

## Project Completion Report Validation

### Rural Development and Modernization Project for the Central and Paracentral Regions (PRODEMOR CENTRAL)

Republic of El Salvador

Date of validation by IOE: January 2018

## I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m)		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	Latin American and the Caribbean	Total project costs	20.07		14.24	
Country	Republic of El Salvador	IFAD loan and percentage of total	14.56	72.5%	14.0	98.3%
Loan number	L-I—728-	Borrower	4.47	22.3%	0.24	1.7%
Type of project (subsector)	Rural Development	Beneficiaries	1.04	5.2%	n.a.	
Financing type	F					
Lending terms*	Ordinary					
Date of approval	12/09/2007					
Date of loan signature	08/04/2009					
Date of effectiveness	18/12/2009					
Loan amendments	1) 15/06/2009 <sup>1</sup> 2) 21/12/2010 <sup>2</sup> 3) 18/11/2014 <sup>3</sup>	Number of beneficiaries	33,000 direct 41,600 indirect		34,435 direct 51,560 indirect	
Loan closure extensions	None	Loan completion date	31/12/2015			
Country programme managers	P.E. Murguía Oropeza (2007-2012) G. Ferrari dos Santos, (2013-2017)	Loan closing date	30/06/2016			
Regional directors	J. Stubbs (2007-2014) J. Lozano Aguirre (2014-current)	Mid-term review			February 2014	
Project completion report reviewer	Nick Bourguignon	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)			97.9	
Project completion report quality control panel	Johanna Pennarz Michael Carbon Jorge Carballo	Date of the project completion report			October 2016	

Source: IFAD GRIPS 2017; IFAD FlexCube 2017; President's Report Addendum 2007; PRODEMOR CENTRAL PCR.

\* 18 years, including a grace period of five years, with an interest rate equal to the reference interest rate per annum as determined by the Fund annually.

<sup>1</sup> The 2009 amendment extended the loan's grace period from three to five years.

<sup>2</sup> The 2010 amendment eliminated the position of cooperating institution (United Nations Development Programme) since IFAD assumed direct supervision in December 2006 and the executive board changed PRODEMOR CENTRAL supervision modalities.

<sup>3</sup> The 2014 amendment reallocated funding categories.

## II. Project outline

1. **Introduction.** PRODEMOR CENTRAL is the eighth loan-funded project implemented in El Salvador, where IFAD started operations in 1984. The project was designed between December 2006 and July 2007. It was approved by the IFAD board on 12 September 2007. The financing agreement was signed on 8 April 2009, and the project became effective on 18 December 2009. The project lasted six years. It was completed on 31 December 2015, and the loan was closed on 30 June 2016. The approval of a US\$15 million loan from the Spanish Trust Fund (STF) in 2011, and its effectiveness in 2014, led to a continuation of the project in two extra Departments under the name PRODEMOR CENTRAL–Extension, to be completed in 2019.<sup>4</sup> The Project Completion Report (PCR) only reports on activities and results from PRODEMOR CENTRAL, which this Project Completion Report Validation (PCRV) will assess.
2. **Project area.** The project area was made up of 66 municipalities in Cabañas, Cuscatlán, La Paz, San Vicente and San Salvador Departments of the Central and Paracentral regions of El Salvador. The selected municipalities were chosen for being predominantly rural and suffering from extreme poverty. Smallholder agriculture is widespread, and there is a significant presence of indigenous peoples. The project area has approximately 1 million inhabitants. The area contains regionally important watersheds and sensitive agro-ecological zones that suffer from land degradation and poor resource management.
3. **Project goal, objectives and components.** The project's goal was to significantly reduce poverty among the rural population in communities and municipalities of the Central and Paracentral Regions. This was to be achieved by building up beneficiaries' human and social capital and increase production, employment and incomes, while rehabilitating and rationally managing natural resources within a context of consolidated structures for rural development.<sup>5</sup> The project had six specific objectives: 1) promote the development of the target group's social and human capital; 2) support competitive and sustainable production for smallholder households, farmers' associations, and economic organizations; 3) contribute to the reversal of processes that cause erosion, deforestation, and the degradation of natural resources; 4) promote the creation and consolidation of productive and transformative activities and turn these into viable and competitive microenterprises; 5) facilitate access to basic rural financial services that are specialized in servicing the target group, for productive and marketing purposes; and 6) facilitate the coordination of rural development programmes and projects, and the harmonization of intervention strategies.
4. The project had five components: **a) Human and social capital and development** would: i) support community-driven development processes giving attention to women, youth and indigenous groups; and ii) rural modernization would further build the capacity of existing farmers' associations and other groups; **b) Sustainable production and the rehabilitation and management of natural resources** would provide technical support for agricultural production and diversification, promote sustainable farm models, promote organic and sustainable farming in erosion-prone areas, and provide in-kind payments for natural resource rehabilitation and management; **c) Business and rural microenterprise development** would promote and support new rural enterprises, modernize and expand existing rural enterprises, and provide technical, advisory and market

<sup>4</sup> The El Salvadoran parliament ratified the subsidiary loan on 21 November 2013, during the Mid-term Review (MTR) mission. The loan is worth EUR11.15 million (US\$15 million). The loan went into effect 23 January 2014 and is expected to be completed the 31 March 2019. Due to the length of time passed for effectiveness and the proximity of PRODEMOR CENTRAL completion and closure, both Government and IFAD consider the STF loan a different project: PRODEMOR CENTRAL – Extension, even if it shares the same goals, objectives and methodology as PRODEMOR CENTRAL.

<sup>5</sup> The President's report was incoherent in terms of stated goals and objectives, listing substantially different objectives in comparison to appraisal, loan agreement, MTR, supervision and PCR goals and objectives.

access support; **d) Rural financial services** encourage the development of rural financial markets, and deepening and expanding financial intermediation and access to basic financial services for the target population; and **e) Project coordination and institutional strengthening for rural development** would strengthen coordination capacities of projects, programmes and the agricultural sector, execute monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and systematization of the project and performance of rural development projects, and establish and operate the Project Coordination Unit (PCU).

5. **Target group.** The project targeted 33,000 direct beneficiaries and 41,600 indirect beneficiaries. The target group consisted of inhabitants of poor communities involved in small-scale family agriculture for consumption and/or local markets; landless farmers and agricultural labourers; owners of small businesses and micro entrepreneurs (agricultural and non-agricultural); rural women and youth; and marginalized populations with significant indigenous cultural traditions.
6. The project had a large number of different activities that used multiple targeting strategies. Geographical targeting was used to select municipalities in the five Departments.<sup>6</sup> Direct targeting was used through specific activities to reach out to community and enterprise groups, and specific demographic groups. Specific measures were also used to empower individuals (i.e. field schools) and groups (support to businesses and communities). Self-targeting measures included selection of value chains that benefit the rural poor and rural finance aimed at servicing the poor. Enabling measures appeared during the project, with the incorporation of the 2011 national Family Agriculture Plan's (FAP) into component B and C activities that actively benefit the rural poor, as well as building the capacity of Ministry of Agriculture (MoA).
7. **Financing.** IFAD, the Government of El Salvador and beneficiaries would finance the programme for an expected amount of US\$20.07 million. Total reported expenditure at completion was US\$14.2 million. See table 1 for a summary of project costs by financier. See table 2 for allocation and expenditure of funds per project component.<sup>7</sup>

Table 1  
**Project costs**

<i>Financier</i>	<i>Approval (US\$ millions)</i>	<i>Approval (per cent of total)</i>	<i>Completion (US\$ millions)</i>	<i>Completion (per cent of total)</i>	<i>Disbursement rate (per cent)</i>
IFAD	14.6	73	14.0	98.3	96.0
Government	4.5	22	0.2 <sup>8</sup>	1.7	5.4
Beneficiaries	1.0	5			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20.1</b>		<b>14.2</b>		<b>70.9</b>

Source: President's report addendum page 2; PCR Annex 6 page 48.

<sup>6</sup> Criteria were: i) the highest rural poverty levels; ii) acute levels of erosion and resource degradation; and iii) presence of indigenous communities.

<sup>7</sup> Stated allocations presented in different documents are inconsistent. This PCRV chose the figures that are most consistent: The President's report addendum, whose totals mostly coincide with design allocations stated in the PCR.

<sup>8</sup> The figure does not include exemptions on Value Added Tax were worth approximately US\$430,000.

Table 2  
**Component costs**

<i>Component</i>	<i>Approval (US\$ millions)</i>	<i>Approval (per cent of total)</i>	<i>Completion (US\$ millions)</i>	<i>Completion (per cent of total)</i>	<i>Disbursement rate (per cent)</i>
A. Human and social capital development	2.1	10.5	1.2	8.3	56.0
B. Sustainable production and the rehabilitation and management of natural resources	4.5	22.5	5.2	36.8	116.2
C. Business and rural microenterprise development	4.2	21.1	4.3	30.0	100.9
D. Rural financial services	5.1	25.4	0.2	1.5	4.2
E. Project coordination and institutional strengthening for rural development	4.2	20.7	3.3	23.3	79.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20.1</b>		<b>14.2</b>		<b>70.9</b>

Source: Appraisal report Appendix 12 table 2; PCR Annex 6 page 48<sup>9</sup> & Annex 6 page 42.

8. **Project implementation.** The project was under the responsibility of MoA and implemented by the PCU. Territorial offices of the PCU aided implementation outside of the PCU's direct area. Capacity building was outsourced to companies and NGOs. The rural finance component would have a rural finance intermediation trust set up that would be funded by another trust created for a previous IFAD project. M&E was under the responsibility of the PCU.
9. **Changes in project implementation.** The 2009 elections saw a change in Government, which launched the FAP in early 2011. The project aligned project activities with FAP objectives. Component B incorporated FAP-Food and Nutrition Security (FAP-FNS) which supported organizations in the project area to apply the FAP-FNS methodology.<sup>10</sup> Component C integrated FAP-Production Chains (FAP-PC) which helped beneficiaries develop business plans and increase business resilience.
10. In December 2011 IFAD approved supplementary financing for the project as requested by the Government of El Salvador. The funds came from the STF for the co-financing for food security, worth EUR11.15 million (US\$15 million).<sup>11</sup> The STF loan agreement expanded the geographical reach of the project by two Departments and 55 more municipalities.<sup>12</sup> It also included social, environmental and production infrastructure as a spending category.<sup>13</sup> Approval and execution of this second loan was complicated: the Mid-term Review (MTR) identified the need for more resources and loan agreement amendments to incorporate the STF loan. A special account in the Central Bank and further fund administration arrangements with the United Nations Development Programme were expected. Parliament's late ratification led to a timing mismatch with consequences on PCU funding.<sup>14</sup> It was decided that the STF loan-funded activities would be implemented

<sup>9</sup> The PCR's component design estimate is the only one that coincides with the President Report Addendum's project design estimate.

<sup>10</sup> According to MTR, this methodology uses demonstration households to teach a range of production techniques and technologies, and marketing (page 25).

<sup>11</sup> The loan agreement was signed in April 2012, was ratified in parliament in November 2013, and became effective on 23 January 2014. Completion is set for 31 March 2019 and loan closure 30 September 2019.

<sup>12</sup> Following the approval of the STF loan, the number of municipalities receiving project services increased to 121 and included the Departments of Chalatenango and La Libertad.

<sup>13</sup> MTR paragraph 52.

<sup>14</sup> The PCU was to be financed by IFAD funds, yet the eventual timing mismatch on loan completion (2015 for the IFAD loan, 2019 for the STF loan) and spending category allocations of the STF loan would necessitate a reallocation of STF funding to increase salaries so as to be able to restart or keep funding the PCU (MTR paragraphs 238-239).

in the extended areas (see paragraph 10) and would become a stand-alone project, though sharing the same goals and objectives as PRODEMOR CENTRAL.

11. Other changes included modification of the design logframe. This was modified in 2014 during MTR. Specific objectives were redefined, while gender-disaggregated results and indicators were added. Changes were also made to reflect the harmonization between FAP and PRODEMOR CENTRAL.<sup>15</sup> IFAD took over direct supervision from UNOPS. Project context changes included increased violence in the project area, which had an impact implementation of activities, partly arising out of the 2009 economic crisis.
12. **Intervention logic.** The project assumed that poverty reduction would be achieved through three pillars: The principal pathway was that by improving the capacity of individuals, groups and businesses to build up enterprises and apply improved farming techniques would allow them to better integrate into market processes that would lead to improved incomes and job generation (component A, B & C). Participatory group approaches would encourage youth and women to be involved in the dynamics (component A). The second pillar assumes that by providing rural financial services and improved Natural Resource Management, the principal pillar is reinforced by having strengthened sources of inputs in the form of seed capital and an improved sustainable resource base (component B & D). The final pillar is that a strengthened ministry would be able to better coordinate and deliver public policies that reinforce the project's main activities throughout the country and after project completion (component E).
13. **Delivery of outputs.** The following paragraphs indicate the major outputs of the project per component using the updated 2014 logframe found in the PCR (see annex III for further details).
14. **A) Human and social capital and development.** Overall average achievement of output result targets was 149 per cent, with seven out of eight outputs exceeding targets. Outputs focussed on strengthening community, producers and business groups through an Organizational Strengthening Programme (OSP) methodology,<sup>16</sup> applying socio-entrepreneurial diagnostics using a 'closing gaps' gender methodology,<sup>17</sup> developing planning tools for organizational strengthening, and organizational and entrepreneurial capacity-building with a gender dimension. Organizations also participated in experience exchange events, and were supported to become legally registered. Affirmative action activities geared towards women and youth were conducted and a comprehensive action plan for the inclusion of rural youth was created.
15. **B) Sustainable production and the rehabilitation and management of natural resources.** The revised component worked with the FAP-FNS methodology, which carried out multiple interventions along two axes. In the production axis, overall average achievement of output result targets was 100 per cent, with only one of five indicators having very poor target attainment. Households developed home-farm plans and received technical assistance. Organizations that benefited from FAP-FNS received technical assistance, farmer field schools were set up, and specialized technical assistance was delivered to individuals.<sup>18</sup> In terms of material goods, 16,569 in-kind payments<sup>19</sup> were

---

<sup>15</sup> The original logframe was weak, with outputs being considered outcome goals.

<sup>16</sup> Following a point-system categorisation of organizations, the OSP methodology determined factors that limit organizational and business capacities through group-specific Organizational Strengthening Plans.

<sup>17</sup> 'Closing Gaps' is a gender equity tool for organizations used to measure the extent to which the organization is gender equitable, to develop gender strategies and/or affirmative actions to close gender equity gaps, and measure improvements and identify necessary improvements to the strategy or affirmative actions (IFAD-ProGénero-CODERSA 2003).

<sup>18</sup> 1,224 of 1,264 targeted adult men; 223 of 228 targeted adult women; 38 of 43 targeted young men; and 15 of 15 targeted young women.

distributed. Only two organizations of a targeted 75 (3 per cent) had compiled food security project profiles. In the environmental and resource management axis, overall average achievement of output result targets was 51 per cent, with only three of six indicators achieving or close to achieving their targets. Beneficiaries and technical staff were trained on natural resource management. An environmental education pilot project and an environmental education platform for schools were developed. Under the sustainable natural resource management plan, 782 of 6,100 individuals (13 per cent of target) benefitted from incentives to sustainably manage natural resources. Under environmental management infrastructure, conservation projects were launched, reaching fewer than the planned targets on hectares covered and beneficiaries.

16. **C) Business and rural microenterprise development.** Overall average achievement of output result targets was 71 per cent. The development of specialized technical assistance<sup>20</sup> exceeded the target by 28 per cent. Business plans financed through competitive funds benefitted rural enterprises, local organizations and microenterprises. These incorporated soil and water risk conservation and/or mitigation measures. A planned investment mechanism for innovative informal enterprises was not implemented.
17. **D) Rural financial services.** The component focussed on financial literacy, group capacity building, and obtaining services of local microfinance organizations. The component's overall average achievement of output result targets was only 46 per cent.
18. **E) Project coordination and institutional strengthening for rural development.** The component focussed on four activities that would strengthen and streamline MoA's actions vis-à-vis other development partners, and achieved 57 per cent of the overall average achievement of output result targets. The component rehabilitated MoA infrastructure and set up service systems, but did not build capacity of staff.

### III. Review of findings

#### A. Core criteria Relevance

19. **Relevance of objectives.** The project's objectives were in line with four out of five of the 2001 El Salvador Country Strategic Opportunities Paper's thrusts (income generation, market linkages, human and community development, innovative sustainable rural financial services, and institutional framework for poverty alleviation) and with its crosscutting thrusts (gender equity, and environmental management and conservation). The project's objectives were also aligned to IFAD's 2007-2010 strategic framework, the 2003-2006 Gender Plan of Action, and the 2006 Targeting Policy. The project was in line with national strategy at the time of design, and specific components were appropriately reformulated to stay in line with the 2011 FAP during implementation (see paragraph 89), as stated at MTR.
20. **Relevance to the needs of beneficiaries.** The project area was chosen following the sequence of projects outlined in the 2001 Country Strategic Opportunities Paper. The Departments did not receive significant assistance from national and international development projects.<sup>21</sup> Selection of municipalities that suffered most

---

<sup>19</sup> These cover a range of types of goods, and include inter alia purifiers, improved stoves, sewage systems, etc. The three largest payments in terms of numbers were 5,168 (of a targeted 8,661) fruit trees; 2,819 (of a targeted 693) vegetable patches, and 1,982 (of a targeted 1,151) poultry pens.

<sup>20</sup> These were classified under production, storage, transformation and marketing.

<sup>21</sup> Appraisal report 2007, paragraphs 59-63.

from extreme poverty, and those that were ecologically sensitive in terms of watershed management was appropriate. Focus on women, youth and indigenous groups was also highly relevant within these municipalities, and improved markedly after MTR once a dedicated unit was created in the PCU. Tracking of indigenous group beneficiaries was very limited however. The two pronged approach discussed in paragraph 12 also aimed to cover those rural poor that had not been reached by Government or by development agencies, while further propelling those that had. While coverage of multiple types of the poor, the less poor, and the marginalised was appropriate, this last point would have consequences on implementation.

21. **Relevance of design.** The two-pronged approach was ambitious. Developing two approaches and dedicated components to serve the poorest on the one hand and the less poor on the other through the project's multi-component structure risked spreading project resources and activities thinly, limiting the potential for multiplying project outcomes and impacts. Furthermore, the project's logic depended on the success of multiple component activities to snowball together. Limited effectiveness in one risked the snowball effect. Allocation of resources followed this logic; as seen in the rural finance component, the project assumed that micro-finance institutions as partners would be found and that legal conditions for transfer of a trust to provide credit would have rural finance be competitive, which was not the case (see paragraph 29).
22. **Adjustments** to the project were relevant and timely. The modification of components resulting from implementation of the FAP provided an avenue for the policy to be put into practice, and dovetailed into the project logic of raising smallholder incomes. The approval of the STF loan was requested by the Government of El Salvador and its focus on nutrition would have reinforced support to marginalised groups and youth. The poor timeliness of the request and subsequent ratification process, however, had implications on efficiency (see paragraph 34) and funding allocations.
23. Overall the project was relevant to the Government of El Salvador, to IFAD and to the needs of the poor. Yet the large number of categories of the poor targeted and subsequent coverage of multiple types of activities and components to reach every category increased complexity, and the project depended on partners for execution that may not have been available. The PCRV rates *relevance moderately satisfactory* (4), one rating lower than Programme Management Department's (PMD) rating of *satisfactory* (5) on account of complicated design.

### **Effectiveness**

24. This section will discuss the attainment of the project's specific objectives based on outcomes attained as presented in the PCR's logframe.
25. **1) Promote the development of the target group's social and human capital.** Targets set to reach this objective have been mostly reached. According to a MoA survey,<sup>22</sup> 78 out of a targeted 45 per cent of organizations supported by the project have improved their capacity and have improved their categorisation by at least one level according to the OSP methodology. 42 out of a targeted 40 rural organizations or businesses have been legally registered. A rural youth citizens participation network was created based on the consolidation of departmental territorial networks created in subsequent IFAD projects. Youth in these networks received training to strengthen dialogue, leadership and entrepreneurship capacities, and reached 1,950 rural and indigenous youth.<sup>23</sup> 71 out of a targeted 80 per cent of organizations that applied the 'closing gaps' methodology had reduced

<sup>22</sup> "Medición de Indicadores de Efecto del Proyecto de Desarrollo y Modernización Rural para las Regiones Central y Paracentral (MAG PRODEMOR CENTRAL) en su Componente de Desarrollo de Capital Humano y Social". May 2016.

<sup>23</sup> This was achieved by setting up the El Salvador Integrated Association of Rural Youth Networks, with the support of the Ministry of Governance and Territorial Development's National Institute of Youth.

gender equity gaps. A weaker result was that only 46 out of a targeted 76 organizations established links with other groups, agencies or projects.

26. **2) Support competitive and sustainable production for smallholder households, farmers' associations, and economic organizations.** Attainment of outcome targets for this objective was mixed. On a positive note, 20,816 out of a targeted 10,159 farmers diversified production and adopted new crops or techniques through the farmer field schools. According to the PCR, the farmer field school techniques focussed on highly nutritious basic grains, vegetables and fruits. Out of these farmers, 12,360 of a targeted 13,864 beneficiaries improved their homes and reduced household drudgery through in-kind payments such as improved stoves, sewage improvements or water filters (see footnote 19), though the data quality supporting this indicator is not clear (see paragraph 41). 47 out of a target of 30 per cent of these beneficiaries were women. Weaker results were on improving organization status. Only 5 of a targeted 10 per cent of organizations graduated their activities to a rural business or microenterprise status.
27. **3) Contribute to the reversal of processes that cause erosion, deforestation, and the degradation of natural resources.** Attainment of outcome targets under this objective is rather poor due to late implementation of activities. The quality of what was delivered was nonetheless positive. Measures that aimed to encourage environmental education were more successful while rehabilitation of land and municipal initiatives to work on environmental issues were less so. 32 of a targeted 34 per cent of schools executed a pilot project on environmental education that focussed on environmental care and conservation. Only 578 of a targeted 2,008ha of land<sup>24</sup> were rehabilitated through soil and water conservation measures, which included hillside drainage networks, water recharging facilities, individual terraces for fruit orchards, live fences, among others. A planned municipalities consortium project to deal with environmental issues was never launched.
28. **4) Promote the creation and consolidation of productive and transformative activities and turn these into viable and competitive microenterprises.** The attainment of target outcomes of this objective was good. The project clearly was successful in nurturing many economic activities through in-kind payments, but failure of others was linked to endemic issues of a lack of investment, market access, and financial literacy that the project aimed to solve. In terms of achievements, 76 of a targeted 75 per cent of rural businesses and microenterprises increased their aggregate value by 10 per cent.<sup>25</sup> The same proportion and target of farm projects improved their access to markets. 109 of a targeted 126 microenterprises were created and operate under business plans, working along multiple value chains.<sup>26</sup> 75 of a targeted 77 per cent of business plans incorporate land conservation and risk mitigation strategies. 21 of a planned 48 per cent of rural businesses were created by women and youth. However, according to one impact survey, 15.2 per cent of enterprises supported by the project closed, attributed to a lack of working capital, lack of market access, lack of skills or interest, and crime.<sup>27</sup>
29. **5) Facilitate access to basic rural financial services that are specialized in servicing the target group, for productive and marketing purposes.**

---

<sup>24</sup> The PCR reports 1,167 ha, but this does not coincide with outcome reports in the PCR's logframe.

<sup>25</sup> The CPM's review of impact studies included this indicator and noted limitations in calculating the result leading to it not being able to be used as an indicator. Limitations include lack of differentiation of rural businesses and microenterprises; no baseline; and no definition of aggregate value.

<sup>26</sup> These were vegetables, basic grains, dairy, fruit, honey, aquaculture, artisan goods, and tourism.

<sup>27</sup> It is expected that the causes referred to come from the income, aggregate value, and market access survey prepared for the PCR. Attribution to the causes is vague in the report, but it is surmised that the following proportions of respondents named the next causes as reasons for closure: 18.8 per cent for lack of working capital, 15.6 per cent for lack of market access, 12.5 per cent for poor administration, 15.6 per cent for lack of interest, and 6.3 per cent for crime.



Achievement of this objective was poor. No microfinance organizations were recruited to provide financial services in the project area, due to poor local conditions for expansion of financial intermediation, and strong competition from low-interest Government-funded financial services (see paragraph 21). Consequently, only 105 of a targeted 1,250 beneficiaries and 2 of a targeted 20 rural enterprises were able to obtain credit. The only positive achievement has been the development of a savings culture. Following unsuccessful outreach to microfinance organizations, the project emphasized savings associations, building up solidarity groups that had 920 (95 per cent women) of a targeted 1,250 (30 per cent women) beneficiaries voluntarily saving. These savings were reportedly used to self-finance income-generating activities, and generate practical experience in finance.

30. **6) Facilitate the coordination of rural development programmes and projects, and the harmonization of intervention strategies.** According to the PCR and its logframe, achievement of this objective has been good. MoA consolidated its Project Coordination Office, a General Management of Rural Development office was created, and the FAP was implemented. This was achieved through the passing of a specific law to set up the General Management of Rural Development office, and registering smallholder and agricultural producer beneficiaries in a Citizens' Attention System intended to provide MoA services within the FAP.
31. **Outreach.** Overall outreach was 34,435 direct beneficiaries compared to a design target of 33,000, of which 17,719 were women (out of a target of 9,900) and 3,324 were youth (out of a target of 3,300). Activity outreach is also disaggregated by gender and youth. The PCR does not disaggregate beneficiaries by department or municipality. There is hardly any breakdown of indigenous beneficiaries, despite being one of the target groups. According to MTR and supervision missions, indigenous communities have been served by the project.
32. **Overall,** the project achieved some of its objectives, particularly in social and human capital, in facilitating the coordination of development programmes and harmonizing intervention strategies, and in supporting productive and transformative activities. It partly achieved objectives supporting competitive agricultural production, and made limited progress in regards to supporting environmental processes and facilitating the development of rural financial markets. Due to the limitations described, the PCRV rates *effectiveness moderately satisfactory* (4), one rating lower than PMD's rating of *satisfactory* (5).

### Efficiency

33. **Project expenditure** according to the PCR was 70.9 per cent of design estimates (see table 1). The shortfall is found in low disbursements of components A and D (see table 2). The IFAD loan disbursed 96 per cent of its design allocation,<sup>28</sup> with average yearly disbursements of 20 per cent of the financed total.<sup>29</sup> The disbursement of the Government of El Salvador was only 5.4 per cent of the committed amount at design. This did not take into account the government's value added tax exemptions (see footnote 8). Low government's disbursement is mostly accounted for by the poor performance of the rural finance component, which represented 83 per cent of the government's allocated funding. Beneficiary contributions are not provided.
34. **Effectiveness lag,** measured as the time between approval to effectiveness, was long, clocking in at 26 months, due to multiple stages of parliamentary ratification for the project to meet effectiveness criteria.<sup>30</sup> According to the Country Programme Manager (CPM), this impacted the portfolio as a whole. Comparison

<sup>28</sup> IFAD FlexCube data states that the loan disbursement at project completion was 98 per cent.

<sup>29</sup> Calculated from Withdrawal Application data in Flexcube.

<sup>30</sup> MTR para. 34; the CPM stated that parliament requires two phases of ratification for loan-funded projects.

against other IFAD projects in the portfolio shows that PRODEMOR CENTRAL lag between approval and effectiveness was the second longest in the portfolio, while it had the longest lag between effectiveness to first disbursement.<sup>31</sup> The creation of PRODEMOR CENTRAL–Extension was due to late ratification of the loan, which led to loan amendments, creating a new project, and re-creating the PCU and associated administrative costs. Despite this, a benefit of this lag may have been the limited redesign of components once the project was re-aligned to meet FAP objectives in 2014.

35. **Economic rate of return.** The Internal Rate of Return<sup>32</sup> at design was estimated at 23.6 per cent.<sup>33</sup> Design calculations expected the project's rate of return to be resilient against time lags and increases in costs, but not resilient against reduction in benefits. The PCR did not calculate an internal rate of return. It can be inferred that rates of return would have been positive through good outreach (paragraph 31) and the high number of enterprises reporting increases in net value (paragraph 28). However, the effectiveness lag and recreation of PRODEMOR CENTRAL–Extension administration may dampen the internal rate return.
36. **Cost per beneficiary.** Neither design documents nor the PCR calculated this indicator. The PCRV calculates design costs per beneficiary at US\$608, while at completion they were US\$413, a 32 per cent decrease. The decrease is accounted for by the slightly higher beneficiary outreach and reduced project costs. However, since the PCR did not take into account beneficiary contributions, overall cost per beneficiary could be higher.
37. **Management costs**<sup>34</sup> decreased by US\$638,000 from design to completion, representing a 20 per cent difference. However, as a percentage of the actual total project costs, the proportion from design increased by 2.6 per cent at completion, representing 19.7 per cent. This is somewhat higher than the El Salvador portfolio design average of 16.6 per cent.<sup>35</sup> The increases are attributed to the inclusion of a PCU gender and youth sub-component, a proportional increase in the PCU planning and M&E sub-component, to scaling up the PCU at project end to prepare for the launch of PRODEMOR CENTRAL–Extension, and using the PCU gender and youth unit to serve other IFAD projects.
38. **Overall,** efficiency was mixed. The PCR highlights the high IFAD loan disbursement rate, and government's relatively high disbursement rate when taking into account value added tax exemptions and non-implementation of the rural finance credit line. Yet the PCRV found that long delays in effectiveness of both loans, and increased associated costs in resources to launch PRODEMOR CENTRAL–Extension shortened the implementation period. In light of the above, the PCRV rates *effectiveness moderately satisfactory* (4), one rating lower than PMD's rating of *satisfactory* (5).

### **Rural poverty impact**

39. In preparation for the PCR, the project commissioned thematic impact surveys.<sup>36</sup> At the time of writing this PCRV, the impact surveys were not available.<sup>37</sup> A Results and Impact Management System (RIMS) baseline survey was conducted in 2012 but the PCR did not conduct an ex ante/ex post analysis. The logframe's three

---

<sup>31</sup> IFAD GRIPS 2017.

<sup>32</sup> The design methodology did not take into account all benefit streams, which raises the possibility that the calculated internal rate of return is higher (Appraisal report paragraph 157).

<sup>33</sup> President's Report paragraph 25.

<sup>34</sup> Component E included a sub-component to fund MoA capacity building. Figures reported here cover the remaining subcomponents that are management-related: PCU planning and M&E; PCU management and administration; PCU gender.

<sup>35</sup> Calculated from GRIPS data.

<sup>36</sup> The three survey themes are as follows: i) incomes, added value and access to markets (50 organizations sampled); ii) crop diversification and technology adoption (118 farmers sampled); iii) OSP impact evaluation (77 organizations sampled) – PCR annex 14.

<sup>37</sup> These were requested repeatedly by IOE in October 2017.

project goal indicators and two project objective indicators are at the impact level. Yet, the PCR itself provides very few quantitative or qualitative impact-level findings from the project.<sup>38</sup> Therefore discussion of impact will limit itself to the project's possible contribution to each impact domain.

40. **Household income and assets.** The PCR discusses reduction in rural poverty at the national level, noting a decrease between 2010-2014 in total poverty from 43.2 to 37.9 per cent and in extreme poverty from 15.1 to 10.9 per cent. It quotes multiple evaluations attributing the causes to increases in household income, of remittances making up 52 per cent of total household income, and of FAP social programmes also providing income.
41. At the project level, there is one logframe impact-level indicator that measured beneficiary income increases, stating that these increased by 13 per cent (out of a target of 15 per cent), yet there is no indication as to how this figure was derived.<sup>39</sup> The PCR also highlights outputs and outcomes in value chain activities (see paragraph 28) that provided US\$3.4 million in gross profits for enterprises involved. Claims that these are due to better access to markets are reported for only one enterprise.<sup>40</sup> Increase in values of businesses is likewise reported though the quality of the data for this indicator is poor (see footnote 19). The provision of certain in-kind payments included productive assets that may contribute to increased incomes (see paragraph 15), but there was no household study to determine the extent of these activities. The PCR reports survey results where 40 per cent of respondents stated they saw increases in sales, while 50 per cent saw a decrease, attributing this to competition, price volatility, economic crisis, and climate.<sup>41</sup> The project did not measure changes in household assets which limit any inference of changes in household incomes. The failure of the rural finance component severely limited beneficiary access to financial inputs. It is reasonable to think that various project activities have contributed to increased household incomes, but available project data does not allow making a definitive judgement in this respect. Finally, supervision missions have attributed increasing violent crime in the project area to increasing costs for organizations and for difficulties in outreach for project technical teams.<sup>42</sup>
42. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** The project provided substantial support to this impact domain. Solidarity groups, community groups, microenterprises and rural businesses were assisted through multiple tools (Organizational Strengthening Plans; business plans; Socio-entrepreneurial diagnostics) to improve their operations and sustainability. According to the PCR logframe, 78 of a targeted 45 per cent of organizations strengthened through Organizational Strengthening Plans have improved their organizational categorization by at least one level, but only 5 per cent graduated to a rural business or microenterprise (see paragraph 26). 56 solidarity groups were created and provided the possibility of saving money almost exclusively for women. The PCR logframe reports 34 of a targeted 15 per cent of women and youth occupy management posts of organizations. Yet there is no discussion in the PCR report on qualitative aspects of this indicator's achievement.

---

<sup>38</sup> Data presented in the logframe project goal impact-level indicators and discussed in the PCR refer to nation-wide rural statistics since department and municipality disaggregated data are not available (review of stated sources of surveys confirms this).

<sup>39</sup> The logframe indicator is stated to be measured by the incomes, added value and access to markets impact survey, but according to the CPM's review of impact surveys this specific indicator was not included.

<sup>40</sup> No indicators collect this kind of data, and the CPM's review of impact surveys found that market access questions to businesses did not differentiate between formal and informal markets and did not measure variations in sales to markets.

<sup>41</sup> The CPM's review of the indicators noted incorrect sampling, not following statistical procedures, no baseline methods used (use of RIMS baseline or recall) to establish rate of change, incorrect identification of items to measure change, and no disaggregation. The CPM came to the conclusion that the indicator was not measured.

<sup>42</sup> Supervision mission October 2014 paragraph 28; Supervision mission April 2015, paragraph 32.

43. The project taught nearly 21,000 farmers new techniques and technologies (see paragraph 26) through farmer field schools, with the logframe reporting 73 of a targeted 85 per cent of farmers adopting and applying these. The project also aimed to for farmers to adopt and apply natural resource conservation and rehabilitation techniques, with 87 of a targeted 65 per cent of beneficiaries doing so. Yet the quality of the studies underpinning these indicators was poor and cannot be taken into consideration.<sup>43</sup> Nor are there other proxy indicators that could establish the level of up-take of technologies, i.e. increased productivity or yields.
44. **Food security and agricultural productivity.** The project's logic in regards to this impact domain rested on improved productivity through farm models, adoption of technologies, and enhanced food security through higher incomes and better use of rehabilitated land. The FAP-FNS activities under objective 2 and land rehabilitation under objective 3 (see paragraphs. 26 and 27) likely contributed to both agricultural productivity and food security. However, there are few indicators that provide a clear picture of project impacts in this domain. The PCR uses child malnutrition rates as an indicator, where it decreased nationally by 30 per cent. This high-level indicator is ill-suited to measure project impacts on food security in the project area, and the PCR does not mention changes of the chosen indicator in the project area.
45. **Institutions and policies.** The project provided significant support to improving both local institutions and being a platform through which FAP would be executed. The use of institutional strengthening methodologies and targeted support to groups discussed in paragraphs 42-43 helped improve resilience, with support to legalisation of institutions also provided. Regarding policy, and following the change in government, the project was able to support the setting up of the Centre for the Development of Family Agriculture and the rehabilitation and stocking of the General Management for Rural Development's offices. More importantly, the project was a testing ground for FAP-FNS and FAP-PC. The PCR discusses output level achievements of these activities, but it can be inferred that important practical experience for beneficiaries and the MoA was also generated.
46. **Overall,** the project had plausible impacts in the domains of human and social capital, institutions and policies, and agricultural productivity. The strengthening of community-level institutions and the capacity building of these, as well as of individual beneficiaries likely improved. However, the PCR claims strong impact without quality data to support it, making the assessment of this criterion difficult (as highlighted in the CPMT minutes for the PRODEMOR CENTRAL PCR). This is especially the case regarding impact-level indicators in household incomes and assets. Pathways that reinforce these impacts either did not happen (rural finance) or depend on levels that were not measured well (access to markets, adoption rates). Neither could the PCR use disaggregated data to establish rates of change. Considering the above, the PCRV rates *rural poverty impact moderately satisfactory* (4), against PMD's rating of *satisfactory* (5).

### **Sustainability of benefits**

47. **Technical sustainability.** The PCR notes that organizations strengthened through OSP methodologies started their activities halfway through project implementation, which did not leave enough time for all intervened groups to improve capacities and generate long-term visions. The 2015 supervision mission and PCR also noted that improved linkages between public and private organizations, and within value chains would improve resilience. Yet outputs at this level were weak (see paragraph 25). The PCR also argues that rural businesses and microenterprises have improved their capacity and that these could respond to future challenges through the use of business plans. However, no strategy was developed beyond

---

<sup>43</sup> See footnote 32.

this to reinforce or support these businesses. The PCRV also observes that replication of in-kind payments is not expected (platforms to ensure this never took off), limiting the sustainability of this type of investment. Outreach to youth through platforms for networking and knowledge sharing have been successful, but the extent to which youth were trained in farmer field schools is unknown, and they have been a minor proportion of beneficiaries receiving technical assistance in rural enterprise activities.

48. **Government commitment.** A few months before project completion, legislative elections were held in El Salvador, leading to a new government and a new MoA rural development strategy. The PCR highlights the alignment of PRODEMOR CENTRAL to the new strategy, particularly on encouraging the development of social capital, food security and inclusive socio-economic development. Allocated resources to specific PRODEMOR CENTRAL activities are not discussed, nor is engagement with municipalities after completion. Institutional architecture to coordinate donors and manage rural and agricultural development processes are mentioned by the PCR, but it does not provide specific details on how these would support PRODEMOR CENTRAL activity sustainability.
49. **External factors.** The PCR has noted several factors that pose risks to the long-term benefits created by the project. As stated in paragraph 42, it notes increased crime and violence that increase costs for economic activities. It also noted that microenterprises working with basic grains have recently been affected by declining yields due to erratic rainfall and drought. Limited effectiveness of physical natural resource management activities limits long-term physical sustainability to environmental challenges, even if education may raise awareness in this area.
50. **Overall** sustainability is mixed. In a context of increased risks, the project has worked on improving capacity of organizations and beneficiaries. Yet the scale of these actions remains in doubt for a large proportion of beneficiaries to cope. Government remains committed at the national level to engage with improving the situation of the rural poor, but specific actions emerging from PRODEMOR CENTRAL are unknown. The PCRV rates *the sustainability of benefits moderately satisfactory* (4), against PMD's rating of *satisfactory* (5).

## **B. Other performance criteria**

### **Innovation**

51. The PCR highlights two innovations generated by the project: reinforcement of the basic grains value chain through a business and service center that allowed for safe sorting, packaging, and subsequent marketing; and the setting up of the rural youth citizens participation network which allowed youth to catalogue business ideas and subsequently leverage public/private funding for implementation. While the former may be logistically innovative, the latter was innovative in terms of creating a new dynamic that serves a key target group and that can be scaled up.
52. The project also brought into practice certain methodological innovations such as implementation of 'closing gaps', OSP, and business plans that were absent in the project area. These are low cost and can be spread through public or private institutions to build the capacity of individuals and groups in the project area or further afield. There is no evidence that grants were used to research or apply innovations in the project. Overall, PRODEMOR CENTRAL was innovative in methodological, technical and organizational terms. Innovation is rated *satisfactory* (5), the same rating as PMD.

### **Scaling up**

53. The PCR considers institutional strengthening activities that created spaces for dialogue of public policies, such as the General Management for Rural Development, the Centre for the Development of Family Agriculture, or the rural youth citizens participation network, as areas where lesson learning could take

place and to scale up solutions. While this may well be possible, the PCR does not explicitly identify cases of scaling up that occurred through the project. The examples provided by the PCR cannot be considered a scaling up of project activities, but as an implementation of MoA strategy.

54. Some mechanisms and planned activities can help set the base for potential scaling up in the future. In the case of the youth citizens participation network, activities will continue under PRODEMOR CENTRAL–Extension, but as of yet cannot be considered scaled up. The General Management for Rural Development's Citizens' Attention System can potentially be used for other MoA activities, though there is no evidence of this happening. Finally, IFAD-financed projects in El Salvador approved since PRODEMOR CENTRAL have seen a sharp reduction in government co-financing while government debt to GDP is nearly 50 per cent.<sup>44</sup> This limits the scope for the Government of El Salvador to finance the scaling up of activities.
55. The PCR does not provide explicit cases of scaling up, though the PCRV considers that there are possible mechanisms put in place by the project that may be able to scale up project activities. Bearing in mind the limited scope for scaling up to occur, the PCRV rates scaling up *moderately satisfactory* (4), one rating lower than PMD.

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

56. PRODEMOR CENTRAL's approach to gender was sensitive from the start, though it had some limitations. Project design identified challenges that Salvadorian women face, including a high female to male ratio due to past armed conflict in El Salvador and high levels of gender-based violence. The project designed a gender strategy that was also youth and indigenous group inclusive. It aimed to guarantee the promotion of rural women to qualitatively improve their wellbeing.<sup>45</sup> It proposed a mainstreaming approach that aimed to include women and youth in all activities across all components, and assigned an outreach target for women (see paragraph 31). The project used multiple methodologies (closing gaps; gender sensitive socio-entrepreneurial diagnostics) to reach out and attempt to achieve the gender strategy. Some limitations to strategy implementation are reported.<sup>46</sup> The PCR does not specifically address gender equality and women's empowerment in a holistic manner. Nonetheless the report provides some qualitative and quantitative information on activities<sup>47</sup> and the logframe contains gender-specific output and outcome indicators. The one significant data limitation is that there is no verifiable way of assessing the degree and extent of changes to women's livelihoods and contexts.
57. The project provided most benefits to women through access to resources (improved income through membership in farming groups), assets (in-kind payments, particularly poultry pens<sup>48</sup>) and services (savings and credit services through solidarity groups<sup>49</sup>). Some in-kind payments specifically met the needs of women in traditional gender roles, such as easing household chores through improved water filters and sewage. Improvement in decision-making and household workload distribution is less clear. Both indicators for women's leadership of businesses and improvements of household conditions and reduction in drudgery are not backed with qualitative data, even if the targets had been reached. Women's participation in solidarity groups set an example for men, who went on to set up their own groups. Women have also shared the approach with

---

<sup>44</sup> World Bank 2017.

<sup>45</sup> Appraisal report Working Paper 3.

<sup>46</sup> As reported by MTR, the strategy was prepared for implementation in 2012, nearly 2.5 years into project effectiveness. Yet it was limited at the time by not having a comprehensive approach to engaging with youth and lacked specific objectives to be reached. Neither were there resources assigned to specific women's activities in components outside the PCU gender unit (MTR paragraphs 64-66).

<sup>47</sup> See PCR Annex 12.

<sup>48</sup> 1,982 pens distributed.

<sup>49</sup> 874 of 920 members in these groups were women.

other women's groups in the regions, demonstrating a level of self-sufficiency. There are no studies to ascertain the level of change that has occurred to women through these activities. Finally, some activities that would have improved women in non-traditional roles and potentially lead to greater societal change were overwhelmingly assisted by men (i.e. technical assistance under Component B) or had very low targets (functional rural businesses set up by women and youth). There are no activities where the gender strategy focussed on working with men.

58. Overall, there was a clear strategy with a dedicated PCU unit. Activities aimed to reach women and men, with a focus on providing access to resources, assets and services. The project may have contributed to other gender domains, yet studies are needed to back this up. The PCRV rates *Gender equality and women's empowerment satisfactory* (5), the same rating as PMD.

### **Environment and natural resources management**

59. PRODEMOR CENTRAL design aimed to address environmental degradation and natural resource management issues in watersheds (see paragraph 12). This was to be achieved through environmental education and public sector capacity building, land restoration, mitigation plans and public sector coordination and cooperation. According to RIMS target achievements for most of these activities were not reached, and outcome achievement of targets was poor (see paragraph 27). Similarly, there is no data on uptake of lessons and techniques.
60. Physical interventions came about by rehabilitating land through 22 environmental projects, which brought back 616 hectares of land. The other main contribution was through in-kind payments. These included 37,274 fruit trees, 128 agroforestry plots and 1,628 lumber trees which can contribute to sustainable resource management and erosion control. Other payments included efficient wood stoves that reduce wood fuel consumption and deforestation. Payments were also conditional, with beneficiaries having to construct conservation measures in beneficiaries' plots. Capacity building and educational interventions also brought about a wide range of benefits. Specialized technical assistance in sustainable production incorporated water-saving techniques (drip and tunnel irrigation), environmentally friendly inputs (integrated pest management, organic fertilizer, prohibiting highly toxic pesticides) and recycling campaigns. Successful interventions with the ministry of education in its environmental education in rural schools programme in 32 schools raised awareness amongst youth. Some business plans also incorporated environmental mitigation measures, though these are not discussed in detail in the PCR. Overall, the project has made substantial contributions to addressing environmental concerns, raising awareness, and building capacity, yet the scale of its effects is limited due to poor achievement of targets. Environment and natural resources management is rated *moderately satisfactory* (4), the same rating as PMD.

### **Adaptation to climate change**

61. El Salvador has led the world's ranking in terms of country most at risk to climate change in 2009, and has suffered from intense hurricanes and dry seasons. Design acknowledged climate change risks and linked its mitigation to objective 3, before IFAD incorporated climate change as a strategic focus. According to the PCR, the 20,816 farmer field school beneficiaries and 265 groups were also taught about nutrition and climate change adaptation. Despite the unreliability of adoption figures (see paragraph 43), adaptive technologies included the application organic fertilizers (*bocachi*), insecticides and fungicides, and the installation of drip irrigation. Infrastructure and in-kind payment activities discussed under environmental and natural resource management (paragraph 60) would have a positive effect on beneficiaries being able to adapt to climate change. The project's relevant and timely focus on the issue, and integration of adaptation concerns into project activities is positive, but reporting of the scale of the intervention is found

wanting. The PCRV rates climate change adaptation *moderately satisfactory* (4), the same as PMD.

### C. Overall project achievement

62. The project's approach to rural poverty reduction was through holistically addressing several key themes to benefit the rural poor and marginalised groups. The themes were addressed with different degrees of success, within a shortened timeframe. Success depended on reasonable assumptions and good performance of all project activities, which was not realistic. The result was likely increased incomes, and certainly stronger institutions and capacity of beneficiaries to respond to challenges and opportunities. Yet these have not been measured appropriately. Where the project was successful, it was due to a strong focus on capacity building and participatory processes pushed by the project, which had a strong gender and environmental strategies. A significant focus on youth also bodes well for long-term sustainability of project activities. The PCRV rates overall project achievement *moderately satisfactory* (4), one rating lower than PMD.

### D. Performance of partners

63. **IFAD** has proven to be a responsible partner in the project, though complex design was the one significant weakness. Quality Enhancement recommendations at design were incorporated to sharpen social and self-targeting mechanisms and on improving the credit component. This latter point was never fully resolved, since it depended on using previous project's structures and credit lines to fund PRODEMOR CENTRAL's. IFAD did not look for alternative solutions throughout the project's timespan. Quality enhancement also noted that complexity of project design may affect project management. Other aspects of IFAD's role were positive. Supervision and implementation support missions were undertaken yearly, and the final years of project implementation saw an increase in supervision frequency. MTR was undertaken one year late according to loan agreement requirements, but was timely enough to incorporate considerations of how to integrate funding from the STF loan. IFAD responded well to the Government of El Salvador's requests by incorporating FAP and the STF loan into the project, pursued its own development responsibilities by pushing for an active focus and activities on youth and gender, and was diligent in requesting evaluative reports including baselines and impact surveys for documentation and lesson learning. Regarding the impact surveys, the CPM reviewed and candidly assessed the quality of these. The PCR highlights positive contributions made by IFAD through its supervisory roles, but omits complex design. Based on the above, the PCRV rates performance of IFAD *satisfactory* (5), the same as PMD.
64. **Government** was able to implement the project through three governments with relative smoothness. Financial management was good, with no perceived issues with audits or procurement. While not envisaged at design, subsequent project activities had multiple ministries engage with the project, as well as incorporate FAP policy activities during implementation. In this regard, coordination was considered satisfactory. On the other hand, M&E could have been improved. A baseline was conducted a year into programme implementation, yet MTR found its usefulness limited.<sup>50</sup> According to the October 2014 supervision mission, at the beginning of the project M&E suffered from weak capacity and staff rotation. A formal Information Management System was only set up by the end of 2014, little over a year before project completion. IFAD supervision highlighted some need for PCU capacity building which was not followed. Lack of some staff limited geographical coverage of the gender PCU unit. While supervision did not find issues with the Government of El Salvador contributions (see paragraph 33), the credit line never disbursed due to the participating public bank being involved in a

---

<sup>50</sup> The MTR states that there is no differentiation between beneficiary and non-beneficiary, limiting comparison with future impact studies.



previous IFAD project and needed to be cleared by government before starting another. The PCU did not comprehensively register beneficiary contributions. While Government was able to keep the project running, its performance on several issues limited strategic implementation and learning. More importantly, the low performance of M&E limited assessment of impact. Government's performance is rated *moderately satisfactory* (4), one rating lower than PMD's.

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

### **Scope**

65. The PCR followed the 2006 PCR guidelines since the Spanish language version of the updated 2015 edition was not yet available at the time of PCR writing. The PCR follows the proposed structure for the report and annexes well. Not all suggested analyses (internal rate of return) are included, and why some were not conducted is not explained (ex-ante/ex post was not possible due to quality of the baseline). The report is somewhat vague on whether the ongoing PRODEMOR CENTRAL-Extension is being assessed or not.<sup>51</sup> The PCRV rates PCR scope *moderately satisfactory* (4).

### **Quality**

66. The PCR provides a relatively good timeline of events and a satisfactory outline of most project outputs and outcomes. Yet it has some limitations. Some financial data presented are inconsistent. It does not clarify what certain activities entailed (i.e. affirmative actions) or what organizations were. Outcome level indicators are used to report on impact. The report itself is oftentimes descriptive, with output level results repeated. Overall, the PCR provides an adequate account of the project, but is not analytical enough, with little explanation of how and why results were obtained or not. The PCRV rates PCR quality *moderately satisfactory* (4).

### **Lessons**

67. The PCR identifies lessons at two levels: sector policy and at the implementation levels. Most lessons are derived from project operational experience based on business and value chains, but also include some analyses that go well beyond the experience of the project. Oftentimes there is a missing link between reflection on the project and a subsequent proposal for action, such as in constituting sectoral technical desks and innovation centres. Focus on business and value chains omits reflection on other important aspects of the project – youth and financial markets. Due to the above, the PCRV rates lessons *moderately unsatisfactory* (3).

### **Candour**

68. There are few instances in the PCR where self-criticism comes through (i.e. group sustainability), and data that points at limitations in implementation is reported but not analysed (i.e. factors limiting business ventures). As seen in the rating disconnect between the PCR and this PCRV, the PCR did not take into account limitations (project implementation complexity, non-achievement of some objectives, effectiveness lag to name a few) that impacted the project. This is particularly the case for rural poverty impact, where the CPM questioned the quantitative impact surveys created to establish impact levels. The PCRV rates PCR candour *moderately unsatisfactory* (3).

## **V. Lessons learned**

69. The PCR highlighted the importance of a holistic approach to rural development. PRODEMOR CENTRAL showed that multidimensional, thematic approaches can work to reach out and benefit a broad constituency of the rural poor and marginalised. High outreach in a number of activities (farmer field schools, rural business and microenterprise strengthening) is testament to their popularity.

---

<sup>51</sup> The CPM and the CPMT ratings minute document stated that only PRODEMOR Central is assessed.

However, the PCR's assessment should also be tempered when considering the complex dual approach used required complicated coordination and dialogue with multiple partners and timing.

70. An operational lesson derived from PRODEMOR CENTRAL is the need to realistically assess the consequences of supplementary funding on implementation in terms of administration. As discussed in effectiveness lag (paragraph 34), long ratification processes are a feature of El Salvador's portfolio. MTR and supervision dedicated considerable time to push forward the STF loan, turn the loan into an extended project, and this distracted both the government and IFAD away from other project implementation issues.
71. A strategic lesson is the good example set by PRODEMOR CENTRAL in integrating changing policies into the project (see paragraph 25). Close alignment not only made the project more relevant to government and beneficiaries, but it also brought different ministries into play and integrating them further into long-term national rural and agricultural development processes.

## Definition and rating of the evaluation criteria used by IOE

Criteria	Definition *	Mandatory	To be rated
<b>Rural poverty impact</b>	Impact is defined as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions. <i>Four impact domains</i>	X	Yes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		No
<b>Project performance</b>	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
<b>Other performance criteria</b>			
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	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 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
Criteria	Definition *	Mandatory	To be rated

Annex I

Criteria	Definition *	Mandatory	To be rated
<b>Overall project achievement</b>	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
<b>Performance of partners</b>			
• 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<sup>a</sup>

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Programme Management Department (PMD) rating</i>	<i>IOE Project Completion Report Validation (PCR) rating</i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (PCR-PMD)</i>
<b>Rural poverty impact</b>	5	4	-1
<b>Project performance</b>			
Relevance	5	4	-1
Effectiveness	5	4	-1
Efficiency	5	4	-1
Sustainability of benefits	5	4	-1
<b>Project performance<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Other performance criteria</b>			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	5	5	0
Innovation	5	5	0
Scaling up	5	4	-1
Environment and natural resources management	4	4	0
Adaptation to climate change	4	4	0
<b>Overall project achievement<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Performance of partners<sup>d</sup></b>			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	5	4	-1
<b>Average net disconnect</b>			<b>-0.58</b>

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

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

<sup>c</sup> This is not an average of ratings of individual evaluation criteria but an overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the rating for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of benefits, rural poverty impact, gender, innovation, scaling up, environment and natural resources management, and adaptation to climate change.

<sup>d</sup> The rating for partners' performance is not a component of the overall project achievement rating.

### Ratings of the project completion report quality

	<i>PMD rating</i>	<i>IOE PCR rating</i>	<i>Net disconnect</i>
Candour	n.p.	3	
Lessons	n.p.	3	
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)	n.p.	4	
Scope	n.p.	4	
Overall rating of the project completion report		3	

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.

## Revised logframe results

OBJETIVOS Y RESULTADOS	INDICADORES	NIVEL DE CUMPLIMIENTO A DICIEMBRE 2015		MEDIOS DE VERIFICACION	SUPUESTOS
<b>FINALIDAD</b>					
Contribuir en la reducción de los niveles de pobreza y pobreza extrema entre la población rural en las comunidades y municipios de la Región Central y Paracentral (departamentos de Cabañas, Chalatenango, Cuscatlán, La Paz, La Libertad, San Salvador y San Vicente).	• Porcentaje de hogares que aumentan su índice de propiedad de los bienes del hogar (RIMS 3)	Reducción de pobreza rural de 43.2% a 37.9% y de la pobreza extrema de 15.1% a 10.9%.		Encuesta de Hogares y Propósitos Múltiples, 2010-2014	
	• Porcentaje de reducción de la desnutrición infantil (RIMS 3)	30% reducción en la desnutrición crónica infantil.		Encuesta Nacional de Salud, 2014	
	• Índice de Desarrollo Humano por municipio y departamento	IDHES mejora posición de 0.65 a 0.67		Informe Mundial sobre Desarrollo Humano (PNUD), 2010-2014	
<b>OBJETIVO DE DESARROLLO</b>					
Las personas en condición de pobreza en el área rural en la Región Central y Paracentral construyen su capital humano y social e incrementan su producción, empleo e ingresos; mientras que rehabilitan y administran racionalmente sus recursos naturales, en el contexto de las estructuras consolidadas en el desarrollo rural.	• 33,000 personas beneficiarias directas forman parte de los procesos de desarrollo integral e inversiones (RIMS 1.8.1)	34,435	104%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	La política gubernamental para el desarrollo rural / reducción de la pobreza mantiene su alta prioridad.
	• Al menos 10 % de la población total atendida son jóvenes y 30 % son mujeres.			Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	Disminuyen los niveles de inseguridad y de violencia en los municipios de la Región Central y Paracentral
	3,300 Jóvenes	3,324	101%		
	9,900 Mujeres	17,719	179%		
	• 375 organizaciones y/o grupos de interés rurales fortalecen sus capacidades de organización y autogestión (RIMS 1.6.4)	265	71%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG), Cartas Acuerdo.	
	• 190 empresas/negocios rurales operando al final del proyecto (RIMS 1.8.3 y RIMS 1.8.4)	92	49%	Planes de negocio y Cartas Acuerdo	
	• Incremento de al menos un 15% en los ingresos de las personas participantes	13%	87%	Evaluación de Negocios Rurales	
• El 85% de los productores y productoras agrícolas que recibieron paquetes tecnológicos con asistencia técnica del proyecto aplican y adoptan tecnologías mejoradas de cultivos estacionales/perennes y rentables (RIMS 2.2.2).	73%	85%	Encuesta de adopción tecnológica en iniciativas de SAN.		

OBJETIVOS Y RESULTADOS	INDICADORES	NIVEL DE CUMPLIMIENTO A DICIEMBRE 2015		MEDIOS DE VERIFICACION	SUPUESTOS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• El 65% de los beneficiarios/as agrícolas aplicaron y adoptaron tecnologías de conservación y rehabilitación de recursos naturales</li> </ul>	87%	133%	Encuesta de adopción tecnológica en iniciativas ambientales.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Al cierre del proyecto al menos el 15% de los puestos directivos de las organizaciones atendidas son ocupados por personas jóvenes y/o mujeres (RIMS 1.6.6).</li> </ul>	34%	227%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
<b>Componente 1: Desarrollo del Capital Humano y Social</b>					
<b>Resultado 1.</b>					
Las capacidades de participación, toma de decisiones y de gestión de las comunidades rurales, asociaciones de productores y proveedores de servicios están fortalecidas, desencadenando un proceso de desarrollo integral centrado en la comunidad y la autogestión, dirigido tanto a un desarrollo incluyente como a la modernización rural.	1) 45% de organizaciones apoyadas por el proyecto han sido fortalecidas y han mejorado su categoría en al menos un nivel según metodología PROFOR.	78%	173%	Encuesta de evaluación del PROFOR	Los aliados estratégicos en la zona del área de influencia mantienen el interés en la zona.
	2) Al menos el 80% de las organizaciones que han aplicado la metodología "Cerrando Brechas", han reducido en al menos el 50% las brechas identificadas.	71%	89%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
	3) 76 organizaciones establecen acuerdos o vínculos con otras organizaciones, programas estatales, gobiernos locales, y entidades privadas (RIMS 2.4.1)	46	61%	Base de datos UPSE	
	4) 40 organizaciones productivas / empresas rurales han obtenido su personería jurídica mediante el Proyecto.	42	105%	Credenciales de personería jurídica e informes de consultoría en apoyo.	
	5) Creación de una red de participación ciudadana de jóvenes rurales.	1	100%	Base de datos UPSE de participantes de Red de jóvenes rurales, por departamento	
<b>Productos 1.</b>					
1.1 Promoción y divulgación del proyecto	1.1.1 25 Grupos de interés con potencial identificados y atendidos en etapa de pre-inversión	26	104%	Credenciales de personería jurídica, informes de consultoría en apoyo y Cartas Acuerdo.	
	1.1.2) 120 eventos de promoción (H/M + J) y divulgación realizados	134	112%	Listado de Asistencia de participantes	
1.2. Caracterización y categorización de las organizaciones y grupos	1.2.1) 300 organizaciones caracterizadas y categorizadas (puntaje y categorías)	315	105%	Base de datos UPSES de organizaciones caracterizadas y SIG.	
1.3. Elaboración de Diagnóstico socio-empresarial (DSE) incluyendo metodología "cerrando brechas".	1.3.1) 170 Diagnósticos Socio Empresariales implementados (DSE) con enfoque de género.	140	82%	Diagnóstico Socioempresarial (DSE)	
1.4. Elaborar e implementar un Plan de intervención a organizaciones usuarias y	1.4.1 Un Plan de intervención del Proyecto para el desarrollo humano y social.	1	100%	PROFOR y caja de herramientas para su implementación	

OBJETIVOS Y RESULTADOS	INDICADORES	NIVEL DE CUMPLIMIENTO A DICIEMBRE 2015		MEDIOS DE VERIFICACION	SUPUESTOS
beneficiarios(as) del Proyecto (incluye al menos planes de sensibilización, fortalecimiento, capacitación empresarial y de gestión organizacional, de asistencia técnica y asistencia técnica especializada, educación financiera, educación ambiental)	1.4.2) 120 organizaciones han elaborado instrumentos de planificación para ser fortalecidas organizacional y empresarialmente	164	137%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG), Cartas Acuerdo	
	1.4.3) 112 organizaciones reciben fortalecimiento organizacional y empresarial en el marco de PROFOR con enfoque de género (RIMS 1.6.4)	164	146%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG), Cartas Acuerdo	
	1.4.4) 534 Eventos de sensibilización en género y liderazgo	524	98%	Base de datos UPSES de eventos realizados	
1.5. Realizar Intercambios de experiencias	1.5.1) 33 organizaciones participan en eventos de intercambio de experiencias	164	497%	Informes de consultoría	
1.6. Apoyo a la legalización de los grupos	1.6.1) 42 organización/grupos son apoyados para legalización	48	114%	Base de datos UPSE e informes técnicos consultoría	
1.7. Implementar acciones afirmativas para mujeres y jóvenes	1.7.1) 92 acciones afirmativas son implementadas (M/H+J)	97	105%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
	1.7.2) 1,858 Personas beneficiarias de acciones afirmativas (M/H +J)	2,409	130%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
	315 Hombre adulto	439	139%		
	588 Mujer adulta	887	151%		
	383 Hombre joven	603	157%		
572 Mujer joven	480	84%			
1.8. Elaboración e implementación de un plan de acción para apoyo al plan de desarrollo integral para la juventud rural de El Salvador	1.8.1) 1 plan integral de acción para inclusión la juventud rural de El Salvador elaborado e implementado	1	100%	Plan de Desarrollo Integral 2014-2015 para el Desarrollo de la Juventud Rural Emprendedora de El Salvador	
<b>Componente 2: Producción Sustentable y Rehabilitación y Manejo de los Recursos Naturales</b>					
<b>Resultado 2.</b>					
La capacidad de producción sostenible y competitiva de las asociaciones de desarrollo comunal (ADESCOS), las unidades familiares de producción y de las organizaciones de productores y productoras están efectivamente apoyadas y fortalecidas en el manejo sustentable y sostenible de los recursos naturales.	1) 10,159 beneficiarios(as) diversifican su producción familiar y adoptan nuevos cultivos o paquetes tecnológicos (RIMS 2.2.2) con asistencia técnica	20,816	205%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG) en base a Planes de Finca-hogar por persona atendida	
	2) 13,864 beneficiarios(as) rurales mejoran sus condiciones de hogar y disminuyen la carga de trabajo doméstico	12,360	89%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG) en base a las Actas de entrega de Incentivos	
	3) 30% de mujeres beneficiarias de proyectos de manejo sostenible de los recursos naturales que disminuyen la carga doméstica de las mujeres	47%	157%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG) en base a las Actas de entrega de Incentivos	
	4) 10% de las organizaciones (ADESCOS, organización enlace, pre-existentes o creadas) gradúan a actividades de negocios o microempresas.	5%	53%	Planes de Negocio y Carta Acuerdo	



OBJETIVOS Y RESULTADOS	INDICADORES	NIVEL DE CUMPLIMIENTO A DICIEMBRE 2015		MEDIOS DE VERIFICACION	SUPUESTOS
	5) 2,008 hectáreas de tierra recuperadas a través de la rehabilitación y conservación de suelo y agua (RIMS 2.1.5)	578	29%	Base de Datos UPSE en base a informes técnicos	
<b>Productos 2</b>					
2.1. Formulación de planes de finca hogar	2.1.1) 11,856 Personas responsable de familia formulan planes de finca/hogar	11,328	96%	Planes de Finca-hogar por persona atendida, Base de Datos SIG	
2.2. Desarrollo de Asistencia técnica por Escuela de Campo (ECAS)	2.2.1) 38 Organizaciones beneficiadas por el PAF-SAN reciben asistencia técnica.	38	100%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG) y Cartas Acuerdo	
	2.2.2) 39 Escuelas de Campo implementadas (ECAS)	39	100%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG), Cartas Acuerdo	
	2.2.3) 624 Personas dentro de las familias demostradoras responsables de las Escuelas de Campo (RIMS 1.2.5)	653	105%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
2.3. Desarrollo de Asistencia técnica especializada	2.3.1) 1,550 personas reciben asistencia técnica especializada (total y por tipo) (M/H + J) (RIMS 1.2.2) 1.2.3, 1.2.4.)	1,500	97%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
	1,264 Hombre adulto	1,224	97%		
	228 Mujer adulta	223	98%		
	43 Hombre joven	38	88%		
	15 Mujer joven	15	100%		
	2.3.2) 11,856 personas que han formulado planes de finca, que han recibido asistencia técnica especializada (total y por tipo) (RIMS 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4.)	20,816	176%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
2.4. Entrega de los incentivos	2.4.1) 14,919 incentivos distribuidos (por tipo de incentivo)	16,569	111%	Acta de entrega de Incentivos  Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
	928 Bomba de mochila	570	61%		
	664 Filtro purificador	788	119%		
	535 Estufa mejorada	784	147%		
	1,723 Huerto familiar	1,837	107%		
	216 Sistema de micro riego por goteo	204	94%		
	693 Parcela de hortalizas	2,819	407%		
	23 Plantinero artesanal	337	1465%		
	52 Campaña de vacunación	1,702	3273%		
	1,151 Módulo de aves	1,982	172%		
	8,661 Frutales (No. Árboles)	5,168	60%		
	38 Sistemas de aguas grises	51	134%		
	77 Talleres hogareños	31	40%		
	158 Espacio doméstico	296	187%		
	2.4.2) 10,587 personas han recibido al menos un incentivo (incentivos productivos, del hogar y	11,328	107%	Acta de entrega de Incentivos Base de Datos del Sistema de Información	

OBJETIVOS Y RESULTADOS	INDICADORES	NIVEL DE CUMPLIMIENTO A DICIEMBRE 2015		MEDIOS DE VERIFICACION	SUPUESTOS
	ambientales) (RIMS 1.2.6)			Gerencial (SIG)	
2.5. Elaboración de perfiles de proyectos de seguridad alimentaria	2.5.1) 75 perfiles de iniciativas productivas para el desarrollo de emprendimientos en organizaciones de seguridad alimentaria	2	3%	Perfil de iniciativas productivas, Planes de Negocio, cartas Acuerdo	
<b>Componente 2: Producción Sustentable y Rehabilitación y Manejo de los Recursos Naturales</b>					
<b>Resultado 3.</b>					
Las poblaciones rurales beneficiarias mejoran la producción sostenible y hacen uso de tecnologías para la rehabilitación de recursos naturales, contribuyendo a revertir la deforestación, la erosión del suelo y la degradación general de los recursos naturales en las parcelas, los niveles de micro-cuencas y municipal.	1) 10,698 beneficiarios(as) y 46 técnicos(as) capacitados en el manejo de recursos naturales (RIMS 1.1.9)	11,374	106%	Informes de consultorías	Prolongadas condiciones climáticas adversas, la lluvia, es decir, irregular y / o pesados o estación seca extendida no perjudican ampliamente los resultados del proyecto
	2) 992 hectáreas de tierra recuperadas a través de la rehabilitación y conservación de suelo y agua (RIMS 2.1.5)	589	59%	Base de Datos UPSE en base a informes técnicos	
	3) Un proyecto piloto de consorcio entre municipios para atender a tema(s) ambiental(es)	0	0%		
	4) 30% de mujeres beneficiarias de proyectos ambientales de obras de conservación y prevención que disminuyen la carga doméstica	41%	137%	Acta de entrega de Incentivos Ambientales Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
	5) 34 escuelas de preescolar y primaria implementan un programa piloto de educación ambiental	32	94%	Base de beneficiarios de Centros Escolares, Informes de Técnicos	
<b>Productos 3</b>					
3.1. Implementación del Plan de Capacitación para municipios	3.1.1) 46 técnicos(as) de las Unidades ambientales de las alcaldías municipales capacitados.	46	100%	Listado de participantes	
3.2. Implementación del Plan de Manejo sostenible de los recursos naturales	3.2.1) 6,100 personas beneficiadas con incentivos para manejo sostenible de recursos naturales	782	13%	Actas de entrega de incentivos Base de datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
	3.2.2) 656 hectáreas con manejo sostenible de los recursos naturales	616	94%	Base de Datos UPSE en base a informes técnicos	
3.3. Realización de obras de conservación de recursos naturales relacionadas con la gestión de proyectos como son: reforestación, construcción de terrazas, viveros forestales, control de inundaciones	3.3.1) 22 proyectos con obras de conservación (RIMS 1.1.10)	22	100%	Cartas Acuerdo	
	3.3.2) 280 hectáreas con obras de conservación (RIMS 1.1.5)	87	31%	Base de Datos UPSE en base a informes técnicos	
	3.3.3) 400 personas beneficiadas con proyectos de conservación y capacitadas	110	28%	Base de Datos UPSE en base a informes técnicos	
3.4. Realización de obras de prevención /mitigación de riesgos de desastres naturales a microcuencas	3.4.1) 2 proyectos con obras de prevención/mitigación de desastres naturales (RIMS1.1.10)	0	0%		
	3.4.2) 56 hectáreas con obras de prevención	0	0%		

OBJETIVOS Y RESULTADOS	INDICADORES	NIVEL DE CUMPLIMIENTO A DICIEMBRE 2015		MEDIOS DE VERIFICACION	SUPUESTOS
	3.4.3) 160 personas de distintas familias beneficiadas directas con proyectos de prevención/mitigación capacitadas	0	0%		
3.5. Desarrollar un Programa de Educación ambiental para niñez y juventud en las escuelas locales	3.5.1) 34 escuelas locales atendidas con un Programa de Educación ambiental para la niñez y juventud	32	94%	Base de Datos UPSE de Centros Escolares Beneficiarios del Programa de Educación Ambiental	
	3.5.2) 1,020 niños/niñas beneficiario(as) del Programa de Educación Ambiental	993	97%	Base de datos UPSE de listado de niños participantes del Programa de Educación Ambiental	
3.6. Diseño e implementación de propuesta de proyecto piloto de consorcio entre municipios para atender a tema(s) ambiental(es).	3.6.1) 1 Proyecto piloto de consorcio entre municipios para atender a tema(s) ambiental(es) diseñado y ejecutado.	0	0%		
<b>Componente 3: Desarrollo de Negocios y Microempresas Rurales</b>					
<b>Resultado 4:</b>					
Personas beneficiarias de forma organizada desarrollan y fortalecen su capacidad empresarial, estableciendo y modernizando empresas competitivas y microempresas rurales (agrícolas y de otro tipo) para los mercados locales y externos, desde una perspectiva de cadena de valor.	1) Al menos 75% de los negocios rurales y de las microempresas aumentan su valor agregado en 10% (rendimiento o transformación de los productos) (RIMS 2.2.2)	76%	101%	Evaluación de Negocios y Microempresas rurales	Se desarrollan ventajas comparativas para que los productos a nivel local, nacional e internacional tengan demanda.
	2) Al menos 75% de los proyectos productivos mejoran su inclusión al mercado y la comercialización de sus productos (RIMS 2.4.1)	76%	101%	Evaluación de Negocios y Microempresas rurales	
	3) 126 microempresas rurales y negocios rurales (agrícolas y no agrícolas) creadas y operando a través de planes de negocio, y beneficiando directamente al menos a 30% de mujeres y 10% jóvenes.	109	87%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	Mejoran o se mantienen las condiciones del entorno de negocios rural
	30% de mujeres	39%	129%		
	10% de Jóvenes	4%	40%		
	4) 48 empresas rurales creadas por mujeres y jóvenes rurales, consolidadas	21	44%	Base de Datos SIG, Cartas Acuerdo	
	5) 100 emprendimientos informales son apoyados por un mecanismo innovador de inversión	0	0%		
	6) 77% Planes de Negocios incorporan acciones de conservación y mitigación de riesgos en suelos.	75%	97%	Planes de Negocio	
7) 117 organizaciones generaron utilidades de la actividad productiva / negocio / microempresa cofinanciada.	75	64%	Evaluación de Negocios y Microempresas rurales		
<b>Productos 4.</b>					
4.1. Elaboración e implementación de planes de negocios mediante asignación	4.1.1) 100 proyectos de negocios/productivos rurales implementados (RIMS 1.8.3)	82	82%	Cartas Acuerdo, Planes de Negocio, Base de Datos SIG	

OBJETIVOS Y RESULTADOS	INDICADORES	NIVEL DE CUMPLIMIENTO A DICIEMBRE 2015		MEDIOS DE VERIFICACION	SUPUESTOS
de fondos concursales	4.1.2) 6,640 miembros de las organizaciones con negocios /productivos rurales (M/H +J) (RIMS 1.8.1)	6,509	98%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
	2,996 Hombre adulto	3,968	132%		
	1,794 Mujer adulta	2,541	142%		
	322 Hombre joven	126	39%		
	188 Mujer joven	124	66%		
	4.1.3) 90 proyectos de microempresas (RIMS 1.8.3) implementados	32	36%	Cartas Acuerdo, Planes de Negocio, Base de Datos SIG	
	4.1.4) 1,800 miembros de las organizaciones con microempresas (M/H +J) (RIMS 1.8.1)	1,102	61%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
	1,134 Hombre adulto	364	32%		
	486 Mujer adulta	738	152%		
	126 Hombre joven	33	26%		
	54 Mujer joven	88	163%		
4.2. Desarrollo de Asistencia técnica especializada	4.2.1) 1,200 personas con asistencia técnica especializada (por tipo de asistencia: producción, acopio, transformación y comercialización) (RIMS 1.2.2, y 1.2.3)	1,538	128%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	
4.3. Creación e implementación de un mecanismo innovador de inversión para negocios informales	4.3.1) 1 Mecanismo innovador de inversión para negocios informales creado e implementado.	0	0%		
4.4. Incorporar en el diseño y ejecución de planes de negocios de empresas y microempresas acciones de conservación y/o de mitigación de riesgos en suelos y agua.	4.4.1) 56 planes de negocios implementados incorporan acciones de conservación y/o mitigación de riesgos en suelos y agua proporcionada por año.	49	88%	Evaluación de Negocios y Microempresas rurales	
<b>Componente 4: Servicios Financieros Rurales</b>					
<b>Resultado 5.</b>					
Personas beneficiarias del proyecto con acceso a crédito y a servicios financieros, facilitan la producción, transformación, comercialización y exportación.	1) 5 Micro financieras en la zona del Proyecto prestan mejores servicios a los pobres rurales (RIMS 2.3.3)	0	0%		Existen en el área del proyecto entidades financieras rurales, comprometida con el desarrollo de la población rural en condición de pobreza.
	2) 1,250 personas beneficiarias están en condiciones para acceder crédito al finalizar el proyecto, de los cuales al menos el 45% son mujeres, y el 10% son jóvenes(RIMS 2.3.2)	105	8%	Informes técnicos y reportes del BFA	Se mantienen condiciones aceptables para los usuarios de los servicios financieros rurales, en especial crédito, sin distorsiones relevantes de parte de grandes competidores.
	3) 20 negocios rurales y microempresas acceden a crédito. (RISM 2.3.1)	2	10%	Reporte del BFA	
	4) 1,250 personas ahorradoras activas al finalizar el proyecto (al menos 30% mujeres) (RIMS1.3.6 ahorradores voluntarios.	920 (95% mujeres)	74%	Base de Datos del Sistema de Información Gerencial (SIG)	

OBJETIVOS Y RESULTADOS	INDICADORES	NIVEL DE CUMPLIMIENTO A DICIEMBRE 2015		MEDIOS DE VERIFICACION	SUPUESTOS
<b>Productos 5</b>					
5.1. Realizar cursos de educación financiera	5.1.1) 50 organizaciones, grupos de interés y comunidades rurales reciben educación financiera	35	70%	Informes de técnicos	
	5.1.2) 609 personas que reciben educación financiera (M/H +J) (RIMS 1.3.2.)	336	55%	Listados de Asistencia Informes de técnicos	
	245 Hombre adulto	50	20%		
	192 Mujer adulta	286	149%		
	90 Hombre joven	0	0%		
	82 Mujer joven	0	0%		
5.2 Formación de grupos solidarios	5.2.1) 100 grupos solidarios creados (RIMS 1.3.1)	56	56%	Base de Datos SIG	
5.3 Identificar las micro financieras que operan en la zona del Proyecto.	5.3.1) Se capacitan al menos 5 micro financieras en la zona del Proyecto	1	20%	Informe de consultoría	
<b>Componente 5: Coordinación de proyectos y fortalecimiento institucional para el desarrollo rural</b>					
<b>Resultado 6.</b>					
Las capacidades de coordinación técnica, operativa e inter-institucional de la Oficina de Coordinación de Proyectos (OCP) y del Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería (MAG), se fortalecen y se consolidan, en la etapa inicial de su transformación y modernización.	1) MAG consolida su Oficina de Coordinación de Proyectos (OCP), con capacidad de coordinación y seguimiento de las estrategias de desarrollo rural integral, políticas y proyectos	100%	100%	Acuerdo Ejecutivo	MAG implementa cambios organizativos para adaptarse a nuevas políticas de Gobierno
	2) Una Dirección General de Desarrollo Rural desarrollo creada.	1	100%	Acuerdo Ejecutivo de creación	
	3) Un plan de agricultura familiar implementado	1	100%	Informes de Ejecución PAF	
<b>Productos 6</b>					
6.1. Implementación del Plan de capacitación del MAG	6.1.1. El MAG cuenta con un plan de sensibilización y capacitación para técnicos y personal clave.	0	0%		
	6.1.2) Se sensibilizan y capacitan 90 técnicos(as) y personal de gestión en temas claves relacionados con el desarrollo rural (a partir de los proyectos financiados por el FIDA y otros).	0	0%		
6.2. Contratación de consultorías externas especializadas	6.2.1) Se sensibilizan y capacitan a # funcionarios públicos del MAG en temas claves de desarrollo rural y política pública (RIMS 1.6.1)	0	0%		
	6.2.2) La Dirección General de Desarrollo Rural cuenta con al menos una asesoría especializada en diálogo de políticas públicas, género y juventud	1	100%	Informe de consultoría	
6.3. Construcción y rehabilitación de infraestructura del MAG.	6.3.1) El MAG cuenta con un Centro de Desarrollo para la Agricultura Familiar (CEDAF) y oficinas de la Dirección General de Desarrollo Rural (DGDR), rehabilitados y equipados	2	100%	Informe de Obras realizadas	

OBJETIVOS Y RESULTADOS	INDICADORES	NIVEL DE CUMPLIMIENTO A DICIEMBRE 2015		MEDIOS DE VERIFICACION	SUPUESTOS
	6.3.2) El MAG cuenta con al menos una Ventanilla Ciudadana para los beneficiarios de programas relacionados con agricultura familiar	1	100%	Informes de consultoría	
6.4. Adquisición de equipo de instalaciones del MAG través de apoyo técnico y financiero para la implementación de un plan de agricultura familiar	6.4.1) El MAG cuenta con Equipamiento para empadronamiento de beneficiarios del PAF	1	100%	Órdenes de compra	

## **Acronyms**

CPM	Country Programme Manager
FAP	Family Agriculture Plan
FAP-FNS	Family Agriculture Plan – Food and Nutrition Security
FAP-PC	Family Agriculture Plan – Production Chains
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MTR	Mid-Term Review
OSP	Organizational Strengthening Programme
PCR	Project Completion Report
PCRv	Project Completion Report Validation
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PMD	Programme Management Department
RIMS	Results and Impact Management System
STF	Spanish Trust Fund

## Bibliography

- Government of El Salvador. 2015. Encuesta de Hogares de Propósitos Múltiples 2014. Gobierno de El Salvador, Ministerio de Economía, Dirección General de Estadística y Censos. 2015.
- IFAD-ProGénero-CODERSA. 2003. Manual Cerrando Brechas. Guatemala 2003.
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2007. Appraisal Report. 2 July 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. PRODEMOR CENTRAL President's Report. 7 August 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Loan Agreement. 10 September 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. PRODEMOR CENTRAL President's Report Addendum. 12 September 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Supervision Mission – Aide Memoire. March 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Supervision Mission – Aide Memoire. November 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Supervision Mission – Aide Memoire. April 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Supervision Mission – Aide Memoire. November 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2013. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Supervision Mission – Aide Memoire. June 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Mid-Term Review. February 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Supervision Mission – Aide Memoire. May 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Supervision Mission Report. October 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2015. PRODEMOR CENTRAL Supervision Mission Report. May 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016. PRODEMOR CENTRAL – Revisión de estudios evaluativos y sistematizaciones. 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016. PRODEMOR CENTRAL – Project Completion Report. June 2016.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2017. FlexCube
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2017. GRIPS
- World Bank. 2017. The World Bank – Data. 2017. Accessed 4 December 2017. <https://data.worldbank.org/country/el-salvador?view=chart>