Independent Office of Evaluation

IFAD Investing in rural people

Project Completion Report Validation

Rural Microfinance and Livestock Support Programme
Islamic Republic of Afghanistan
Date of validation by IOE: April 2018

I. Basic project data

			Approval (US$ m)		*Actual (US$ m)*	
Region	Asia and the Pacific	Total project costs	26.117		31.500	
Country	Afghanistan	IFAD financing (initial) and percentage of total	23.89	91.5%	29.29	93.1%
Grant number	DSF-8033-AF 2000000395 (additional financing)	IFAD supplementary financing	[6.0]	NA	6.0	
Type of project (subsector)	Agriculture and Microfinance	Microfinance Investment Support Facility for Afghanistan	2.218	8.5%	2.218	6.90%
Financing type		Microfinance Institutions	0.002	0.1%	0.02	0.6%
Financing terms*	DSF grant	Cofinancier 3				
Date of approval	30 April 2009 25 Nov 2013 (additional financing)	Cofinancier 4				
Date of financing agreement signing	7 July 2009	Beneficiaries				
Date of effectiveness	24 August 2009	Other sources				
Financing agreement amendments	23 Mar 2010 2 Apr 2015 (additional financing)	Number of beneficiaries (if appropriate, specify if direct or indirect)	20,000 households (component 1) and 5100 women and farmers (component 2)		Direct beneficiaries: 282,405 households[1]	
Grant closure extensions	Extended by three years from 31 March 2014 to 31 March 2017					
Country programme managers	Hubert Boirard	Grant closing date			31 March 2017	
Regional director(s)	Hoonae Kim	Mid-term review			30 April 2012	
Project completion report reviewer	Philippa Morgan	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)			98%	
Project completion report quality control panel	Michael Carbon Fumiko Nakai	Date of the project completion report			10 March 2017	

Source: Project Completion Report (PCR) 2017, appendix 5, P.39
* This was a special loan 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.

[1] According to the PCR, the majority of the reported direct beneficiaries (more than 80 per cent) were livestock owners reached by project-supported livestock extension services. The PCR also reported that according to the project data, 442,823 households benefited indirectly but noted that the details of benefits were not clear.

II. Project outline

1. **Introduction.** The Rural Microfinance and Livestock Support Programme (RMLSP) was the first IFAD-financed programme in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The project received board approval on 30 April 2009. The financing agreement was signed on 7 July 2009 and became effective as of 24 August 2009. The original project completion date was 30 September 2013, but the IFAD Executive Board approved additional financing (grant) of US$6 million for scaling up purposes, combined with a three-year extension. The loan was closed on 31 March 2017, three years after the original date of 31 March 2014, and the project was implemented between 24 August 2009 and 30 September 2016; a total duration of seven years. The Mid Term Review (MTR) took place in April 2012.

2. **Programme context.** Afghanistan is one of the poorest countries in the world and in 2009 ranked 181 out of 182 countries according to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Index.[2] The country faces a severe crisis as a result of nearly three decades of conflicts beginning in 1979 with the Soviet invasion. Despite significant achievements since the fall of the Taliban in 2001, the establishment of democratic institutions and ministries, and improvements in health, education and infrastructure, critical levels of insecurity and rampant criminality are severely restricting further progress. Afghanistan is characterized by the dominance of mountainous terrains (75 per cent of the country) with little arable land for agricultural activities. Conflicts have disrupted or destroyed many routes to local markets and recurrent droughts have affected much of the country since 1999. Around 77 per cent of the population lives in rural areas[3] and tends to raise cattle alongside agricultural activities. The country currently receives a vast amount of money from donors, accounting for 90 per cent of all public expenditure.[4] However, funds are disproportionately channelled to conflict areas in the south and leaving areas in the north, traditional farming areas, considerably under resourced.

3. The financial sector in Afghanistan is small, with just 15 licensed commercial banks including three government owned and international banks such as Standard Chartered and Citibank, operating through 418 branches across the country. There are currently four main types of agricultural credit arrangements available to small and poor farmers and include: (i) anawat which involves short selling of commodities for cash loans (used by shopkeepers); (ii) commodity credit which allows shopkeepers and traders to purchase goods on credit and pay later; (iii) family and kinship group sources; and (iv) salaam.[5] [6] Government policy statements are actively promoting Islamic financing as the preferred form of financial services as evidenced in the rapid expansion in the sector between 2003 and 2008.

4. **Programme area.** Programme activities were originally planned for implementation in eight provinces, namely Balkh, Baghlan, Bamyan, Faryab, Jawzjan, Nangarhar, Samangan and Saripul. Following the MTR mission and consultations with Government, the project area was redefined: two additional provinces were included (Badakhshan and Takhar) and three provinces were replaced (Faryab, Samangan and Saripul with Kabul, Herat and Kunduz).

5. **Project goal, objectives and components.** The **goal** of the RMSLP was to reduce the vulnerability and improve the livelihood means, incomes, food security and nutritional status of the poor and vulnerable rural households on a sustainable basis in selected areas of Afghanistan. The project **purpose** was to provide

---

[2] UNDP Human Development Report, 2013, http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/Country-Profiles/AFG.pdf
[3] World Bank, World Development Indicators 2006.
[4] The Agency Coordinating Body for Afghan Relief (ACBAR), Aid Effectiveness in Afghanistan, March 2008.
[5] Salaam is an informal credit system and used most commonly by opium producers. It involves the advance sale of produce at negotiated prices, often before planting season but also later on in the crop cycle.
[6] IFAD Design Report 2009, P.13.

sustainable access to smallholders, existing livestock owners and those who aspire to have livestock – with a focus on women, women headed households, the uncreditworthy and *Kuchis* (pastoralists) - to appropriate microfinance services and technical livestock packages (health, management, processing and marketing) and the skills required to engage in new, more productive or more profitable economic, agriculture-based enterprises.

6. The three project components were as follows: **Component 1: Rural microfinance** comprising the following sub-components: 1.1) innovation facility; 1.2) targeting the ultra-poor; 1.3) technical support and capacity building for microfinance institutions (MFIs); **Component 2: Livestock support** with sub-components: 2.1) integrated dairy scheme; 2.2) veterinary services; 2.3) backyard poultry development; and 2.4) dairy goat raising; and **Component 3: Programme Management and Coordination** with sub-components: 3.1) Programme Coordination Unit, 3.2) Young Professional Programme; and 3.3) special financing facility.

7. **Institutional and implementation arrangements.** The Ministry of Finance (MoF) was designated as the executing agency at programme design and the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL) as the lead programme agency. Service providers implemented activities in the programme districts. A project coordination unit (PCU) was established at MAIL to oversee overall coordination of day to day activities including to ensure contractual compliance of service providers who were selected on the basis of expertise, experience, reputation and track record. Contracts with service providers included performance indicators, such as financial management and procurement processes. A Project Steering Committee comprising of senior ministries was established to provide oversight and policy guidance and to approve annual work plans and budgets.

8. **Target group.** Beneficiaries were selected according to the following selection criteria: (i) small farmers and livestock-keepers, including the landless and those who currently have no livestock; (ii) women and households headed by women; and (iii) resettled and nomadic *Kuchis pastoralists.*

9. The programme mainly used a self-targeting and demand driven target strategy to determine beneficiaries for microfinance activities, focusing on new versus existing serviced clients in line with best practices for microfinance in volatile environments. In order to counter the exclusion of ultra-poor groups due to large loan sizes, the programme introduced the Targeting the Ultra-Poor (TUP) scheme, which used a Participatory Rural Appraisal methodology, including social mapping, wealth ranking and community interviews to identify beneficiary households. The process for beneficiary selection under component one was undertaken by Community Development Councils and verified by the PCU. The identification of *Kuchis* pastoralists was undertaken in conjunction with *Kuchis* representatives and in line with IFAD's Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples. A gender component was incorporated into the target approach through a strategy that specifically aimed at reaching 50 per cent women-headed households.

10. **Financing.** The total estimated project cost at design was US$26.12 million with an IFAD grant financing US$23.89 million (91.1 per cent of the total amount). Following the Executive Board approval on 31 December 2013, an additional US$6 million was awarded to the project, bringing the IFAD grant total to US$29.89 million by project end. RMLSP was co-financed by the Microfinance Investment Support Facility for Afghanistan (MISFA) to the tune of US$2 million (7.7 per cent) and MFIs for US$0.2 million (0.01 per cent). The Government contributed US$2,000. The project also benefitted from an additional US$93,000 donated by the Swedish government as a complementary contribution to IFAD to provide grant financing for improved food security of country programmes.

Table 1
Project costs in USD millions

Donor	*Planned*	*Percentage of total (%)*	*Revised[7] amount (2013)*	*Percentage of total*	*Amount at completion*	*Percentage disbursed (%)*
IFAD grant	23.987	91.49	29.897	91.40	29.28[8]	92.95
MISFA	2.218	8.50	2.218	8.59	2.22	7.04
Government	0.002	0.01	0.002	0.01	0.002	0.006[9]
Total	26.117	100	32.12	100	31.50	100

Source : PCR 2017, page v. and page 39.

Table 2
Component costs in USD millions

Component	*Planned*	*Percentage of total (%)*	*Supplementary funding[10]*	*Percentage of total*	*Amount at[11] completion*	*Percentage disbursed (%)*
Rural Microfinance	12.18	46.63	1.734	28.9	12.153	37.83
Livestock Support	9.318	35.67	3.728	62.14	16.250	50.59
Programme Management	4.619	17.68	0.537	8.95	3.714	11.56
Total	26.117	100	6.00	100	32.117[12]	100

Source: PCR 2017, P.39 and “President’s memorandum: Proposed supplementary financing to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan”, 2013, P.4.

11. **Project implementation.** Each component in the programme was designed to be implemented by service providers who had been pre-identified or pre-selected at design stage based on their capacities and established reputation in Afghanistan in order to mitigate any risk that may arise owing to inexperience and lack of capacity on the part of MAIL. MISFA was the lead implementer for component 1, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and ICARDA (the International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas) were contracted as service providers under component 2. Selected service providers for sub-components included: Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee, Coordination of Afghan Relief, Dutch Committee for Afghanistan, First Microfinance Bank and Mutahid in ten provinces in Afghanistan including Badakhshan, Baghlan, Balkh, Bamyan, Herat, Jowzjan, Kabul, Kunduz, Nangarhar and Takhar. Balkh Livestock and Dairy Union (BLDU), an additional service provider, took over activities from FAO after 2012.

12. Implementation of activities under the microfinance component faced initial delays of up to 12 months at the start of the project, mainly due to tax issues between MISFA and MoF, which had originally led to MISFA’s refusal to accept payments

---

[7] IFAD’s Executive Board approved an additional US$6 million on 31 December 2013 increasing IFAD's total funding to US$29.89 million by project end.
[8] A discrepancy was noted for the actual amount at completion under Overall Project Costs for IFAD funding. The PCR Appendix 5: Actual RMLSP costs has reported the final IFAD amount equal to the appraisal amount, however disbursement was stated as 97.69 per cent. However, on P.21 of the PCR under programme costs and financing, IFAD’s financial performance by component equals US$29,28 million, which would be 98 per cent disbursement rate from appraisal amount. The PCRV has reported the data provided under P.21 of the PCR.
[9] The PCR has reported the disbursement percentage as a number (70,500.00) in Appendix 5, Table 1, overall project costs. The PCRV has used arithmetic to calculate the percentage disbursed based on the numbers provided in the table.
[10] SDR amounts obtained and converted from “President’s memorandum: Proposed supplementary financing to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan”, 2013 using a conversion rate of 1.534527.
[11] These amounts include the additional US$6.0 million approved by the IFAD Executive Board in 2013.
[12] A discrepancy was noted between the PCR’s “at a glance table” and Appendix 5: Actual RMSLP costs for the total component costs amounts. The PCRV has recorded data from the Appendix 5 in this case.

from the project and the delays in signing contracts with service providers until December 2010. The deteriorating security situation negatively impacted on the MFIs operational ability to grow their client bases, portfolio quality and increased operated costs. In 2013, the microfinance sector underwent a consolidation process for MFIs operating in the country with the exclusion of five of MISFA's MFI partners. The lengthy consolidation process in 2013 hindered efforts to expand outreach of the microfinance sector. RMLSP was able to absorb the delay due in part to a three-year programme extension and additional funding awarded to the programme.

13. In 2013, the project was granted a two-year extension and a further US$6 million in funding. In line with the MTR recommendations, RMLSP was also granted an additional one year no-cost extension. This extended the original closing from 31 March 2013 to 31 March 2016. The main justification for the request was that the programme was providing a well-established platform, which could be effectively used to increase the outreach and expand the results, innovations, and best practices of the programme.[13] The main activities that fell within the parameters of the additional financing included: outreach and cost effectiveness, geographical expansion and consolidation.

14. Following the 2012 MTR recommendations, a decision was made to cancel any further innovations under the Innovation Facility, with the balance of funds reallocated to support the expansion of the financial graduation of the ultra-poor, under the TUP scheme, to one additional province and to component 2.[14] All pilot projects under sub-component 1.1 were completed following the MTR with the balance of funds transferred to sub-component 1.2 and component 2 as above.

15. FAO was initially the main service provider for the backyard poultry development scheme. FAO transferred responsibility of the backyard poultry development scheme over to BLDU in order to strengthen local capacity.

16. Adjustment of targets were made to the programme's logical framework based on recommendations from the MTR and included the downgrading of the original target of 20,000 households reached under component 1 microfinance to 12,000 households.

17. **Intervention logic.** The projects intervention logic was applicable to both components – rural finance and livestock support – contributing directly to the programme purpose and goal. By expanding the range of financial services currently on offer by MFIs, poor rural households were expected to have greater access to these services, allowing for more investment in productive activities, leading to increases in agricultural productivity and/or production and household incomes for MFI clients. Beneficiaries involved in livestock support would benefit from improved livestock health and new skills, which would in turn stimulate production to increase food security and higher incomes. The project was designed to invest in the smallholder livestock community through a combination of technical packages and advisory services with the aim of gradually improving their credit worthiness. In parallel, MISFA and its partner MFIs would gradually improve their ability to offer microfinance services. The conjunction of both access to credit and to improved livestock health and rearing skills would lead to increased productivity and incomes.

18. **Delivery of outputs.** The Project Completion Report (PCR) reported that RMLSP had reached 282,405 households (or 1.69 million people) directly. The PCR main text and the data in the logframe (appendix 2) provide the number of beneficiaries by sub-component/activity as follows: 39,393 borrowers under component 1 (including 1.760 households that benefited under the TUP scheme); 1,900 milk

---

[13] IFAD Memo for approval of additional financing and two-year extension.
[14] IFAD, RMLSP, Mid-Term Report 2012.

producers; 234,000 livestock owners accessing animal health services through veterinary field units; 11,958 Kuchi (pastoral) households with access to veterinary services; 5,800 women supported for backyard poultry development; and 1,300 women supported for dairy goat development. The total of these numbers is 294,351 and not 282,405: they are not totally far apart but still with the difference of more than 10,000. It is also not clear whether there may be double-counting. It is noted that over 80 per cent of direct beneficiaries reported was reached through animal health services and livestock extension services. The PCR also reported that according to the project data, 442,823 households benefited directly but noted that the details of benefits were not clear. Indeed, the PCR lacked sufficient evidence to support reported beneficiary numbers, both direct and indirect.

19. Even with reservations on some of the figures reported as discussed above, it can be said that the programme performed well overall against expected outputs despite the fluid security and political environment. Key quantitative design targets and actual results at project completion were over-achieved or mostly achieved. Under component 1, the reported number of households accessing loans was almost double the target (39,393 against the target of 20,000). In the case of goat vaccinations, targets were exceeded by 629 per cent and, in the case of livestock deworming, by 372 per cent. While the achievements are impressive, these results could indicate that the targets should have been revised at mid-term. Please see annex V for a full breakdown of output results.

III. Review of findings

A. Core criteria

Relevance

20. The programme objective was aligned with the IFAD Country Strategic Opportunities Programme (COSOP) (2008-2012) and its overarching objective to "reduce gender disparities and increase the social and economic status of vulnerable and marginalized communities" as well as COSOP strategic objective 2, "to increase access to rural-focused financial services" and 3, "to enhance the assets, skills and productivity of rural households".

21. RMLSP was envisaged to help shape Government policy in: (i) the microfinance sector, for example through cross-subsidization of interest rates between urban borrowers and rural borrowers, aimed at providing access to the poorest segment of the rural population; and (ii) the livestock sector through the piloting of models for private-public partnership in the delivery of livestock extension and veterinary services.

22. The programme objective was also aligned with the Afghanistan National Development Strategy (2008-2013) and the National Agriculture Development Framework which includes the agriculture and rural development sector under the third pillar - Economic and Social Development - aimed at supporting the poorest and most vulnerable segments of rural society through a range of measures designed to diversify incomes. Moreover, lack of access to rural finance services was identified as a key constraint for agriculture and rural development under the Agriculture Master Plan (2006-2011).

23. The programme design is relevant to Afghanistan's policies. Specifically, RMSLP was to contribute to the promotion of the Afghan Government's key policy statements promoting the use of Islamic financing, which resulted in the launch of Islamic products by six banks and one bank converting all business activities into Islamic financing.[15] The programme was relevant to the political context and ensured coordination with relevant development partners. For example, RMSLP's

[15] IFAD 2015 Supervision Mission Report, P 4.

dairy and poultry activities were conducted in coordination with the Emergency Horticulture and Livestock Project funded by the World Bank.

24. The programme design was relevant and centred around microfinance and livestock, selected on the basis of earlier programmes in Afghanistan which had demonstrated that investments in the smallholder dairy and poultry sectors and the provision of animal health and livestock services on a near-cost basis were robust, sustainable and promoted local economic development.[16] RMLSP's Targeting of the Ultra Poor was particularly relevant to the context, as it graduated beneficiaries, who were previously excluded from borrowing from Afghan banks and microfinance institutions, allowing them to access these institutions through the use of innovative models. The micro-finance component, designed to increase outreach of agricultural credit and rural financial packages was relevant to the programme's objective of supporting MISFA partner organisations to offer a wider range of sustainable financial services.

25. While the programme components were aligned with the roles and mandate of MAIL, issues with synergies between the two components, microfinance and livestock, originally envisaged at design, were identified during the 2013 supervision mission. The main issue included a lack of harmonization between the two components and no docking points or joint action areas established to promote synergies.[17] Additionally, the PCRV noted a lack of attention to market linkages.

26. While there were some weaknesses in the project approach, overall, the programme objectives and design were well aligned with Government and IFAD strategies and policies and the sectoral and rural poverty context. The PCRV rates relevance as satisfactory (5), in line with the PCR rating.

Effectiveness

27. The programme provided a broad range of financial product services adapted to the needs of smallholders. Interest rates in Afghanistan, at the time of project design, were prohibitively high, thus excluding poor and vulnerable beneficiaries. The programme aimed to address high interest rates by reducing MFIs' lending costs and by promoting business models in the livestock sector that would yield sufficient profit to absorb the cost of the credit. Furthermore, it was envisioned that a significant contribution could be made to improving livelihoods of smallholders and poor livestock owners by facilitating the provision of services, technological packages and quality inputs as well as microcredit. While the individual components were successfully implemented, the programme lacked linkages between rural producers, organizations and local markets, which remains a significant constraint to beneficiaries improving their livelihood means.

28. **Microfinance component.** The expected outcome under this component was: (i) 12,000 rural households, with a focus on women, have access to a wider range of microfinance products and services adapted to their specific needs and economic activities; and (ii) pilot a model for the inclusion of those who are currently excluded from microfinance services by building their skills and asset base, helping them to graduate to service provision.

29. Coordinated by MISFA and under the supervision of the PCU, three new rural finance products, including Shar'ia compliant loans, TUP and agricultural loans, were successfully piloted reaching a total of 39,393 households, exceeding the revised target of 12,000 households. 34,258 households were reached through micro-finance loans, 3,375 through Shar'ia loans and 1,760 through TUP. 83 per cent of the loans provided under this component were used by MFI clients for investment purposes including business expansion or for the purchasing of farm inputs. Beneficiaries of the TUP were linked with self-help groups and cooperatives

[16] IFAD President Report, 2009.
[17] IFAD Supervision Mission Report, 2013, P.6

to better access finance. However, the programme failed to secure the 50 per cent female borrowers envisaged at design, and by programme end, only 9 per cent of the borrowers were female. RMSLP's TUP achieved higher levels of success and managed to reach 1,760 ultra-poor female headed households in Bamyan and Badakhstan.

30. **Livestock component**. Just over half of the cooperatives members (59 per cent of design target), 890 of 1,500 milk producers envisaged at design, were regularly supplying milk to milk collection facilities, and by project end, the centres were collecting an average of 2,500 litres of milk per day. However, effectiveness of the dairy plant is questionable given that, despite findings from a market and feasibility study to the contrary, milk sellers are able to sell fresh milk for higher prices informally. Construction of the dairy plant faced a number of delays resulting from issues over land allocation from the Government and procurement difficulties with the purchase of machinery and equipment. Actual completion took place in late 2013 while processing machinery was finally commissioned in 2015. By project end, the plant was operating at 20-30 per cent capacity. Furthermore, a market and feasibility study that was conducted may have overestimated the absorptive capacity of the local market and the plant may be oversized.[18]

31. According to the PCR, 84 new Basic Veterinary Workers (BVW), of whom 20 per cent are women, increased their knowledge and expertise as a direct result of the programme's capacity building activities and are now providing basic and intermediate services to livestock owners in the villages. Post project completion, the 30 Veterinary Field Units (VFU) supported by the project are providing technical support, supervision and a supply of vaccines to the BVWs. However, as noted in the 2016 Supervision Mission Report, para-vets will need to ultimately diversify their source of suppliers and medicines to be more cost efficient. Also linked with the VFUs are the Village Poultry Groups who access medicines and poultry service suppliers through the VFUs. As with the BVWs, usage of a single supplier can result in higher demand versus supply which could result in higher prices for goods and services. Veterinary services were improved which reportedly resulted in a 50 per cent reduction of livestock mortality rates.

32. Despite the deteriorating security situation from 2012 onwards 30 VFUs were established and succeeded in reaching a total of 234,000 livestock owners with extension services in 59 districts in five provinces. 4,200 extremely poor livestock owners were also supported with subsidized de-worming campaigns, and 11,958 *Kuchis* households received veterinary services.

33. In light of the above, the PCRV rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory (5), in line with the PCR rating.

Efficiency

34. According to the PCR, RMLSP's economic internal rate of return was 24 per cent.[19]

35. The PCR reported an overall average cost per beneficiary household at US$114 and US$19 per beneficiary, indicating good value for money. Variations across sub-components were as follows: the cost per beneficiary household for backyard poultry was US$319 and US$2,128 for dairy goat activities; US$2,954 for integrated dairy system and US$2,000 for TUP.

36. **Component costs.** Overall, the programme spent US$32.12 million. IFAD's contribution totalled US$29.29 million with a 98 per cent disbursement rate at project end. 15 per cent of the total budget was spent on project management

[18] IFAD PCR, 2017, P. 123.

[19] The analysis included all incremental costs and benefits that could be quantified and associated with programme implementation. Production models and sub-models were derived for four activities (goats, dairy, poultry and veterinary services). Household models were subsequently derived and aggregated into sub-project models with the use of FARMOD. These models pattern the livelihood options and resources available and broadly illustrate project impact on incomes and labour use of households adopting both farm and non-farm technology options.

costs. Project costs excluded overheads for service providers, which in the case of FAO amounted to 13 per cent. High costs were partly attributed to the fact that FAO had to receive the clearance from the United Nations Department of Safety and Security for each field trip. The programme made efforts to reduce these costs by ending the cooperation with FAO and transferring the contract to a local service provider with a much lower profile than a UN agency, and thus requiring less security. BLDU was subsequently contracted to take over backyard poultry activities.

37. The PCRV noted multiple discrepancies for component costs between two sources reported in the PCR. In appendix 5 (actual RMSLP costs, page 39) of the PCR, the amount at completion is reported as US$32.117 million, while in the "at a glance" table on page v, the final amount indicated is US$31.762. Furthermore, Table 1 in Appendix 5 states IFAD's contribution at completion was US$29.897 million, which is equal to the appraisal amount plus the additional US$6 million approved in 2013. In this case, disbursement would be 100 per cent, and not the stated 98 per cent. Under programme costs and financing on page 21 of the PCR, IFAD's actual amount at disbursement is US$29.287 million, which is 98 per cent disbursement.

38. The PCRV rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory (4), same as the PCR rating.

B. Rural poverty impact

39. In 2014, RMSLP's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) unit consolidated the annual outcome survey reports covering 2013-2014 into one document. Two further outcome studies were conducted in 2015 for backyard poultry and the integrated dairy scheme. The assessment below is based on the two outcome studies conducted through the PCU, Results and Impact Management System (RIMS) data for 2014, 2015 and 2016, and information reported in the PCR.

40. **Household income and assets**. According to the Integrated Dairy Scheme Annual Outcome Report 2014[20], in 2013, 66 per cent of surveyed households self-reported having "sufficient" incomes. In 2014, this number increased slightly to 67 per cent but then dropped significantly in 2015 to 43 per cent. Incomes under the "low" category followed a similar pattern with 32 per cent of households reporting "low" incomes in 2013 dropping to 24 per cent in 2014 followed by a substantial increase to 48 per cent in 2015. The same report attributed changes in the sufficient category to insecurity in the project area. However, by project end, the PCR had recorded increases of 30 per cent in milk producers' income and annual income increases of US$330 for fodder producers from US$500 to US$830[21] (36 per cent increase) and an additional 162 ha of fodder crops were grown. Fodder crop producers had an estimated average net return of US$4,195 per ha,[22] similar to vegetable and stone fruits such as peach or apricot. Beneficiaries increased their household income through sales from surplus milk and milk products, including an estimated AFN721[23] per week from the additional 4 kg of goat's cheese produced. Project beneficiaries reportedly increased the original number of livestock assets provided to them by the project by 23 per cent for sheep, 200 per cent for goats and 342 per cent for cows.

41. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** The programme invested substantially in capacity building interventions which included all participating farmers and the microfinance institutions. RMLSP supported local social capital through the establishment of a variety of community organisations including farmers' field schools, self-help groups, poultry and seed production groups. In a society where few women are employed, the programme has made considerable achievements towards the inclusion of women beneficiaries, particularly through

[20] Integrated Dairy Scheme Annual Outcome Report, 2014, P.4.
[21] IFAD, PCR, 2017, P.31, Appendix 2: RMLSP logical framework.
[22] IFAD, PCR, 2017, P. 12.
[23] Afghan Afghani (AFN) is the unit of currency for Afghanistan. 1 USD roughly equals 69.42 AFN.

the backyard poultry and dairy goat activities, who are managing their social and economic development and now have better access to markets and inputs allowing them to better market their products.

42. **Food security and agricultural productivity**. RMSLP's RIMS survey lacked baseline data from which to compare third level impact indicators. For the purposes of the PCRV, the actual values reported at mid-term (2012) were used to assess progress on food security indicators. All mid-term measurements were exceeded with the exception of the percentage of underweight children (weight for age), which increased from 35 to 42 per cent for boys and from 26 to 36 per cent for girls. The percentage of chronic malnourished boys had dropped from 45 at mid-term to 18 per cent by project end. For girls, 60 per cent were malnourished in 2012 compared to 18 per cent in 2016. The number of households experiencing two hungry seasons decreased from 15 per cent in 2012 to 3 per cent in 2016, while the number of months that households remain hungry for remained the same (3 months). However, the PCR raised concerns over the accuracy of the data. The rate for chronic malnutrition reported at mid-term was in line with the national average of 59.3 per cent. Therefore, the 18 per cent rate measured at completion is surprisingly low, and may not be reliable, especially in the absence of baseline data.[24] Despite this, RMLSP positively affected food security through production of dairy products - milk, cheese and yoghurt from cows and goats, as well as chicken eggs and chicken meat. Furthermore, a study conducted in 2012 amongst 373 children aged 1–5 years old from backyard poultry beneficiary and non-beneficiary households in targeted areas showed that 30 per cent of the eggs produced by a household are consumed by the household. Moreover, children belonging to beneficiary households had higher bodyweights compared to the control group.[25] Overall, the programme beneficiaries benefitted from increased productivity through the introduction of improved vet extension services, management practices, access to markets and financial services. All beneficiaries participating under the livestock component have increased farm production through mortality reduction benefits, winter feeding, developing pastures and backyard poultry.

43. In 2016, an average of 2,061 kg of various types of fodder crop seeds were produced and sold to other union members, non-members and NGOs by Khatiz Dairy Union, who also sold 127 MT[26] of concentrate feed through its 18 primary dairy cooperatives. Beneficiaries who took part in the dairy scheme increased milk production per cow from two litres to nine litres of milk per day and goats cheese production by 4 kilo grams per week.

44. **Institutions and polices**. RMLSP's microfinance sub-component was designed to increase outreach of agricultural credit and rural finance packages and to provide funding to support Shar'ia compliant packages. It was also envisaged at design that the programme would generate sufficient knowledge and lessons learned to contribute towards national policy. Many lessons have been learned that are being applied to the microfinance sub-component within IFAD's newly implemented Support to National Priority Programme 2 (SNaPP2).[27] However, the supervision mission reports for 2015 and 2016 noted gaps in a number of policy and regulation areas, for example, the para-vet registration/licensing and registration and standardization of veterinary pharmaceuticals. Furthermore, the microfinance sector still lacks a clear policy framework to guide the sector which will affect long-term sustainability.

45. **In summary,** while some areas performed better than others, impact level results were particularly hard to measure in the absence of a comprehensive impact study and comparable baseline data of programme impact on food security. Furthermore,

[24] IFAD PCR 2017, P. 17.
[25] IFAD PCR 2017.
[26] Metric Tonnes (MT) is the unit of measure for volumes.
[27] IFAD Supervision Mission Report, 2016, P. 2.

the programme's Annual Outcome Study had noted some decreases in household incomes in 2015 and an increase in chronic malnutrition for children. While the programme yielded positive results through its microfinance component, the sector still lacks a policy framework to govern the microfinance sector in the long-term. RMLSP contributed towards a significant increase in beneficiaries' assets. The programme's rural poverty impact is rated as moderately satisfactory (4), one point below the PCR rating.

C. Other performance criteria

Sustainability of benefits

46. The strategic decision to promote microfinance through MISFA provided a basis for sustainability as MSIFA is expected to continue to provide finances and capacity-building support to MFIs beyond the programme life.[28]

47. RMLSP's dairy scheme was designed to be self-sustaining within three years of completion based on experience in other parts of the country. However, the 2016 implementation support mission raised issues with the sustainability of the dairy scheme due to the absence of a well-sequenced approach to production and marketing. Furthermore, some of the milk collection centres lacked Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) [29] certification and ISO (International Organisation for Standardization) certification was still pending.

48. To ensure sustainability, the 2015 supervision mission recommended that a greater emphasis be placed on aligning exit strategies and consolidating interventions before those would be handed-over.[30] In response to this recommendation, in 2016, the programme held a final workshop with all the service providers to align exit strategies to meet the requirements of a handover to communities, local institutions or MAIL. The 2016 mission concluded that most of the strategies proposed by the service providers as exit strategies would be sufficient to ensure post-project support was adequate for beneficiaries.

49. The programme promoted sustainability through capacity building provided to the Community Development Councils, district governors' offices and Directorate of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock offices. This was expected to facilitate knowledge transfer to enable local offices to undertake future activities independently.

50. There is a real risk to sustainability of the microfinance and livestock activities promoted through the project if the Government does not put in place policies and frameworks to promote and govern the sectors. In light of the above, the PCRV rates sustainability as moderately satisfactory (4), the same of the PCR rating.

Innovation

51. The programme applied innovation through its financial graduation of the ultra-poor (TUP) activities which was a new and innovative concept in the Afghanistan context. Two new product lines were developed, pilot-tested and upscaled through the Innovation Facility: (i) agricultural financial products developed by the MFI partner First Microfinance Bank; and (ii) sharia compliant individual and group loans developed by the MFI partner Mutahid. RMLSP also contributed to innovation through a number of features included in the programme, namely the "Passing on the Gift" practice in the goat sub-component, which was a new concept in Afghan society and contributed to building a sense of social cohesion among poor vulnerable women.

[28] IFAD President Report, 2009.
[29] HACCP is a management system in which food safety is addressed through the analysis and control of biological, chemical and physical hazards from raw material production, procurement and handling, to manufacturing, distribution and consumption of the finished product.
[30] IFAD 2015 Supervision Mission Report.

52. With the addition of two further IFAD funded operations in Afghanistan, RMSLP shifted M&E, financial and procurement activities to a centralised Programme Support Unit, established to meet the joint needs of all the IFAD-funded operations. The Project Management Units continued to support the projects through the provision of technical expertise. This model was innovative in Afghanistan and the MAIL has plans to replicate it for other donor-funded interventions.

53. The PCRV rates Innovation as satisfactory (5), the same as the PCR rating.

Scaling up

54. The programme's microfinance activities attracted a lot of interest from both government and international partners. The TUP programme was highly successful and attracted further international funding from the World Bank and Italian Development Cooperation to the tune of US$15 million and US$3.4 million respectively to scale-up the scheme in seven additional provinces. The SNaPP2, a new IFAD-financed project, is also scaling-up TUP activities in three provinces. The two-tiered project management structure model of management within a ministry structure also proved successful and can be replicated, as well as the Young Professional Consultant sub-component, which provided an entry point for agriculture faculty graduates to gain essential field experience.

55. The PCRV rates scaling up as satisfactory (5), the same as the PCR rating.

Gender equality and women's empowerment

56. By 2012, the programme had reached impressive numbers of female beneficiaries, however, it lacked a gender strategy and most of the "gender" activities in the project were geared towards women-focused activities without really including an economic empowerment strategy for women. Activities implemented at the field level had a strong gender focus but less so at the PCU level, where staff lacked the capacity to guide the service providers to include gender aggregated data in their reporting. Following MTR recommendations, a gender specialist was hired to introduce and implement a Gender Strategy (Guideline) focusing on women's empowerment and a check list, which was shared with service providers. By 2015, the supervision mission had noted a high level of women's involvement. The backyard poultry study reported that 18 per cent of women beneficiaries (compared with 14 per cent from the control group) had full control over the income generated through the sale of poultry related items and there was an increase in the number of female-headed households who utilised veterinary services from 9 per cent in 2013 to 45 per cent in 2014.

57. The women's self-help groups were particularly successful and provided access to microfinance services at the community level. By project end, 21 self-help groups and 134 women's dairy goat groups had been established. RMLSP organized *mahrams*[31] to accompany female project staff on field visits.

58. The PCRV rates gender equality and women's empowerment as satisfactory (5), equal to the PCR rating.

Environment and natural resources management

59. The usage of fodder crops has reduced the pressure on the carrying capacity of local grazing lands, while mulberry saplings and atriplex cultivation add to the greenery of the area. Improved stables have resulted in better conditions for livestock leading to reduced mortality and a general improvement in health. Stables have also provided a reliable supply of manure to be used as fuel during the winter. However, the programme missed a key opportunity to transfer knowledge and sustainable natural resource management practices, including the

[31] Mahram is some unmarriageable kin who can act as a legal escort for women during a journey longer than a day and a night.

promotion of environmentally friendly animal husbandry practices, to beneficiaries of the livestock component. In a country that is severely affected by acute water shortages on a regular basis, the programme could have supported communities to establish community based natural resource management groups to ensure suitable natural resource management.

60. In light of the above, the PCRV rates environmental and natural resources management as moderately satisfactory (4), in line with the PCR rating.

Adaptation to climate change

61. While the PCR stated that the programme was designed in line with IFAD's Climate Change Strategy, the PCRV did not find evidence to support this. The programme design report included additional covenants for pest management and resource protection but failed to include any details regarding how the project was in line with IFAD's Climate Change Strategy. The programme was classified as Category B at design and it was recommended that continuous monitoring of land and water management and climate change related aspects be undertaken during programme implementation.

62. While the programme used climate sensitive technologies, practices and processes including a reverse water osmosis machine and dairy plant machines, both of which were environmentally friendly, the programme missed an opportunity to collect lessons learned on adaption practices which could contribute towards future climate change strategies. The PCRV rates adaption to climate change moderately unsatisfactory (3), same as the PCR rating.

D. Overall project achievement

63. Overall, the programme's activities have positively contributed to increasing and diversifying income sources, by improving livestock productivity and production. Major achievements in the microfinance sector include the piloting and development of shariah-compliant rural finance products that were subsequently adopted by several micro-finance institutions and the successful adoption of the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee model that targets the ultra-poor.

E. Performance of partners

64. **IFAD.** The programme's design was relevant and in line with the Governments priority areas. Despite the lack of an IFAD country office in Afghanistan, the programme received regular support from the IFAD country team and a team of advisors providing specialised support to the programme.

65. IFAD undertook eight supervision missions between 2010 and 2015 providing sufficient supervision and implementation support to project staff. An MTR was undertaken in a timely manner in 2012 and provided sound recommendations which were subsequently taken up in the later part of project implementation.

66. The PCRV rates IFAD's performance as satisfactory (5), in line with the PCR rating.

67. **Government.** The MAIL was the lead programme agency and provided oversight and strategic direction and implementation guidance to the PCU, who managed and coordinated the service providers. Despite the delayed commencement of the project and initial oversight challenges with the service providers which led to the initial exclusion of reporting of gender disaggregated data, by project end, the PCU was effectively supervising the service providers' activities, leading to increased quality in reporting. While no baseline survey was undertaken for the project, an M&E system based on an M&E plan was established and functioning by 2012. The PCU monitored programme outcomes on an annual basis which informed decision and management actions.

68. The Government faced some staffing gaps throughout the programme, namely a Gender Officer, which impacted the programme's ability to implement a gendered

response, and Administration and Human Resources Manager. This was later rectified with the recruitment of a gender specialist consultant. The MTR raised some issues regarding the lack of clarity on tax exemption entitlement for goods procured under the project resulting from a lack of coordination between MAIL and MoF.

69. MoF fully controlled the special accounts with a review conducted by the MAIL finance department and internal audit unit. Final approvals were forwarded to MoF by the MAIL Deputy Minister. Programme accounts were managed on Quick book software, in line with IFAD requirements. There were no internal control issues and appropriate procedures were followed throughout.

70. No counterpart funding was envisaged from the government towards RMSLP's activities, however, the MAIL was expected to make in-kind contributions in the form of office space, electricity, internet, water, security expenses etc. Contributions were recorded in the financial management system on an annual basis and amounted to US$118,895 at project end. The PCRV rates government performance as satisfactory (5), in line with the PCR rating.

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

71. **Scope.** The PCR scope is comprehensive and meets all the IFAD requirements. In general, the PCR includes a good representation of all key criteria and sufficient annexes including stakeholder consultations. Scope is rated as satisfactory (5).

72. **Quality.** At the time of PCR preparation, RMSLP had not conducted a full impact study. Therefore, findings were drawn from many studies conducted throughout the project's lifespan. The programme conducted an impact study of the backyard poultry which, combined with the annual outcome survey reports, provided nuanced details to highlight qualitative aspects of the programme's achievements. The project lacked a baseline survey and RIMS surveys were incomplete. Early annual outcome survey reports were completed without a control group for comparison purposes. The PCR indicates the challenges the programme has faced in accurately reporting impact level results as the programme had not conducted a baseline survey at project onset. Furthermore, data inconsistencies relating to overall project costs and costs by component were noted in the PCR. The PCRV rates quality at moderately satisfactory (4).

73. **Lessons.** The PCR captures a number of useful lessons, some of which were incorporated into IFAD's newest programme in Afghanistan (SNaPP2). Lessons are rated as satisfactory (5).

74. **Candour.** RMLSP was IFAD’s first supported programme in Afghanistan and the programme has achieved some remarkable results considering the high-risk environment and lack of policy frameworks. However, the PCR could have provided a more objective review of partner performance, given the initial capacity challenges of the MAIL in particular. The PCR is easily digestible and provides a clear objective record of programme successes and challenges. The PCRV rates candour at satisfactory (5).

V. Lessons learned

75. **There is a need for proactive policy dialogue**. Whilst performance in the microfinance and livestock sectors have been noted, both sectors lack a supportive policy framework and clear regulations to govern future activities, critical for the microfinance and livestock sectors’ sustainability. The programme design did not have a specific focus on policy dialogue and as such, the programme was unable to influence finance and agricultural extension policies. Future programmes should include a much stronger focus on policy dialogue, as well as policy specific objectives and key performance indicators to measure progress.

76. **There is a need for a stronger market and private sector orientation**. Solid approaches and instruments to develop agribusiness value chains and linkages with the private sector were missed in the programme design, and the activities were not supported by a rigorous analysis of products, markets and competitors. Future programmes should include a stronger focus on value chains with the inclusion of specific activities linking producers and their organizations to markets and the private sector.

77. **Women's self-help group model should be enhanced for future programmes**. The women's self-help groups established under the poultry and dairy goat sub-components have become efficient mechanisms to allow members' access to microfinance services at the community level. In order to enhance the benefits of this model, future similar interventions should include: (i) capacity building for group leaders and members on technical and business skills; (ii) the establishment of strong linkages between the groups and local markets; and (iii) evolution of the groups into formal, economically viable cooperatives or associations.

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.	X	Yes
	Four impact domains		
	• 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.		No
	• 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, the extent to which specific groups such as youth are included or excluded from the development process.		No
	• 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.		No
	• 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, considering 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 improve 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	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction.	X	Yes
Scaling up	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have been (or are likely to be) scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and other 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

Criteria	*Definition* *	*Mandatory*	*To be rated*
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, scaling up, as well as environment and natural resources management, and adaptation to climate change.	X	Yes
Performance of partners			
• IFAD • Government	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 X	Yes 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[a]

Criteria	*Programme Management Department (PMD) rating*	*IOE Project Completion Report Validation (PCRV) rating*	*Net rating disconnect (PCRV-PMD)*
Rural poverty impact	5	4	-1
Project performance			
Relevance	5	5	0
Effectiveness	5	5	0
Efficiency	4	4	0
Sustainability of benefits	4	4	0
Project performance[b]	4.5	4.5	0
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	5	5	0
Innovation	5	5	0
Scaling up	5	5	0
Environment and natural resources management	4	4	0
Adaptation to climate change	4	3	-1
Overall project achievement[c]	**5**	**5**	**0**
Performance of partners[d]			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	5	5	0
Average net disconnect			**-0.17**

[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, 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.

Ratings of the project completion report quality

	PMD rating	*IOE PCRV rating*	*Net rating disconnect*
Candour		5	
Lessons		5	
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)		4	
Scope		5	
Overall rating of the project completion report			

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.

List of Acronyms

BLDU	Balkh Livestock and Dairy Union
BVW	Basic Veterinary Workers
COSOP	Country Strategic Opportunities Programme
DAIL	Directorate of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
MAIL	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFI	Microfinance Institution
MISFSA	Microfinance Investment Support Facility for Afghanistan
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MTR	Mid Term Review
PCR	Project Completion Report
PCRV	Project Completion Report Validation
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
RIMS	Results and Impact Measurement System
RMLSP	Rural Microfinance and Livestock Support Programme
SNaPP2	Support to National Priority Programme 2
TUP	Targeting the Ultra-Poor
VFU	Veterinary Field Unit

Bibliography

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2008. Country Strategic Opportunities Programme (COSOP).

_____. 2009.President's Report on a Proposed grant to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Rural Microfinance and Livestock Support Programme.

_____. 2009. IFAD. Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Rural Microfinance and Livestock Support Programme (RMLSP), Project Design Document, Volume 1: Main text and annexes.

_____. 2011, 2013, 2015 & 2015. Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Rural Microfinance and Livestock Support Programme (RMLSP), Implementation Support Mission (ISM).

_____. 2012. Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Rural Microfinance and Livestock Support Programme (RMLSP), Mid-term Evaluation.

_____. 2013. President's memorandum: Proposed supplementary financing to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan", P.4, Table 1: Additional financing expressed in accordance with the existing cost categories.

_____. 2014 & 2016. Results and Impact Management Systems (RIMS) data.

_____. 2017. Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Rural Microfinance and Livestock Support Programme (RMLSP), Project Completion Report Ratings Table.

_____. 2017. Islamic Republic of Afghanistan for the Rural Microfinance and Livestock Support Programme (RMLSP), Project Completion Report.

Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock. 2013 and 2014. RMLSP, Annual Outcome Survey Report, Programme Coordination Unit (PCU).

_____. 2015. RMLSP, Annual Outcome Survey Report Backyard Poultry Project, Programme Coordination Unit (PCU).

_____. 2015. RMLSP, Annual Outcome Survey Report Integrated Dairy Scheme Project, Programme Coordination Unit (PCU).

Reported programme results

Source: PCR, appendix 2: RMLSP logical framework

Outputs by component	Indicator	Targets (planned)	Actual (achieved)	Percentage achieved
Output 1.1.1 A range of innovative microfinance products and services pilot tested and adapted to the needs of rural households, farmers and livestock owners.	3 financial institutions participating in the project	3	3	100
	10,000 active borrowers (individuals), 50% of women	10,000	39,393	394
	Average loan size by product line	unknown	Agriculture loans: US$ 960, Sharia Loans: US$ 1,545	
Output 1.2.1 Skill training and provision of asset to TUP beneficiaries in the pilot-test model completed.	1,690 beneficiaries trained in financial services	1,690	1,760	104
	1,690 beneficiaries trained in livestock production practices and technologies	1,690	1,760	104
Output 1.3.1 MFIs provided with the necessary technical assistance, capacity building and operational support to develop innovative financial products, as well as to help enhance their capacity for financial product identification, assessment and risk measurement	Staff of financial institutions trained	200	131	65
	Value of gross loan portfolio	AFN 565,710,900	AFN 2,423,675,481	428
Output 2.1.1: Improved production and efficiency of milk production and processing in Nangarhar and to establish a member-owned network of some 1,500 milk and dairy producers	1,900 farmers are trained in crop production practices and technologies (commercial fodder)	1,900	2,205	116
	1,500 farmers are trained in livestock production practices and technologies (milk production)	1,900	1,900	100
	19 dairy production groups formed	19	17	89
	1 dairy processing facility constructed	1	1	100
	5 milk collection chilling centre established	5	5	100
	17 milk collection points	17	15	88
Output 2.2.1: A self-sustaining network of high quality animal health service providers established in the northern region	60 additional Basic Veterinary Workers selected, trained and equipped	60	123	205
	30 VFU constructed and furnished	30	30	100
	Farmers trained in post-production, processing and marketing	4500	4000	89
Output 2.3.1: Poor rural women derive and retain increased income from backyard poultry rearing	5000 women trained in livestock production practices and techniques	5000	5800	116
	5000 women provided with basic inputs and equipment	5000	5800	116
	60 female community members trained as trainers	60	60	100
	60 livestock production groups formed/ strengthened	60	120	200
Output 2.4.1: Poor rural women derive and retain	1000 women trained in livestock (dairy goat) production practices	1000	1300	130

Outputs by component	Indicator	Targets (planned)	Actual (achieved)	Percentage achieved
increased income from dairy goat production	and techniques			
	1000 women trained in goat milk processing and marketing	1000	1300	130
	1000 women provided with basic inputs and equipment	1000	1296	130
	150 livestock (dairy goat) producers' groups formed/ strengthened	150	134	89
	6000 goats vaccinated	6000	37,728	629
	1000 households (women) receiving facilitated animal health services	1000	1300	130

Source: PCR, 2017, P.31 Appendix 2 RMLSP Logical Framework and P41 Appendix 6 Actual Physical Progress of the RMLSP