 is estimated at USD 3,075 and USD 12,500 respectively, which shows a threefold increase in total revenues and a wider distribution among the fishery communities. Across all households, this impact domain is rated as *moderately satisfactory (4)*.
18. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** According to the PCR, more than 13,000 individuals have participated in technical and vocational training and/or literacy programmes, therefore improving their human capital. This has been reinforced by improvement with access to clean water and health services. Access to electricity made it possible for the communities to improve their knowledge, increase their awareness and benefit fully from educational, cultural and political programmes through TV and satellite programmes. About 95% of households in targeted villages report the availability of literacy programmes as compared to 2% before the project. Moreover, diversified training and capacity building programmes, strong and effective involvement of women in the community affairs coupled with the community-driven physical and social sub-projects have improved the level of human assets in these communities (PCR Digest). Both PMD and the PCRV rated this impact domain as *moderately satisfactory (4)*.
19. **Food security and agricultural productivity.** At the time of PCR preparation, the impact assessment study was still under implementation and did not provide detailed data on crop yields and animal products. It would also have provided estimates of gross margins of typical enterprises in line with the appraisal report<sup>10</sup>. The PCR simply states that livestock has increased by more than 20% and fish landing has increased more than three-fold. Therefore, return to labour and net

---

<sup>10</sup> Under these circumstances, some doubts about the accuracy of revisiting farm models in order to recalculate the ERR, as reported by the PCR (see Paragraph 13), may be appropriate.

income for a fisherman would have improved. The major source of livelihood is livestock and to a limited extent agriculture in a conservative scenario, where yield and production of staple crop remained unchanged. The increase in livestock production (as shown in the macro-data) is due most likely to intensive vaccination and treatment programmes that contributed to food security. The number of livestock increased by 20%, milk and fattening cycle was reduced by 50%. Given the above mentioned reservation about accuracy, this impact domain is rated as *moderately satisfactory* (4).

20. **Natural resources, the environment and climate change.** The PCR makes the case that the promotion and support of artisanal fishing techniques instead of commercial fishing is likely to be sustainable in the long-run. The accompanying support activities, such as use of cages for rock lobster fishing, collection analysis and dissemination of fish statistics, is an important instrument which should assist authorities develop appropriate policies for a sustainable artisanal fishing subsector. The establishment of participatory monitoring of coastal fishing zones against illegal, inappropriate or untimely fishing is likely to have a positive impact on the conservation of marine resources. In addition, the project husbandry and management techniques for improved crop and livestock based on established practices did not involve heavy use of fertilisers, chemicals or drugs. Given this evidence, both PMD and the PCR rate this impact domain as *satisfactory* (5).
21. **Institutions and policies.** The PCR does not assess institutions and policies per se but rather draws some lessons, which will be taken up again in the appropriate section. The PCR Digest goes more to the point, noting that, on the positive side, the project was able to create a dynamic process that encouraged further investments in the Governorate over the years. In addition, staff from local administrations, village development committee members and project staff benefitted from specialised training, advocacy, community workshops and awareness campaigns. On the other hand, despite the fact that all the outputs for the fisheries support services were completed, the recommended policy instruments have not been enforced by the Ministry of Fisheries Wealth. In view of the above, the PCR concurs with PMD and rates institutions and policies as *moderately satisfactory* (4).

## C. Other performance criteria

### Sustainability

22. According to the PCR, the continuity of project benefits depends on the following: (i) effective operation and outreach of the MAI support services; (ii) active CEA/CPV village extension agents; (iii) effective credit delivery channels and (iv) continued investments in social services. The PCR perceives only one option to assure these conditions, i.e. a follow-up project (AMRDP II). It suggests a transition period until December 2010 during which AMRDP II would be designed, with some support from IFAD, and then submitted to various donors. However as none of the four IFAD development interventions<sup>11</sup> that followed the closure of AMRDP covers the Al-Mahara Governorate, the option suggested by the PCR disappears and the prospects for sustainability of the project investments are being reduced. The PCR Digest notes that project sustainability was to be considered both fragile and risky. This was primarily due to the fact that the project's exit strategy had not been fully formulated. In addition, the prospects for sustainability were not assured as the project supported public services which may have deteriorated in the future.

---

<sup>11</sup> The four latest Projects approved by the IFAD Executive Board after the Al-Mahara project closing include the: Economic Opportunities Programme (EOP), approved in April 2010; Fisheries Investment Programme (FIP), approved in December 2010; YemenInvest-Rural Employment Programme (REP); and Rural Growth Programme, approved in December 2013.

23. In view of the above the PCRV rates sustainability *moderately unsatisfactory (3), lower than the moderately satisfactory (4)* self-rating by PMD,

### **Innovation and scaling up**

24. The PCR is very short on this criterion and advises to view the innovative features of the Project in relative terms taking into account the Yemeni context. The PCR Digests is more rewarding than the PCR and attests that the project's design was perhaps too ambitious. In fact, it was supposed to carry on innovative features, such as: a community empowerment process; reinforcement of the role of women recruited as Community Para-Veterinarian (CPVs) and Community Extension Agents (CEAs); nurture and support the infant NGOs to improve their managerial capabilities; explore the possibility of using some NGOs as delivery instruments for village-based financial services and strengthen the development of the civil society in the area; encouraging Yemen's growing and vibrant private sector. Among all these planned features, the only one reported by the PCR is the introduction of the participatory approach which was made in an area like Al-Mahara where the top-down approach previously prevailed.
25. In the absence of a follow-up project that would have provided, at least, a good opportunity for up scaling, the PCRV rates this criterion as *moderately unsatisfactory (3), same as the self-rating by PMD.*

### **Gender equality and women's empowerment**

26. The PCR displays a considerable amount of gender disaggregated data. This allows a reasonably educated assessment of gender equality and women's empowerment, with the PCR Digest being a good source of synthetic information. The project established a separate gender team that was assigned the gender mainstreaming responsibility of project activities. The project implemented a considerable set of activities benefitting rural women. It established women community structures such as 39 CDCs, of which 14 are DAs. Women were also involved in participating in various technical and vocational trainings (health and nutrition, para-veterinary, Community Agricultural extension, literacy programmes, sewing) as well as they took part in the establishment of income generating subprojects such as (sewing shops, grocery shops, coffee milk, bakery, livestock fattening). Most of these activities are well managed and profitable. The total number of women benefiting directly from these gender-specific interventions has been 14,782. 4,258 women benefitted from literacy programme. In addition, they have also benefited from the rest of the activities as members of the 8,634 households. 50% of the trained women have been integrated in the local economy and created a positive growing synergy in various cities and villages. It is worth noting that impact on women could have been much higher if they had access to credit. This evaluation criterion is rated by both PMD and the PCRV as satisfactory (5).

## **D. Performance of partners**

27. **IFAD.** The PCR is clear in its assessment of IFAD performance. The Country Programme Manager for Yemen at IFAD had been changed three times within the period from 2002 to 2007, therefore contributing directly to the already volatile implementation status of the project portfolio, in general, and AMRDP, in particular. IFAD's exclusive reliance on UNOPS for implementation support without direct and active involvement in search of innovative solutions to protracted problems, such as rural credit and community extension support services, or bridging the financial gap caused by UNDP withdrawal as a co-financier, did not produce the desired results. On the other hand, the set-up of an IFAD country presence office in 2006 and shifting to direct supervisions is perceived as fostering the scope and quality of implementation support to the project portfolio. IFAD performance is rated as *moderately satisfactory (4)*.

28. **Government.** The PCR only displays an otherwise unspecified rating exercise of all involved ministries and local bodies, faring all as moderately unsatisfactory, except for the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation. The rating is based on the four criteria of quality, timelines, problem solving and commitment. The PCR Digest is more specific by stating that PMU performance has been unsatisfactory. Several reasons underpin this assessment. Initial project's poor performance was associated with low disbursement, arbitrary management decisions, poor procurement practices and inadequate financial management, in addition to high staff turnover. There have been delays and transparency issues in procurement due to poor management and oversight which then have been resolved with the new managers entering the system in 2007. Since then, project performance has improved significantly in terms of procurement and financial management, quality and timelines of reporting. Up to the project closing date, the Government has provided USD 1.2 million to co-finance the four components. This exceeds the appraisal estimate by 130%. However, no reason is given in PCR to justify this higher amount. PMD and the PCRV rate government performance as *moderately unsatisfactory* (3).

### **E. Overall programme achievements**

29. MARDP is a project with a variable performance and impact record. Moderately satisfactory rating scores in almost all impact domains are noteworthy although many of them occurred principally in fishers' households. However, as in many other IFAD operations, low efficiency seems to be correlated to government performance in the unsatisfactory range<sup>12</sup>. The PCRV also concludes that sustainability was at risk at completion. It is not known whether the similar assessment of PMD may have played a role in not going for a follow-up phase in Al-Mahara Governorate.

## **IV. Assessment of PCR quality**

30. **Scope.** The PCR Digest notes that the PCR is only partly in line with guidelines. Indeed, there is a generalized lack of precise references (no bibliography) where they would have been important, for instance comparative data between the baseline and impact surveys. On the other hand, painstaking accounting of planned and achieved outputs form an important part of the annexes. Scope is therefore rated as *moderately satisfactory* (4).
31. **Quality.** According to the PCR Digest, the lack of quantitative data to assess project's impact on the different domains is a major shortcoming strongly affecting the quality of the PCR. As mentioned above, the PCR did rely on project data that apparently kept track of physical progress but failed to provide evidence to what extent specific objectives have been achieved. Quality is rated as *moderately satisfactory* (4).
32. **Lessons.** As the PCR Digest states, the lessons learned are presented mainly as recommendations. These may be pertinent but the reader is not informed why such recommendations are made, i.e. on what kind of lessons they build. For instance, the PCR recommends that saving and credit association (SAC) or similar informal community-based rural financial services should be created to ensure reliable access to rural financial services. One can only assume that such a recommendation is made because the rural finance component with the Credit Agriculture Cooperative Bank was underperforming. Against a PMD rating of moderately satisfactory, this criterion is rated by the PCRV as *moderately unsatisfactory* (3).

---

<sup>12</sup> IFAD. IFAD's institutional efficiency and efficiency of IFAD-funded operations, Corporate-level Evaluation, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), Rome, August 2013.



33. **Candour.** In some areas, e.g. in the assessment of partners, the PCR is quite lucid and critical. On the other hand, the PCR maintains that the project was efficient even when calculating itself the exorbitant per beneficiary household cost, which is hardly ever done in PCRs. Candour is consequently rated as *moderately satisfactory (4)*.

## **V. Final remarks**

### **Lessons learned**

34. An ambitious project design full of innovative features (Paragraph 23) is inconsistent with overly simplistic assumptions regarding implementation (Paragraph 7). What made matters still more problematic was IFAD's exclusive reliance on UNOPS for implementation support without direct and active involvement in search of innovative solutions to protracted problems, starting from effectiveness to 2008 (Paragraph 25). Innovative features are necessary, but they must be relatively simple to implement, especially in remote and sparsely populated areas. And innovation deserves close attention from the start. This did clearly not happen with AMRDP.

## Rating comparison

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>PMD rating<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>IOE rating<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (IOE PCRV – PMD)</i>
<b>Project performance</b>			
Relevance	4	4	0
Effectiveness	4	4	0
Efficiency	3	3	0
<b>Project performance<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Rural poverty impact</b>			
Household income and assets	4	4	0
Human and social capital and empowerment	4	4	0
Food security and agricultural productivity	4	4	0
Natural resources, environment and climate change	5	5	0
Institutions and policies	4	4	0
<b>Rural poverty impact<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Other performance criteria</b>			
Sustainability	4	3	-1
Innovation and scaling up	4	3	-1
Gender equality and women's empowerment	5	5	0
<b>Overall project achievement<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Performance of partners<sup>e</sup></b>			
IFAD	4	4	0
Government	3	3	0
<b>Average net disconnect</b>			<b>-0.2</b>

<sup>a</sup> Rating scale: 1 = highly unsatisfactory; 2 = unsatisfactory; 3 = moderately unsatisfactory; 4 = moderately satisfactory; 5 = satisfactory; 6 = highly satisfactory; n.p. = not provided; n.a. = not applicable.

<sup>b</sup> Arithmetic average of ratings for relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

<sup>c</sup> This is not an average of ratings of individual impact domains.

<sup>d</sup> This is not an average of ratings of individual evaluation criteria but an overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the rating for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, rural poverty impact, sustainability, innovation and scaling up, and gender.

<sup>e</sup> The rating for partners' performance is not a component of the overall assessment ratings.

<i>Ratings of the PCR document quality</i>	<i>PMD rating</i>	<i>IOE PCRV rating</i>	<i>Net disconnect</i>
Scope	4	4	0
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)	4	4	0
Lessons	4	3	-1
Candour	4	4	0
<b>Overall rating of PCR</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

## Definition of the evaluation criteria used by IOE

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Definition<sup>a</sup></i>
<b>Project performance</b>	
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, institutional priorities and partner and donor policies. It also entails an assessment of project design in achieving its objectives.
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.
<b>Rural poverty impact<sup>b</sup></b>	Impact is defined as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household income and assets</li> </ul>	Household income provides a means of assessing the flow of economic benefits accruing to an individual or group, whereas assets relate to a stock of accumulated items of economic value.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human and social capital and empowerment</li> </ul>	Human and social capital and empowerment include an assessment of the changes that have occurred in the empowerment of individuals, the quality of grassroots organizations and institutions, and the poor's individual and collective capacity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Food security and agricultural productivity</li> </ul>	Changes in food security relate to availability, access to food and stability of access, whereas changes in agricultural productivity are measured in terms of yields.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural resources, the environment and climate change</li> </ul>	The focus on natural resources and the environment involves assessing the extent to which a project contributes to changes in the protection, rehabilitation or depletion of natural resources and the environment as well as in mitigating the negative impact of climate change or promoting adaptation measures.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutions and policies</li> </ul>	The criterion relating to institutions and policies is designed to assess changes in the quality and performance of institutions, policies and the regulatory framework that influence the lives of the poor.
<b>Other performance criteria</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability</li> </ul>	The likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. It also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Innovation and scaling up</li> </ul>	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have: (i) introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction; and (ii) the extent to which these interventions have been (or are likely to be) replicated and scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and others agencies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender equality and women's empowerment</li> </ul>	The criterion assesses the efforts made to promote gender equality and women's empowerment in the design, implementation, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation of IFAD-assisted projects.
<b>Overall project achievement</b>	This provides an overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the analysis made under the various evaluation criteria cited above.
<b>Performance of partners</b>	This criterion assesses the contribution of partners to project design, execution, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation. It also assesses the performance of individual partners against their expected role and responsibilities in the project life cycle.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IFAD</li> <li>Government</li> </ul>	

<sup>a</sup> These definitions have been taken from the OECD/DAC *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management* and from the IFAD Evaluation Manual (2009).

<sup>b</sup> The IFAD Evaluation Manual also deals with the "lack of intervention", that is, no specific intervention may have been foreseen or intended with respect to one or more of the five impact domains. In spite of this, if positive or negative changes are detected and can be attributed in whole or in part to the project, a rating should be assigned to the particular impact domain. On the other hand, if no changes are detected and no intervention was foreseen or intended, then no rating (or the mention "not applicable") is assigned.

## **Bibliography**

- IFAD. Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board on a Proposed Loan to the Republic of Yemen for the Al-Mahara Rural Development Project, Rome, 9 December 1999
- IFAD. Republic of Yemen Al-Mahara Rural Development Project (AMRDP), Project Completion Report IFAD Loan 528-YE, Rome, April 2010.
- IFAD. Al-Mahara Rural Development Project, PCR Digest, Rome, 2011.
- IFAD. Republic of Yemen, Country Strategic Opportunities Programme, Rome, 1997.
- IFAD. Republic of Yemen, Country Strategic Opportunities Programme, Rome, 13 November 2007.
- IFAD: Republic of Yemen, Country Programme Evaluation, Rome, December 2012.
- UNOPS. Al-Mahara Rural Development Project, Supervision Mission, 3 July – 07 August 2008, September 2008.
- IFAD. Republic of Yemen, IFAD Follow Up Mission, Aide Memoir, March 2012.
- IFAD. IFAD's institutional efficiency and efficiency of IFAD-funded operations, Corporate-level Evaluation, Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE), Rome, August 2013.