

Project Completion Report Validation
Livestock Sector Rehabilitation Support Project
(LSRSP)
Republic of Burundi
Date of validation by IOE: October 2016

I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m)		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	Eastern and Southern Africa	Total project costs	17.815		17.815	
Country	Burundi	IFAD loan and percentage of total	13.978	78.46%	13.978	78.46%
Loan number	DSF 8002-BI	Borrower	2.229	12.51%	2.229	12.51%
Type of project (subsector)		Cofinancier 1				
Financing type		Cofinancier 2				
Lending terms*	Ordinary terms	Cofinancier 3				
Date of approval	April 2007	Cofinancier 4				
Date of loan signature	June 2007	Beneficiaries	1.608	9.02%	1.608	9.02%
Date of effectiveness	February 2008	Other sources				
Loan amendments		Number of beneficiaries	Direct: 93572		Direct 83651	
Loan closure extensions	01					
Country programme manager	Rym Ben Zid	Loan closing date	June 2014		December 2014	
Regional director(s)	Sana Jatta	Mid-term review			September 2011	
Project completion report reviewer	Mohamed Tounessi	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)			99%	
Project completion report quality control panel	Fabrizio Felloni	Date of the project completion report			December 2014	

Source: President's Report, Project Status Reports and Project Completion Report.

*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 cent) 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 cent) 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 per cent of the variable reference interest rate and a maturity period of 20 years, including a grace period of five years; (iv) loans on ordinary terms, with a rate of interest per annum equivalent to one hundred per cent (100 per cent) of the variable reference interest rate, and a maturity period of 15-18 years, including a grace period of three years.

II. Project outline

1. **Introduction.** Burundi remains one of the poorest countries in the world. Most of the population lives in rural areas where poverty is estimated at about 70 per cent.¹ Livestock is essential to the livelihoods of numerous poor households. Farm animals serve a number of purposes, providing food, cash income, and manure to preserve soil fertility and enhance productivity of staple crops. The livestock sector suffered enormous damage during the civil war and is only slowly recovering despite strong demand for animal products (meat, milk products and honey). A large part of the population does not have sufficient capital to acquire livestock. For those owning animals, productivity is very low because of the lack of access to technical and animal health services; inadequate infrastructure; shortage of forage; and low genetic potential.²
2. **Project area.** Project activities were implemented in seven provinces including: Cibitoke, Gitega, Karusi, Kayanza, Bujumbura, Bururi and Ruyigi.
3. **Project goal, objectives and components.** As stated in the President's Report, the project's overall objective was to improve the livelihoods of the **rural** poor and restore their food security. Its specific objectives were to: (i) raise livestock productivity while developing the downstream sector through increasing access to livestock processing technology, infrastructure and markets;(ii)facilitate the access of the poor and vulnerable to veterinary services and reinforce the sector in terms of sanitary risk management, prevention and protection; and (iii) strengthen the capacity of elected community committees responsible for local community development and introduce farmers' field school methodology to upgrade farmers' skills and promote participatory competitive research activities.
4. The Project was implemented, through the following components: (i) **rehabilitation of livestock production and enhancement of product value**, representing 59 per cent of total costs and including: diversification and **improvement** of resources and nutrition, rehabilitation and sustainable management of productive capital and economic exploitation of livestock products; (ii) **community-based animal health services and animal health surveillance and protection**, representing 19 per cent of total costs and including: Community Animal Health Workers (ACSAs) network development, sanitary and epidemiological monitoring protection;(iii) **capacity-building of communities and smallholder farmers**, representing 9 per cent of total costs and including: Capacity building of community structures and Support to self-training of small producers, through introduction and development of Farmers Field Schools (FFSs); and (iv) **project coordination**, representing initially 13 per cent of total costs with the provision of technical and fiduciary capacities and operating costs to implement the project.³
5. **Target group.** The project targeted directly, approximately 100,000 poor household among the 556,000 poor and vulnerable households in the project area. Priority was given to vulnerable groups such as woman-headed households, unemployed young people and returnees with very limited land or livestock, or no assets whatsoever. Other activities were focusing on poor farmers to assist them in improving livestock productivity and marketing. The project was designed and prepared as a complementary project and service provider for livestock activities of IFAD programmes which were ongoing in Burundi, namely the Rural recovery and development Programme and the Transitional Programme for Post-Conflict Reconstruction.

¹<http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/burundi/overview>

²President's Report, Paragraph 1.

³PCR paragraph146 table: budget allocation and disbursements.

6. **Financing.** At design, total project costs were estimated at US\$17.815 million. This was to be funded by an IFAD grant worth US\$13.978 million, Government contribution amounting 2.229 and beneficiary contribution, worth US\$1.608 million. Actual project costs were kept the same.

Table 1
Project costs

<i>Source of financing (USD million)</i>	<i>Approved</i>	<i>Disbursements at completion</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
IFAD (debt sustainability framework grant)	13.978	13.880	99%
Government	2.229	2.164	97%
Beneficiaries	1.608	1.936	120%
Total	17.815	17.980	101%

Source: Project Completion Report.

7. **Project implementation.** Overall responsibility for project implementation was with the Ministry of Agriculture. Implementation was under the overall responsibility of the project coordination unit, which was sharing key staff with other ongoing IFAD projects at the central and provincial levels. The project used the committees that have been set up by these projects, i.e. the steering committee and the technical advisory committee. Elected community committees were entrusted with the planning, implementation and monitoring of project activities at the village level. Beyond that, implementation was arranged mainly through contracting of implementing partners on the basis of either binding memorandums of understanding with public-sector implementing partners or contracts with participating NGOs and private-sector implementing partners.⁴
8. **Significant changes during implementation.** The Project Mid-term Review (MTR) held in September 2011, resulted in a slight change in project structure covering consolidation of all aspects involving distribution of animals: "Rehabilitation of productive capacities", "Recapitalization of poor households, intensification and conservation of forage resources and multiplication and distribution of seeds and plant materials. To meet the demands and needs of organizational and structural reinforcement of several categories of beneficiaries (especially seed multipliers, the producers of milk and honey), a specific activity related to improved professionalization of different small business was introduced.⁵ After the MTR, the staffing of the project coordination unit was increased from 14 to 25 staff.⁶ Moreover, since the MTR the project staff were undergoing staff performance evaluation.⁷ A final important change is UNOPS as Cooperating Institution, to direct supervision by IFAD. No amendments were brought to the grant agreement except the extension of a three-month period with the completion of the project to 30 June 2014 and closing on 31 December 2014⁸ and financial reallocation in September 2012, following the MTR.⁹
9. **Intervention logic.** The Project was designed as a structuring project aiming at reconstructing, from the most vulnerable producers to the institutional level, the livestock sector hindered by years of conflicts. The design was aligned with the Country orientations and with the IFAD strategy. It had built around key actions that enable the strengthening of the rural poor, to restore their food security. Project goals and objectives were coherent, addressing the challenge of raising livestock productivity, increasing access to livestock processing technology, infrastructure and markets and facilitating the access. Logframe is very informative

⁴ See Annex 9 of the Appraisal report.

⁵ PCR, table project structure after the MTR, Paragraph 19, Page 3.

⁶ PCR, Paragraph 151, following negotiations of the Grant Agreement, the project coordination unit staff to be financed directly by the project increased to 14 people instead of the ten planned without changing the COSTAB. It was later reinforced, following the recommendations of MTR and supervision missions, reaching a total of 25 staff.

⁷ PCR, Paragraph 153.

⁸ Ibid, PCR, Annex 6, page 72.

⁹ Ibid, PCR Paragraph 149.

with updated key indicators from appraisal, MTR, to completion. However, as designed, the project involved a risk with the setup of partnership with research institutions, processing and market access. These three challenges could not be addressed because of the time span of the project, lack of effective know how and lack of adequate financial resources.¹⁰

10. **Delivery of outputs.** The analysis of outputs is provided in detail in the section related to effectiveness, since the Project Completion Report (PCR) and supervision mission reported mainly on the project outputs through the different components. The key outputs recorded through the three components were: 140 seed growers associations established, 20,000 elected members of community solidarity chains trained in 976 "collines", 69 communal veterinary technicians trained on artificial insemination, to improve the genetic potential of local and exotic breeds, 18,500 artificial inseminations were conducted. 1,393 animal health community agents trained. 220 FFSs established with a total of 7,350 members of which 66 per cent were women. 84 per cent of farmer's members adopted recommended technologies for the establishment of forage crops, production of livestock feed, production and use of manure, good sanitary practices and control of reproductive cycles of animals. 90 milk production associations trained and four milk centres established and 1,393 ACSAs including 209 women trained.

III. Review of findings

11. The report presents findings based on review of the project design document, the President report, the PCR, the MTR, supervision reports, Project Status Reports (PSRs) and other relevant materials.

A. Core criteria

Relevance

12. The LSRSP was designed at the time when the country was coming out of a period of 12 years of deadly conflict. The challenge for the Government of Burundi was to put the country in a process of sustainable reconstruction of productive capacity and economic recovery. The project preparation coincided with the finalization of the first programme to fight poverty (Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy, August 2016). Recognizing that the rural sector was the main source of economic growth, it set priorities for actions such as stepping up cultivation of food crops and export crops, and livestock breeding, reactivating the private sector and diversifying rural employment and income-generating opportunities. However, as mentioned in the intervention logic, the project involved a risk with the setup of partnership with research institutions, processing and market access. According to the PCR, these three challenges could not be addressed because of the time span of the project, lack of effective know how and lack of project adequate financial resources.
13. Within this sector, animal husbandry, especially breeding of short cycle animals, was considered an important strategic focus of the fight against poverty because of the key position, occupied on farms in terms of household food security, generation of regular cash income, and restoration of soil fertility. In addition, at the time of design, livestock was considered a key element in the promotion of rural women and as a driver element for income generating activities and rural employment. Therefore, the project was fully in line with the Country Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction, which underlined three major thrusts: (i) improving governance and security; (ii) promoting sustainable growth; and (iii) developing human capital.
14. The general objective and specific initial targets of the project are still relevant. These objectives were initially well identified. They continue to meet real needs and

¹⁰ PCR, Paragraph 35.

major concerns of targeted beneficiaries of the project. This was very much in line with the Government's overarching priorities of reducing household vulnerability.

15. To reach its specific objectives, LSRSP, was implemented on the basis of an intervention strategy based on three options: (i) participatory community development; (ii) the principle of service outsourcing, and (iii) livestock short-cycle species, such as entry point for actions against poverty. Project interventions were also part of a twofold approach: (i) direct support to vulnerable households through capital recapitalization and capacity building to improve food security and income; and (ii) reconstruction and protection of productive capital through the establishment of community services in animal health, epidemiological monitoring, artificial insemination and genetic improvement.
16. The project built on the programme-based assistance that IFAD has been providing to the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the agricultural sector and the rural economy in the transition from a crisis situation to a long-term development system. The choice of the community planning approach was the right choice as underlined by the PCR consultation workshop. Under this approach, the identification of project beneficiaries was done transparently by the population on the basis of poverty criteria defined by the communities themselves. In particular, it was highlighted by the PCR and MTR and supervision missions that all activities proposed under the different project components were requested by the communities.
17. On IFAD's side, the programme approach adopted by the project, has strengthened the synergy among programmes and expanded the impact on poverty reduction and food security, in line with the IFAD Policy on Crisis Prevention and Recovery. The project is aligned with the Fund's strategic objectives of building human and social assets and developing productive assets and sustainable technology, in accordance with the IFAD Strategic Framework 2007-2010. Similarly, it fully supports the regional strategic objectives of promoting effective and equitable linkages between poor producers and market opportunities and creating an improved system of managing knowledge, know-how, and the transfer of information and technology.
18. In addition, the Project's framework as designed was coherent with IFAD's Country Strategic Opportunities Paper (2006) that envisages a three-pronged thrust, including: facilitate access by the rural poor to new economic opportunities, strengthen the organizations of the rural poor to enable them to access services and resources and participate in rural development policies, and facilitate participation by women and vulnerable groups in the economic initiatives supported by the project. In summary, the design of the strategy and project intervention approaches were generally relevant and contributed to some extent to the objectives and results of the project. Therefore, the Project Completion Report Validation (PCRV) rating for relevance is satisfactory (5), same as the PMD rating.

Effectiveness

19. According to the PCR, supervision mission reports and PSRs, The project has recorded satisfactory levels of outputs and outcomes through the specific objectives outlined above in paragraph 5. Most outputs have been reached at a 90 per cent level as reflected in the last supervision report.¹¹
20. The project has contributed to changing beneficiaries' livelihoods in a positive way. The breeding livestock base was transformed through accessible local services, functional associations of forage production, community solidarity chain of breeders (goats, pigs, rabbits) organized and providers of quality animals, municipal veterinary technicians who became artificial insemination agents, who improved

¹¹Supervision mission report 2014, Appendix 2 updated logical framework: progress against objectives, outcomes and outputs, page 28.

the genetic potential of local breeds, ACSA deployed throughout the project zone, who became the link between agro-breeder and the municipal veterinary technicians and the extension FFS which transformed animal husbandry practices regarding production, use of manure, proper feeding, good health practices and control of the reproductive cycle.¹²

21. Two outcomes have to be particularly highlighted: (i) Community Solidarity Chains (CSC) vested in Hill Community Development Committees (CDCs); and (ii) the tremendous decrease of livestock mortality from 25 per cent to 3 per cent, due to easy access to affordable veterinary services provided by ACSAs to more than 400,000 livestock breeders, far beyond the 60,000 target.¹³
22. The PCR section on project effectiveness is reporting over full ten pages on targets and achievements¹⁴. In terms of achievements of specific objectives, the project has shown strong degrees of effectiveness.
23. **Objective 1: Rehabilitation of livestock production and enhancement of product value** represented 59 per cent of total costs and included: diversification and improvement of resources and nutrition, rehabilitation and sustainable management of productive capital and economic exploitation of livestock products. It has affected all categories of stakeholders including grass root community structures, state structures and local service providers.
24. Overall the component achieved its planned target in the areas of diversification, conservation and intensification of forage resources, improvements of nutrition, capacity rehabilitation for artificial insemination, rehabilitation of productive capacity and recapitalization of poor households through rabbit, pig and poultry recapitalization kits. 140 seed growers associations planned were carried out at 100 per cent and seed production was performed at 86 per cent. Concerning the community solidarity chains, 20,000 elected members were trained in 976 « collines ». Animal breeders for cattle, pigs and rabbits were organized and provided quality animals and quality male breeding. 69 communal veterinary technicians were trained on artificial insemination, to improve the genetic potential of local and exotic breeds. The artificial insemination success rate went from 25 per cent at the start of the project to 50 per cent, while it was projected at 35 per cent in year 7. 18,500 artificial inseminations, out of 31,000 planned (60 per cent) were realized.¹⁵ 1,393 animal health community agents were trained. 220 FFS were established, including 7,300 herders and 66 per cent of women. 90 milk production collinaires associations were also trained and four milk collection centres were established.¹⁶
25. However, the PCR and the December 2013 supervision report, noted weak performance with artificial insemination, economic exploitation of livestock products (milk and beekeeping) management governance of community institutions and effective registration and monitoring system of genitors. The late start of these activities and the complexity of their implementation are the causes of poor performances.¹⁷
26. **Objective 2: Community-based animal health services and animal health surveillance and protection**, representing 19 per cent of total costs, included: ACSA network development and capacity building, sanitary and epidemiological monitoring protection. Overall the component achieved its planned target. 1,393 ACSA including 209 women were trained and supported by the project. This has led to a drastic decrease in animal mortality.

¹² PCR workshop consultation, Annex 11, page 106.

¹³ PSR, 2014.

¹⁴ PCR, page 7 to 17.

¹⁵ PCR, Paragraph 52. Initial target at appraisal was 12,000 artificial insemination, however MTR brought the target to 31,000.

¹⁶ PCR, Paragraph 39.

¹⁷ Supervision December 2013, Paragraph 7, page 2 and PCR, Paragraph 69-71.

27. The mortality of young cattle decreased from 11 per cent to 1 per cent, the young pigs from 23 per cent to 3 per cent and that of young goats from 23 per cent to 3 per cent. Adult cattle mortality decreased from 16 per cent to 3 per cent, adult pigs from 26 per cent to 3 per cent and adult goats from 14 per cent to 2 per cent¹⁸. The remarkable reduction in mortality of the animals was achieved through: (i) the training of farmers on signs of major diseases and how to detect them and the availability of veterinary products for sale nearby farmers. Reducing product cost is estimated at 36 per cent following the introduction of the ACSA service. Moreover, the actions related to health protection and epidemiological monitoring led to control of animal diseases including African swine fever and Newcastle disease¹⁹.
28. At the level of policy dialogue, three laws were signed including the law on animal health, the law on the veterinary profession and veterinary medicine and the law governing the inspection of animal products. However, the Ministerial Order on the health mandate of the ACSA is not yet signed.²⁰
29. **Objective 3: Capacity building of communities and smallholder farmers,** representing 9 per cent of total costs and including: capacity building of community structures and support to self-training of small producers, through introduction and development of FFS. Overall, the component achieved its planned targets. 220 FFS were established, against an appraisal target of 200 FFS. The total membership reached 7,350 members of which 66 per cent were women. FFS provided learning centres of innovation with a high level of technology adoption among their members. Thus, 84 per cent of farmer's members adopted recommended technologies for the establishment of forage crops, production of livestock feed, production and use of manure, the adoption of good sanitary practices and control of reproductive cycles of animals.²¹ Based on the considerations above in terms of outcomes and outputs achieved, the PCRV rates effectiveness as satisfactory (5), same as PMD.

Efficiency

30. The project became effective eight months after it was signed, leading to effectiveness lag of eight months, which is lower than the country average (approximately 12 months)²². The project was implemented within the project lifespan including a three-month extension and reallocation of grant proceeds was recorded one time in September 2012. The extension period was used to develop innovative marketing mechanisms, in partnership with other on-going IFAD projects PAIVA-B (Support Project for the Intensification of Agricultural and Value Chain) and PRODEFI (Value Chain Development Programme).²³
31. The total amount disbursed including all sources of financing reached the amount of US\$ 17.980 million, representing an overall disbursement rate of 101 per cent. Disbursements by financing sources are the following: IFAD's debt sustainability framework grant 99 per cent, Government 97 per cent, and beneficiaries 120 per cent.²⁴ However, unbalanced disbursement rate are recorded by component: Component 1: rehabilitation of livestock production and enhancement of product value 96 per cent, Component 2 Community-based animal health services and animal health surveillance and protection 61 per cent, Capacity building of communities and smallholder farmers 84 per cent and Coordination 199 per cent²⁵. In contrast, organization, management and project coordination, efficiency was affected by the high costs of project management, which exceeded 99 per cent of

¹⁸ PCR, Paragraph 77 and table Mortality of animals by species and age group before and after the establishment of ACSA, page 13.

¹⁹ PCR, Paragraph 78.

²⁰ Ibid, Paragraph 80.

²¹ PCR, Paragraph 96.

²² IFAD grant agreement was signed in June 2007 and was effective in February 2008.

²³ PSR, 2014.

²⁴ PCR, Paragraph 138.

²⁵ Ibid, Paragraph 143,144,145 and 146 and table page 31.

the initial allocation. The percentage of management costs fixed at 12.6 per cent of total costs in the appraisal budget has more than doubled and represented 24.8 per cent of total costs. This is explained in part by an underestimation in the appraisal report of the necessary personnel for the project implementation.²⁶

32. Annual Work Plan and Budget execution was on average 84 per cent with a peak in 2013 (107 per cent) and 101 per cent in 2010. The low 72 per cent completion rate and 53 per cent respectively recorded in 2008 and 2009 correspond to the low level of activities at the start of the Project.²⁷ According to the PCR, based on the estimated number of direct beneficiaries (83,651 households or 465,800 people) and total costs of the Project (US\$18 million) the actual cost per direct beneficiary of LSRSP is US\$38 per individual and the cost per household was US\$215, per household of 5 people.²⁸
33. Another measure of efficiency was apprehended through the assessment of the economic viability of the project based on the achievements during the period of implementation²⁹. To this effect, the PCR analysed the actual cost-benefit of the project, with observed costs, margins and prices at project completion for goat recapitalization kit, pork recapitalization kit, cattle kit, rabbit recapitalization kit and milk production. Cost benefit analysis over a period of 15 years, including the six years of implementation, showed that the project is profitable. According to the PCR, this very high profitability, is attributable to highly productive activities (kits pigs (48 per cent), rabbits kits (33 per cent), kits goats (47 per cent), cattle kit (79 per cent) and milk production (7.5 per cent), that generate profits quickly, while requiring low costs (investment and operation).³⁰ However, the PCR cannot ascertain that assumptions and figures used are viable to calculate the profitability attributable to each model. In addition, despite the relevance and profitability of the activities initiated by the project, PCR found that beneficiaries and the farmer organizations are still fragile to sustain the profitability of activities supported by the project³¹. Based on the considerations above, the PCR rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory (4), same as PMD.

Rural poverty impact

34. The LSRSP did not carry out baseline survey that would have to compare the initial situation and the situation after the project completion. This PCR's analysis was derived from three sources: first, IFAD's Results and Impact Management Survey (RIMS) conducted in 2012, which served as a baseline to position the results of the RIMS survey of 2013. Second: regional and national stakeholder workshops which were organized in the context of project completion that served as a venue for qualitative assessment by beneficiaries. Regional workshops were held in seven provinces including: Bujumbura, Bururi, Cibitoke, Gitega, Karusi, Kayanza and Ruyigi.³² Third, a survey that covered a sample of 423 households. The majority of those surveyed consist of recipient goats (27.18 per cent), pigs (30.73 per cent), cattle (10.40 per cent) and farrowing pigs (8.03 per cent). 17.25 per cent were non-LSRSP beneficiaries. Women accounted for 31.44 per cent.³³ There was no control group to compare with the findings of the survey.
35. Thematic studies were mentioned by the last supervision mission report³⁴, including: the effects and impact of genetic improvement, effects and impacts of the project on the empowerment of rural women, assessment of the functionality and durability of producers organizations involved in the multiplication of cuttings

²⁶ Ibid, Paragraph 145.

²⁷ Ibid, Paragraph 148 and graph page 32.

²⁸ Ibid, Paragraph 188.

²⁹ Ibid, PCR, Annex 9, financial and economic analysis, page 106.

³⁰ PCR, Annex 9, Financial and Economic Analysis.

³¹ Ibid, Paragraph 193.

³² PCR Annex 11, page 120.

³³ Impact study, page 4 and 5.

³⁴ Supervision report, Paragraph 107.

and seeds of forage crops, assessment of the functionality and durability of producers organisations involved in the milk and honey value chain, the evaluation of the functionality and durability of producers organisations involved in the production of rabbit breeders and pig breeders. However, they were not available for review by PCR. It seems that the PCR concentrated more on qualitative than on quantitative evidence, basing its assessment rather on feedback received from project stakeholders and project beneficiaries. This section on impact is therefore describing possible impacts based on information data given in the PCR and other relevant documents.

36. **Household income and net assets.** According to PCR and supervision missions, LSRSP had an impact on household income beneficiaries through: the sale of animal products (milk, animals), increased agricultural productivity (related to fertilization) that improved coverage of annual food needs, the multiplication of improved seeds sold through associations of forage seeds, the recapitalization of small livestock that generated income when reselling animals, income from professional activities of ACSA and income generated by permanent jobs in small farms³⁵ (collection of fodder, security, maintenance of litter).
37. According to the PCR, the impacts are considered satisfactory in terms of accumulation of goods and improved livelihoods. 100 per cent of ACSA reported having improved their economic situation, 100 per cent acquired livestock and 40 per cent acquired land³⁶. The results of the impact survey showed that two thirds (66 per cent) of beneficiary households claimed to have increased their income by more than 30 per cent. Most of the lower third are direct or indirect beneficiaries of activities implemented in late 2013 and 2014 for which results have not yet been maximized. On average, 53 per cent of beneficiary households recorded an increase of their incomes greater than 50 per cent.
38. Program interventions have allowed beneficiaries to increase income per capita by 96 per cent compared to an increase of only 18 per cent for non-beneficiaries during the same period.³⁷ The households, who reported an increase of at least 50 per cent of income, represented 58.07 per cent of respondents (all categories of animals). Moreover, the index of goods accumulation increased from 42 before the project to 55 per cent at the end of 2013, representing an increase of 32 per cent.³⁸
39. Profits from ACSA's activities were estimated to average 75,000 FBU (Burundian Franc) and 165,000 FBU per month on the increase in other productions resulting from investments made by CASA. 95 per cent of ACSAs say they have improved their incomes by more than 50 per cent, resulting in an improvement of nearly ten times the poverty line set at 191,000 FBU per year and per person.³⁹ ACSA, as private service provider has created additional employment and generate income in rural areas. The monthly income reported by ACSA vary around 70,000 FBU compared to the target of 60,000 FBU set by the MTR.⁴⁰
40. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** This section is not treated in the PCR. However based on the review of different documents, 20,000 elected members of community development committees were trained to perform their duties. 140 seed multiplication associations were assisted and are still operational. 90 milk production associations were also trained. 69 communal veterinary technicians were trained on artificial insemination. 220 FFS were established, providing services to 7,300 livestock producers. In particular 1,393 livestock health community agents were trained and become autonomous since early 2014 while

³⁵ PCR, Paragraph 116.

³⁶ PCR, Paragraph 84.

³⁷ Ibid, Paragraph 117.

³⁸ Supervision mission December 2013, Paragraph 100.

³⁹ PCR, Paragraph 83.

⁴⁰ Supervision mission, December 2013, Paragraph 76.

affirming themselves as reliable and recognised partners for the Livestock and Agriculture Provincial Departments that regularly rely on them for vaccination campaigns. This comprehensive capacity building and training provided to communities, producer organizations benefiting from productive investments and decentralized technical structures, resulted certainly in impact on human, social capital and empowerment.

41. **Food security and agricultural productivity.** Through training, capacity building, and funding of productive activities, LSRSP impacted both food security and agricultural productivity. According to the programme's participatory impact evaluation,⁴¹ households who benefited from animals recorded a sharp increase in agricultural production through the production and use of manure. 79 per cent reported 60 per cent production increase, against 38 per cent for non-beneficiaries. The survey also indicates that 79 per cent of beneficiaries have improved food security (reducing the lean period) against 43 per cent for non-beneficiaries.⁴²
42. The availability of animal products, such as milk and pork, suggests that part of the rural population has improved the quality and diversity of food ration, through the consumption of unsold products (milk, small livestock), or through increased income to purchase regular meat or milk for the family.⁴³
43. In terms of agricultural productivity, the field visits undertaken by the last supervision mission⁴⁴ confirmed that beneficiaries registered a net increase of agricultural production from 50 to 200 per cent depending on the type of animals and culture. Cattle and pigs produced a large amount of good quality manure that led to increase in yields for major crops (banana, bean, corn, potato, cassava and vegetables).
44. An increase in yields per hectare from 40 per cent to 65 per cent has been registered as a consequence of the adoption by beneficiaries of the innovations disseminated by the project. The level of adoption of improved agricultural technologies is estimated to average 73.74 per cent.⁴⁵ The provision of artificial insemination services was used extensively to improve the genetic potential of animals in the project area. Also, installation of the ACSA network served in improving access to veterinary services of all farmers in the priority area. The establishment of associations and private seed multipliers contributed to increased production and productivity of agriculture and livestock⁴⁶.
45. **Institutions and policies.** The project's impact on institutions and policies is not thoroughly assessed in the PCR. However, the project had an impact on rural community organizations and supported the decentralization process at local level through targeted capacity strengthening. The implementation of the LSRSP relied heavily on collaboration with many structures: The CDCs and the Communal Community Development Committees were strengthened to play a key role in supporting the community solidarity chain device. They have become the direct counterparts of decentralized state structures at local level. The involvement of CDCs had a strong impact in terms of "social capital"⁴⁷ with a strong commitment to these structures.
46. In addition, the project prompted the participation of an increased array of stakeholders and support institutions, and in particular the project promoted the ACSA on which project implementation was hinging and had direct impact in the

⁴¹ Annual participatory survey on impact, October 2013, sample of 423 households.

⁴² Ibid, Paragraph 2.2.3, Table A, Page 8.

⁴³ PCR, Paragraph 113-114 and 115.

⁴⁴ December 2013 Supervision mission, Paragraph 13-14.

⁴⁵ Ibid, Paragraph 100.

⁴⁶ PCR, Paragraph 122.

⁴⁷ PCR, Paragraph 128.

reduction of animal morbidity and mortality⁴⁸. The establishment of the ACSA network has created 1,393 direct jobs, including 209 jobs for women. The quality of the ACSA services is positively assessed by 77 per cent of households in the project area.⁴⁹ They have become the direct counterparts of decentralized state structures at local level. The project has also contributed to shaping the rules and regulations for ACSAs, which were recognized in their role, by the veterinary services of the State with the granting of an accreditation by the Animal Health Department.⁵⁰

47. Community capacity building of small producers through the structuring of groups or pre-cooperatives for milk producers, forage seeds, pigs, rabbits and calf producers, showed improved professionalism in dealing with the market and decision making process. FFS were instrumental in building small producer capacity and is already a framework of cohesion and solidarity, which is an excellent prerequisite for a multifunctional professional organization⁵¹. The Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock benefited also from capacity building and have seen its role boosted through, FFS and artificial insemination. Its involvement with FFS, found a promising new way to contribute to the transformation of agro-forestry-pastoral practices⁵².
48. **Overall rural poverty impact.** LSRSP had positive impact across the defined impact criteria, in view of the benefits seen among the target groups in terms of income and assets, food security and agricultural productivity, human and social capital and empowerment, policy and institutions. The project has contributed to improving the living conditions, incomes and food security of the beneficiaries by providing knowledge and modern agricultural practices, in particular in the field of animal husbandry. New structures and jobs were created at local level and linkages with public institutions were established to pave the way to long-term sustainability. There are indications that household income and assets have improved through new activities and investments, even if not enough time has elapsed to be able to see significant changes. The PCRV rates the overall rural poverty impact as satisfactory (5), same as PMD.

Sustainability of benefits

49. Key features to ensure sustainability of the LSRSP includes the pursuit of profits generated by the project after its closure, and takes into consideration the strategies envisaged to gradually reducing assistance to the project (exit strategy) and good governance of local institutions. This criterion also considers the profitability of economic activities supported, regular availability of funds for operating costs for ACSA and artificial insemination, the availability of technical and organizational support and political support after project closure.
50. The PCR is presenting a positive situation with regard to sustainability, based on qualitative assessment. In particular, the PCR underlines the high beneficiary ownership of project achievements due to the participatory approach adopted by the project in combination with relevant training and capacity building efforts. By focusing its approach on participatory community development, the project contributed significantly to addressing the issues of ownership and local capacity building, crucial conditions for sustainability. According to IFAD's Regional Division for East and Southern Africa, the CDCs were strengthened across the project target areas and could manage well CSCs. Even under the new operations, these CDCs

⁴⁸ PCR, Paragraph 77. The mortality of young cattle decreased from 11 per cent to 1 per cent, the young pigs from 23 per cent to 3 per cent and young goats from 23 per cent to 3 per cent. Adult cattle mortality decreased from 16 per cent to 3 per cent, adult pigs from 26 per cent to 3 per cent and adult goats from 14 per cent to 2 per cent.

⁴⁹ December 2013, supervision mission, Paragraph 11.

⁵⁰ Ibid, Paragraph 11.

⁵¹ Ibid, Paragraph 12.

⁵² PCR, Paragraph 131.

are still monitoring the CSCs and are involved in targeting. The CDCs are permanent committees partly elected by the population.

51. According to the PCR, the chances of sustainability of the investments made by the program are considered high, for the following reasons: concerning, the institutional sustainability of ACSA, the General Directorate of Livestock has already acquired considerable experience in the establishment and development of ACSA networks. ACSAs are included in the law presented by the project to the Government on veterinary services and the replication of this approach is mandatory in livestock rearing: ACSAs are currently being recruited in all provinces. The function of ACSA is exercised privately and ACSA are able to support themselves after obtaining a working capital to build their stock of veterinary drugs. Based on their business plans, ACSA activities for livestock restocking have attractive levels of profitability and therefore, have opportunities and sufficient guarantees to access credit from financial institutions. However, even if the results achieved and the potential for growth of ACSA network are encouraging, some constraints remain and require attention from the LSRSP and national authorities.⁵³
52. However, even if the results achieved by ACSA network are encouraging, some constraints remain and require attention from the LSRSP and national authorities. Indeed, the lack of regulatory framework in relation to the activities of ACSA inhibits the replication of this approach. Moreover, the majority of ACSA expressed the need for improved capacity building, to raise the level of knowledge and therefore to provide better services to farmers⁵⁴. Further training of ACSA should include training in management and entrepreneurship development to make animal health agents, not only technicians but also pro-active entrepreneurs.⁵⁵
53. With regard to artificial insemination, tangible economic benefits through the production of high performance animals were noted. However, the activity is not economically viable as long as the artificial insemination is free. In this situation, the operation of the National Artificial Insemination Centre was not economically viable⁵⁶. The free service to farmers was relevant but to make it sustainable, a service charge and reimbursement mechanisms need to be put in place.⁵⁷ In addition, the veterinary drug supply system is irregular, because of the lack of business oriented channel and collaboration between stakeholders. An institutional audit is needed, to improve the level of collaboration and communication between all players of artificial insemination⁵⁸. Furthermore, the performance and efficiency of the National Artificial Insemination Centre is still a cause of concern, mainly due to the lack of electricity to run the cold chain for conservation of seeds and inadequate staffing and organization to produce seeds and nitrogen for artificial insemination.⁵⁹
54. Concerning the producer organizations, the speed in their set up process was very fast and has challenged the foundations of their sustainability.⁶⁰ As highlighted by supervision missions, their management governance is still fragile⁶¹. Only milk cooperatives have reached a certain degree of organization⁶². The beekeepers cooperatives begin to be structured, while other associations (pig producers, rabbits and forage seed producers) are not yet structured even if the organizational

⁵³ PCR, Paragraph 88.

⁵⁴ December 2013, supervision mission, Paragraph 74.

⁵⁵ Ibid, Paragraph 133.

⁵⁶ Ibid, Paragraph 39.

⁵⁷ Ibid, Paragraph 131.

⁵⁸ December supervision mission, Paragraph 36.

⁵⁹ Ibid, Paragraph 38.

⁶⁰ December 2013 supervision mission, Paragraph 88.

⁶¹ Ibid, paragraph 134.

⁶² As communicated by ESA, before the project closure, conventions were signed with the other IFAD funded projects as well as with a World Bank project to take over the Cooperatives running the milk collection centres.

frameworks are in place. More support on management capacity is needed to put them in the path of sustainability⁶³. In addition, the PSR⁶⁴, confirmed the fragility of farmer organizations, especially market oriented groups (pre-cooperative associations). They require additional support in business capacity building, linkages with the existing national farmers' movement to become economically viable and institutionally sustainable.

55. Another important player in the project were the FFS. These have not yet reached the required management standard. They still have to become more organized to provide extension services. Therefore, the existing FFSs need more support and capacity building⁶⁵. In short, although the project contributed to some positive achievements, such as the enhanced capacity of local communities to manage their development, there are non negligible sustainability risks linked to the activities supported by the project. Sustainability is therefore rated moderately satisfactory (4), one point below the PMD rating.

B. Other performance criteria

Innovation and scaling up

56. **Innovation.** The most significant innovations initiated by the LSRSP include: (i) ACSA that helped to bring down the mortality rate of animals with basic veterinary care; (ii) CSC that enable every community across the hills, to promote access to small farmers; and (iii) FFS, as an extension method based on peer exchanges allowing farmers to adopt new techniques. Evidence on Innovations related to the presence of ACSA and the development of the CSC is provided in the evaluation of the ACSA and the final impact assessment study.
57. **Scaling up.** Replicability and scaling up are not analysed in the PCR, through the tools defined by IFAD such as Guidance on Country Scaling up, pathways, drivers and spaces. Moreover, there is no evidence of specific measures taken to ensure that successful innovations are scaled up in wider Government policies or programmes funded by the Government or other development partners. ACSAs and CSCs are replicated and scaled up currently in all IFAD funded operations and are adopted by a number of partners, particularly the World Bank funded projects. Both innovations helped restock after the damages caused by the war (1993-2005) and are contributing to restore soil fertility because of the extended use of manure. These two innovations are contributing currently, after being scaled up by the other operations, to the construction of the Milk Value Chain. The PCR rates innovation and scaling-up as satisfactory (5), same as the PMD rating.

Gender equality and women's empowerment

58. The PCR and supervision missions present some quantitative and qualitative information regarding LSRSP's impact on gender equality and women's empowerment. The qualitative evidence suggests significant changes in women's empowerment⁶⁶. According to the PCR, women have improved their standing in groups. Women participate more in meetings, actively search for information, look to diversifying activities, and are more interested in capacity building activities.
59. However, despite the project's intentions for a cross-cutting gender strategy, the quantitative information suggests that the proportion of women benefitting from the project was heterogeneous but overall quite modest. Gender-disaggregated data⁶⁷ indicates that out of 63,341 households reached through the CSCs, 19,643 were female headed households (31 per cent). FFS beneficiaries counted 66 per cent of women, the forage production associations, 58 per cent. 106 women out of a total of 452 beneficiaries (13 per cent) received heifers distributed by the LSRSP.

⁶³ Ibid, Paragraph 134.

⁶⁴ PSR, December 2013.

⁶⁵ December 2013 supervision mission, Paragraph 91.

⁶⁶ PCR, Paragraph 30.

⁶⁷ December 2013 supervision mission report, Paragraph 102.

In addition, five women out of 58 beneficiaries received brood stock bulls (8 per cent) and four women out of 20 beneficiaries (20 per cent) benefited from calf cattle. Women beneficiaries for goats, pigs, rabbits and poultry account for about 32 per cent, respectively, 26 per cent, 42 per cent and 41 per cent of the total beneficiaries.

60. For associations and groups they represent about 26 per cent of the members of hill associations, 33 per cent of beekeeping associations, 58 per cent for forage crops groups, 53 per cent for rabbit breeders, and 35 per cent for pig breeders. In ACSAs, women membership was only 15 per cent (209 women out of 1,393 ACSA members). Their representation in decision-making bodies was relatively low (29 per cent). Therefore, the project did not succeed in increasing the share of women in decision-making bodies and hence in empowering them. The PCRV rates gender equality and women's empowerment as moderately satisfactory (4), one point below the PMD rating.

Environment and natural resources management

61. Based on the information in the PCR and other consulted documents,⁶⁸ no negative impact on the environment was noted. The LSRSP was not aimed at directly improving the natural environment, and data on environmental impacts of project interventions remain limited. However, according to the PCR, production and application of animal manure promoted by the project contributed to the restoration and improvement of soil fertility. Even non-beneficiaries who buy manure, have increased the fertility of their land which led to an increased agricultural production without using mineral fertilizers⁶⁹. In addition, the activities of CDC and Communal Community Development Committees have certainly contributed to raising people's awareness on protecting natural resources and the environment and to building the capacity in using existing natural resources more efficiently. The PCRV rates environment and natural resources management as moderately satisfactory (4). It was not rated by PMD.

Adaptation to climate change

62. There are studies in Burundi on climate variability and vulnerability, on climate projections and on the potential impacts of climate change⁷⁰. Burundi is obviously subject to the adverse effects of climate change, which are affecting economic growth, food security, livelihoods of the poor, and assets (natural resources and infrastructure). Vulnerability studies show that all the vital sectors of the national economy are affected by the phenomena of variability and climate change. The socio-economic consequences are most felt by poor people living primarily from natural resources, such as farmers. It is, therefore, crucial to increase the resilience of farmers, reducing their vulnerability to climate change effects.
63. While this was not foreseen explicitly in project design, and not reported as "adaptation to climate change", the project did support the diversification of agro-pastoral activities, such as small livestock for reconstitution or fattening, that somehow indirectly strengthened the resilience of smallholder men and women to risks, including those brought by climate change. This diversification of the production systems may have reduced poor farmers' dependence on highly weather-sensitive farming activities, and allowed them to expand their capacity to take advantage of better years to recover from previous crises, and to be better prepared against future impact of climate change. Manure contributes to restore soil fertility and structure, soil degradation including erosion is contained and there is an increase of agricultural production: therefore, households may be less exposed to climate shocks and more climate resilient. Because of the development

⁶⁸ PCR, Paragraph 126. Supervision mission reports are not reporting on the environment and natural resources.

⁶⁹ PCR, Annex 10 Impact on Environment, page 19.

⁷⁰ See for instance: https://www.weadapt.org/sites/weadapt.org/files/legacy-new/knowledge-base/files/4e2555c0189a8Economics_of_Climate_Change_in_Burundi_Factsheet.pdf

the CSC, beneficiaries planted forage trees that could also contribute to the reduction of soil degradation and erosion. Resilience to shocks (including climate shocks) may also be enhanced by the presence of livestock on farm which is a form of reserve capital. In addition, increased income generated by the project could help in the short-term when dealing with the aftermath of extreme weather events. Considering that climate change adaptation is an important issue in Burundi which was not explicitly taken into account by the project, but that it was somewhat contributed to indirectly, the PCRV is rating adaptation to climate change moderately satisfactory (4), one point below the PMD rating.

C. Overall project achievement

64. The PCR does not include an overall assessment of the project. Based on the PCR and other reviewed documents the PCRV's appreciation is overall positive. In general terms, the LSRSP has contributed in attaining its development objectives of improving the livelihoods of the rural poor and restoring their food security, through raising livestock production and productivity. The design of the strategy and project intervention approaches were generally relevant and contributed to some extent to the objectives and results of the project. The project has significantly contributed to improving beneficiaries' livelihoods. The breeding livestock base was transformed through accessible local services, functional associations of forage production, community solidarity chain of breeders, communal veterinary technicians and the FFS, which improved farming practices. Two particular outcomes have to be particularly earmarked, including: CSCs vested in CDCs and the tremendous decrease of livestock mortality from 25 per cent to 3 per cent, due to easy access to affordable veterinary services provided by ACSAs to more than 400,000 livestock breeders.
65. The most significant innovations initiated by the LSRSP include: the promotion and development of ACSA, CSC and FFS. However, those innovations are not backed up by evidence, tracking system and cost effectiveness analysis for each innovation. With regard to sustainability, although the project contributed to some positive achievements, there are non-negligible sustainability risks linked to the activities supported by the project. Impact on gender equity, the environment and climate change adaptation was modest. However, considering the satisfactory relevance, effectiveness and rural poverty impact of the project, the overall rating of project achievement is satisfactory (5), same as the PMD rating.

D. Performance of partners

66. **IFAD.** The performance of IFAD is not much analyzed in the PCR. It noted that IFAD's performance was appropriate in that it provided adequate support and guidance during implementation. UNOPS undertook the first supervision mission in December 2008. Thereafter, IFAD decided to put the project under direct supervision and carried out five supervision missions with adequate coverage of technical and financial matters, which were critical for the project's performance. In addition, an MTR mission was fielded in September 2011, which corrected design issues and helped the project to revise its targets by channeling interventions and resources on areas and activities considered as the triggers for a long-term development process. The establishment of the IFAD Country Office in 2008, headed by IFAD Representative and Country Director, was certainly instrumental in providing support on implementation and design support, to policy dialogue, partnership building and knowledge management for LSRSP. In light of the above, the PCR rates IFAD performance as satisfactory (5), same as PMD.
67. **Government.** The performance of the Government is not much analyzed in the PCR. The Government provided appropriate financial and technical support, and counterpart funds were adequate and timely. In terms of compliance with contractual clauses, generally all the provisions of the agreement were met. The project was placed under the responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture. Overall

policy guidance and supervision was ensured by the sectorial and policy steering committee. There is no information on the activities of the Steering Committee and how it complied with its tasks at a strategic level. Public institutions at the central, provincial and communal level played an important role in project implementation. The contribution of government agencies involved was appreciated by the PCR. There were 4 government structures involved in the project implementation: (i) the General Directorate for Livestock, for data management and livestock registration; (ii) the Directorate for the Promotion of Livestock Production, for the implementation and monitoring of cattle breeders; (iii) the National Center for Artificial Insemination, for artificial insemination activities; and (iv) the Direction of Animal health, for the establishment of community agents for animal health and the organization of vaccination campaigns, prevention, detection and early warning. In light of the above, the PCRV rates the performance of Government as satisfactory (5), one point below PMD.

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

68. **Candour.** In several sections of the report, the PCR tends to over-emphasize the project's achievements, despite some challenging issues such as sustainability. In addition, many sections, covering the evaluation criteria, are not evidence-based oriented, relying on admittedly professionally competent, opinions and judgment. The PCRV assesses the PCR's candour as moderately satisfactory (4).
69. **Scope.** The PCR covered most of the key aspects of the project. However, a number of sections of the PCR did not provide in-depth analysis as required in the IFAD guidelines for PCR preparation. Moreover, several mandatory sections, such as, human and social capital and empowerment and institutions and policies are not provided in the PCR report. The project did not carry out baseline survey that would have to compare the initial situation and the situation after the project completion. The assessment of impact is mostly taken from three sources: IFAD's RIMS survey conducted in 2012, which served as a baseline to position the results of the RIMS survey of 2013, the regional and national stakeholder workshops which were organized in the context of project completion that served as a venue for qualitative assessment by beneficiaries and a survey that covered a sample of 423 households. On this basis, the PCRV assesses PCR scope as moderately satisfactory (4).
70. **Quality.** The PCR is on the whole well written, although it is devoid of relevant footnotes and bibliography. Analysis and conclusions are in most cases clearly connected. However, quantitative evidence provided in support of the statements made about effectiveness and impact is quite limited and not always persuasive. The report analysis is more output than outcome oriented. The PCR has a strong focus on relevance, and physical outputs. The PCRV considers the quality of the PCR as moderately satisfactory (4).
71. **Lessons.** The PCR concludes with a series of lessons learnt that are largely congruent with the main conclusions, however in rather generic terms and with virtually no critical outlook. More could have been included about project weaknesses and challenges (in particular sustainability). The PCRV would have liked to see lessons from the following questions: If we had to start a new project, what would we do differently? What should we have done better? What advice could we give to others? What were neglected elements of the project? The PCRV rates lessons as moderately satisfactory (4).

V. Final remarks and lessons learned

72. The PCR presents operational and technical lessons with which the PCRV concurs. The lessons are about mainly technical topics like, the production of forage seeds, milk marketing, mortality of poultry kits, cooperatives and financial management of the honey collection centres and artificial insemination. If any single lesson

deserves reiteration, it is the importance of the commercialization of livestock services, with the public sector providing more of a catalytic, advisory and monitoring role. The privatization of veterinary and all services, input supply and product marketing can lead to more efficient and sustainable services at the farm gate. Therefore, the necessity for cost recovery for private-good services and encouragement of private sector service delivery is critical for sustainability.

73. Another lesson shows that efforts to increase livestock productivity must be undertaken simultaneously with the provision of necessary inputs: seeds, improved breeding stock, processing and marketing facilities.
74. Though the PCR and PSR were affirmative about the effectiveness of the exit strategy put in place by the project through different agreements signed between associations and the Burundi Institute for Agronomic Sciences, MOUs vesting SCSs in CDCs, the PCRV is not convinced that the phasing out of the project was addressed adequately. In the future, the Terms of Reference of the last two supervision missions should clearly include a specific section on how the project is handing over results and achievements to Government and beneficiaries and therefore how the sustainability challenge is addressed.

Definition and rating of the evaluation criteria used by IOE

Criteria	Definition *	Mandatory	To be rated
Rural poverty impact	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. <i>Four impact domains</i>	X	Yes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household income and net assets: 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. The analysis must include an assessment of trends in equality over time. Human and social capital and empowerment: Human and social capital and empowerment include an assessment of the changes that have occurred in the empowerment of individuals, the quality of grass-roots organizations and institutions, the poor's individual and collective capacity, and in particular, the extent to which specific groups such as youth are included or excluded from the development process. Food security and agricultural productivity: Changes in food security relate to availability, stability, affordability and access to food and stability of access, whereas changes in agricultural productivity are measured in terms of yields; nutrition relates to the nutritional value of food and child malnutrition. Institutions and policies: 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. 		No
Project performance	Project performance is an average of the ratings for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of benefits.	X	Yes
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 and coherence in achieving its objectives. An assessment should also be made of whether objectives and design address inequality, for example, by assessing the relevance of targeting strategies adopted.	X	Yes
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.	X	Yes
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.	X	Yes
Sustainability of benefits	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.	X	Yes
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	The extent to which IFAD interventions have contributed to better gender equality and women's empowerment, for example, in terms of women's access to and ownership of assets, resources and services; participation in decision making; work load balance and impact on women's incomes, nutrition and livelihoods.	X	Yes
Innovation and scaling up	The extent to which IFAD development interventions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) have introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction; and (ii) have been (or are likely to be) scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and others agencies. 	X	Yes
Environment and natural resources management	The extent to which IFAD development interventions contribute to resilient livelihoods and ecosystems. The focus is on the use and management of the natural environment, including natural resources defined as raw materials used for socio-economic and cultural purposes, and ecosystems and biodiversity - with the goods and services they provide.	X	Yes
Adaptation to climate change	The contribution of the project to reducing the negative impacts of climate change through dedicated adaptation or risk reduction measures	X	Yes

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Mandatory</i>	<i>To be rated</i>
Overall project achievement	This provides an overarching assessment of the intervention, drawing upon the analysis and ratings for rural poverty impact, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of benefits, gender equality and women's empowerment, innovation and scaling up, as well as environment and natural resources management, and adaptation to climate change.	X	Yes
Performance of partners			
• IFAD	This criterion assesses the contribution of partners to project design, execution, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation. The performance of each partner will be assessed on an individual basis with a view to the partner's expected role and responsibility in the project life cycle.	X	Yes
• Government		X	Yes

* These definitions build on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management; the Methodological Framework for Project Evaluation agreed with the Evaluation Committee in September 2003; the first edition of the Evaluation Manual discussed with the Evaluation Committee in December 2008; and further discussions with the Evaluation Committee in November 2010 on IOE's evaluation criteria and key questions.

Rating comparison:

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>IFAD-PMD rating^a</i>	<i>PCRVR rating</i>	<i>Rating disconnect</i>
Rural poverty impact	5	5	0
Project performance			
Relevance	5	5	0
Effectiveness	5	5	0
Efficiency	4	4	0
Sustainability of benefits	5	4	-1
Project performance^b	4.75	4.5	-0.25
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	5	4	-1
Innovation and scaling up	5	5	0
Environment and natural resources management	NA	4	NA
Adaptation to climate change	5	4	-1
Overall project achievement^{c,d}	5	5	0
Performance of partners			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	6	5	-1
Average net disconnect^e			-0.4

^a 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.

^b Arithmetic average of ratings for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of benefits.

^c 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, sustainability of benefits, rural poverty impact, gender, innovation and scaling up, environment and natural resources management, and adaptation to climate change.

^d The rating for partners' performance is not a component of the overall project achievement rating.

^e This is the sum of all rating disconnects divided by the number of ratings for which disconnects could be calculated. The compound ratings for project performance and overall project achievement are not taken into account.

Ratings of the project completion report quality

	<i>PMD rating</i>	<i>IOE PCRVR rating</i>	<i>Net disconnect</i>
Candour		4	
Lessons		4	
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)		4	
Scope		4	

Rating scale: 1 = highly unsatisfactory; 2 = unsatisfactory; 3 = moderately unsatisfactory; 4 = moderately satisfactory; 5 = satisfactory; 6 = highly satisfactory; n.a. = not applicable

Bibliography

Burundi, Country Strategic Opportunities Programme, September 2008.
LSRSP, project design report, March 2007.
LSRSP, President's report, April 2007.
LSRSP, grant agreement, June, 2007.
LSRSP, project completion report, December 2014.
LSRSP, Mid Term review report, November 2011.
LSRSP internal evaluation report, October 2013.
LSRSP, supervision mission reports, 2010, 2012, 2013 and 2014.
PSRs, 2013 and 2014.
LSRSP, RIMS, 2012 and 2013.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACSA	Community Animal Health Workers
CDC	Hill Community Development Committee
CSC	Community Solidarity Chains
FFS	Farmers Field Schools
MTR	Mid-term Review
PCR	Project Completion Report
PCRV	Project Completion Report Validation
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PSR	Project Status Report
RIMS	Results and Impact Management Survey