

Project Completion Report Validation

Coastal Community Development Project

Republic of Indonesia

Date of validation by IOE: March 2019

I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m) ***		Actual (US\$ m) ***	
Region	Asia and the Pacific	Total project costs	43.200		44.879	
Country	Republic of Indonesia	IFAD loan and percentage of total	24.200	56.0%	24.365	54.3%
IFAD loan number	I-880-ID	IFAD grant	2.000	4.6%	2.253	5.0%
Spanish Trust Fund loan number	E-16-ID					
IFAD grant number	I-C-1392-ID					
Type of project (subsector)	Natural Resource Management	Spanish Trust Fund* loan	7.800	18.0%	8.975	20.0%
Financing type	Loans and grant	Borrower (Indonesian Government)	7.090	16.4%	7.046	15.7%
Lending terms (IFAD loan)	IFAD loan on ordinary terms**	N/A				
Date of approval	21/09/2012	N/A				
Date of loan signature	23/10/2012	Beneficiaries	2.152	5.0%	2.240	5.0%
Date of effectiveness	23/10/2012	Other sources (N/A)				
Loan amendments	N/A	Number of beneficiaries	Direct: 19 800 households. Indirect: 50 000 households.		Direct: 18 925 households; 75 700 individuals. Indirect: 427 800 individuals.	
Loan closure extensions	N/A	Project completion date	31/12/2017		31/12/2017	
Country programme managers	Ronald Hartman	Financing closing date	30/06/2018		30/06/2018	
Regional director(s)	Nigel Brett (current) Hoonae Kim	Mid-term review	14/09/2015			
Project completion report reviewer	Nuri Niyazi	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)	100.7%***			
PCRV quality control panel	Ernst Schaltegger Fumiko Nakai	Date of the project completion report	26/06/2018			

Sources: Design Completion Report (2012), President's Report (2012), Project Completion Report (2018).

* Spanish Food Security Cofinancing Facility Trust Fund.

** Ordinary loan terms: interest is borne on the principal amount outstanding at the IFAD reference interest rate as determined semi-annually by the Executive Board. Ordinary loans have a maturity period of 15 to 18 years including a grace period of three. The Government of Indonesia requested an extension of the grace period from three to five years, consistent with the length of the project implementation period.

*** The higher actual amounts and loan disbursement rates can be assumed to have resulted from favourable exchange rates.

II. Project outline

1. **Introduction.** A loan for the Coastal Community Development Project (CCDP) in Indonesia was approved by the IFAD Executive Board on 21 September 2012 and became effective on 23 October 2012, with an expected duration of five years. The project was completed on 31 December 2017 and the loan was closed on 30 June 2018 as scheduled.
2. **Project area.** The project concentrated on 12 coastal districts across nine provinces, with diverse natural resource settings and resource bases and a range of socio-cultural characteristics. Common features of the project target areas and communities selected were the dependence on marine resources (generally degraded but with good potential), high levels of poverty and the need and potential for better access to markets.
3. **Project context.** At the time of project design (2010-2011), Indonesia had weathered the financial crisis of 2008 and had a well-performing economy, while substantial challenges in reducing poverty remained, especially in the eastern parts of the country and in coastal and small-island communities. The prevalent conditions among target communities at the time of project design included that these: (i) were generally, often among the poorest communities in the country, and in many cases food-insecure; (ii) showed potential for economic opportunities, particularly for a range of high-value marine products with a strong market demand; (iii) faced high levels of marine and coastal resource degradation; and (iv) were characterised by gender inequality in terms of women's social status and involvement in economic activities.
4. **Project goal, objectives and components.** The goal of CCDP was to reduce poverty and enhance economic growth among the active poor in coastal and small-island communities. This was to be achieved through the project's development objective of increasing household incomes for families involved in fisheries and marine activities. The intended outcomes were: (i) for target communities to implement profitable and sustainable marine-based economic activities without any detrimental impact on marine resources; (ii) to expand economic opportunities in project districts for sustainable, market-based small-scale fisheries and marine operations; and (iii) to manage the project efficiently and transparently for the benefit of the target households and communities.
5. The project had three main components: **Component 1 – Empowerment, development and resource management (US\$27.554 million, 63.7 per cent of total project cost):** this component focused on the establishment of marine-based economic activities in the target communities, driven by participatory processes and village determination of priorities for the project's support of village-based infrastructure, coastal resource management and enterprise groups. **Component 2 – District support for marine-based economic development (US\$7.942 million, 18.4 per cent of total project cost):** this component was to strengthen technical and institutional capacities, as well as infrastructure, at district-level, with the overarching aim of improving the functioning of and access to markets and value chains. **Component 3 – Project management (US\$7.746 million, 17.9 per cent of total project cost):** this component focused on the delivery of project management services and building the capacity required to scale up project activities.
6. **Target group.** The CCDP's target communities were located in coastal areas of eastern Indonesia, which are less affluent and developed than other regions of the country. The district selection criteria included the number of poor coastal communities and their potential for increasing incomes from fishing and marine operations. This was coupled with the selection of districts with a variety of geographic and socio-cultural contexts, so as to allow for generating lessons for the replication of the development models that were being tested. In each district,

around 15 villages were selected, with a projected total of 180 target villages. The household targeting strategy was designed to include five sub-groups of households within project-supported villages with variable levels of labour availability and assets that enabled access to marketable marine resources. With regard to CCDP beneficiary target numbers, 19,800 households were to be targeted as direct beneficiaries and an additional 50,000 households as indirect beneficiaries, totalling 320,000 direct and indirect individual beneficiaries. CCDP also had specific gender targets, aiming for: (i) 30 per cent of project participants at all levels to be women; (ii) at least two enterprise groups in each village to be comprised predominately of women; (iii) women to be involved in the management of the groups.

7. **Financing.** Total project cost was US\$44.879 million, constituting 103.9 per cent of the total project budget. IFAD fund disbursements were as follows: US\$24.365 million (54.3 per cent of the actual total cost) as IFAD loan, \$8.975 (20.0 per cent of total) as Spanish Trust Fund¹ loan and \$2.253 as IFAD grant (5.0 per cent of total). Financier contributions are shown in Table 1 and planned (approved) *versus* actual (disbursed) costs per component with disbursement rates in Table 2.

Table 1
Project costs (in US\$ million)

	<i>Approval (1)</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Actual (2)</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Disbursement rate (2/1)</i>
IFAD loan	24.200	56.0%	24.365	54.3%	100.7%
IFAD grant	2.000	4.6%	2.253	5.0%	112.7%
Spanish Trust Fund ^{**} loan	7.800	18.0%	8.975	20.0%	115.1%
Government	7.090	16.4%	7.046	15.7%	99.4%
Beneficiaries	2.152	5.0%	2.240	5.0%	104.1%
Total	43.200		44.879		103.9%

Sources: Design Completion Report (2012), Project Completion Report (2018).

^{*} The higher actual amounts and disbursement rates can be assumed to have resulted from favourable exchange rates.

^{**} Spanish Food Security Cofinancing Facility Trust Fund.

Table 2
Component costs (in US\$ million)

	<i>Approval (1)</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Actual (2)</i> [*]	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Disbursement rate (2/1)</i> [*]
Component 1	27.554	63.7%	28.365	63.2%	102.9%
Component 2	7.942	18.4%	8.768	19.5%	110.4%
Component 3	7.746	17.9%	7.746	17.3%	100.0%
Total	43.241		44.879		103.8%

Sources: Design Completion Report (2012), Project Completion Report (2018).

^{*} The higher actual amounts and disbursement rates can be assumed to have resulted from favourable exchange rates.

8. **Implementation arrangements.** The Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF) was the lead implementing agency for the project, through its General Directorate of Marine, Coasts and Small Islands, followed by the General

¹ Spanish Food Security Cofinancing Facility Trust Fund.

Directorate of Marine Spatial Management after a re-structuring of the Ministry in 2016. The Project Management Office (PMO) was responsible for guiding the overall project implementation and providing management support. A Project Steering Committee provided project oversight and coordination. Twelve Project Implementation Units (PIU) in each of the 12 project districts were responsible for implementation activities at the district and village levels, and one additional PIU (in Badung, Bali) concentrated solely on knowledge management and human resource development. For all PIUs, District Oversight Boards were established to provide additional oversight of district and village-level activities.

9. **Changes and developments during implementation.** Several adjustments were made during implementation to the project design and implementation modalities, including: (i) the mainstreaming of savings components in all enterprise groups; (ii) an improved knowledge management programme; (iii) inclusion of activities related to integrated coastal management (ICM) at village and district levels; (iv) inclusion of ecotourism development; and (v) engagement of private-sector partners to strengthen market linkages.
10. **Intervention logic.** Although no specific theory of change was articulated in the design report to link the expected outcomes from CCDP's activities to its development objective, as noted in the PCR, the project's interventions were based on poverty analysis in coastal communities in Eastern Indonesia. As such, members of fishing communities were found to be generally resource-poor, highly dependent on an eroding base of natural resources, vulnerable to extreme climatic events and with incomes from small-scale inshore fishing insufficient to meet basic subsistence needs. In response to these issues and needs, CCDP's approach was described to be based on four main elements: community empowerment, a market focus, targeting for poverty, and replication and scaling up. CCDP's overall objective was to increase incomes by creating sustainable economic opportunities at village level and strengthening integration of the village enterprise groups in the broader value chain, with the two technical components being highly complementary.
11. The goal of CCDP was to reduce rural poverty and enhance economic growth among the active poor in coastal and small-island communities by increasing household incomes for families involved in fisheries and marine activities. Poverty reduction and economic growth were to be measured using the indicators of decreased acute and chronic child malnutrition and an increase in households with improved asset ownership. The project goal and development objective were to be reached through the specific objectives of: (i) establishing profitable and sustainable marine-based economic activities; (ii) expanding economic opportunities for market-based small-scale fisheries and marine operations; and (iii) efficient and transparent project management. These objectives were to be engendered by the specific outputs of the three project components. Under Component 1 community-based marine resource management areas were to be managed effectively and marine-based economic activities were to be supported by construction of community infrastructure and the creation of sustainable community enterprises. Component 2 was to strengthen district-level services and infrastructure to ensure the linking of high-potential products from marine activities with markets and value chains. Component 3 sought to provide efficient and transparent project management, as well as build capacity for scaling-up of project activities.
12. **Delivery of outputs.** A detailed table summarising CCDP's output delivery by component is presented in Annex III. The outputs enumerated in the PCR were achieved to completion rates averaging 123.9 per cent, with 11 of the 13 outputs completed to 100 per cent, or more, of their respective appraisal targets. Only for two outputs under Component 1, namely community-based marine resource management areas and enterprise groups, achievements were below expected

levels, amounting to 50 and 89 per cent of appraisal targets, respectively. At the same time, the two outputs achieving the highest delivery rates (193 and 200 per cent, respectively) were also implemented under Component 1, these being village-level ICM plans and female-headed households contributing to the formulation of development priorities.

III. Review of findings

A. Core criteria

Relevance

13. **Relevance of objectives.** The goal and objectives of CCDP, with its focus on income generation, market linkages, village-level group formation, poverty alleviation, food security and natural resource conservation in eastern Indonesia, were aligned with the development objectives of the Government of Indonesia. The latter's policies, priorities and strategies for coastal community development, poverty alleviation and resource conservation are outlined in the following documents: (i) MMAF's Strategic Plan for 2010–2014, as well as the subsequent one for 2015–2019, which articulated four policy themes, namely 'pro-poor, pro-job, pro-growth and pro-sustainability' development; (ii) MMAF's "*Susinisasi* Program", which directed 80 per cent of the Ministry's financial resources towards community development; and (iii) the Government's policy of promoting equity between regions by prioritizing development efforts in eastern Indonesia, in view of high levels of poverty and food insecurity in that region.
14. Relevance of the project objectives vis-à-vis IFAD's strategies and policies was ensured by its alignment with IFAD's Country Strategic Opportunities Programme, with specific reference to: (i) assisting small-scale producers to participate in remunerative markets; (ii) enhancing risk resilience of small-scale producers and their families; and (iii) increasing the responsiveness of rural institutions to small-scale producer needs.
15. **Adequacy of project design.** The Project Completion Report (PCR) states that the design was highly relevant to the needs of the specific target groups. The project's 2013 baseline survey and 2014 annual outcome survey (AOS) provided strong evidence at the start of the project of a low prevailing asset base, acute and chronic malnutrition rates in children, food insecurity and limited livelihood opportunities in project areas – all of these constituting characteristics that the design intended the project to address. The PCR showcased that, at a workshop conducted by CCDP in September 2017, beneficiary participants confirmed their top development priorities to notably include increased income for their families and natural resource sustainability. Further strong evidence of the project's relevance to beneficiary needs were cited by the PCR to be the results of the 2017 AOS, which found that nearly all beneficiaries rated CCDP as satisfactorily addressing their priorities and needs. Lastly, the PCR considered that qualitative confirmation of the consistency between project design and beneficiary needs was obtained by way of discussions with beneficiaries during the project completion mission, through observations in project areas, as well as relevant assessments made in project supervision and mid-term review mission reports.
16. **Project adjustments during implementation.** Several adjustments were made during implementation to the project design in an effort to ensure continued high levels of relevance of project interventions. Firstly, the approach to savings groups at the village level was adjusted to encourage all enterprise groups to integrate a savings component into their activities, rather than to continue to form dedicated savings groups as per the initial project design. This change responded to the need to support and provide for the sustainability of all enterprise groups established by CCDP and took into account the feedback received from communities at the start of project implementation that dedicated savings groups were not strongly supported at community level. Secondly, the inclusion of activities related to ICM at village

and district levels responded in a timely manner to an increased government policy emphasis on ICM. Thirdly, in like manner, the addition of ecotourism development to the project's intervention portfolio reflected the government's sharpening focus on eco-tourism over the course of the project, realizing the emerging potential for eco-tourism development to simultaneously support income generation, increased environmental awareness, village-based ICM and environmental resource-base enhancements.

17. CCDP's goals and objectives were well-aligned with government and IFAD and development objectives, and several appropriate design adjustments were made during implementation, so as to accommodate additional emerging government priorities for rural and coastal development, thus ensuring continued high levels of relevance of project interventions. *This PCRV therefore rates the relevance of CCDP as satisfactory (rating 5)*, in agreement with the rating provided by the Programme Management Department (PMD).

Effectiveness

18. The total number of beneficiary households reported in the PCR to have been reached during CCDP implementation and participating in enterprise groups under the project was 18,925, translating to around 75,700 individual beneficiaries (based on the national average household size of four members). The number of indirect beneficiaries was estimated at 427,800 individuals, bringing the total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries to 503,500 and translating to achievement rates of 96 per cent for direct beneficiary numbers and of 157 per cent for total beneficiaries.
19. As indicated in the above section titled "Delivery of outputs", physical outputs and indicator targets across all three project components were delivered or met with high completion rates in almost all cases, many targets having been exceeded by considerable margins by the time of project completion.
20. **Objective 1: Establishing profitable and environmentally sustainable marine-based economic activities.** With regard to an assessment of the degree of achievement of the project objective of establishing profitable and sustainable marine-based economic activities, the following were deemed key outputs subservient to this objective: (i) 20 community-based marine resource management areas were demarcated, declared and ratified (against a target of 40 such areas); (ii) village-based ICM plans were put in place in 174 villages, constituting 96 per cent of all project villages (against an appraisal target of 50 per cent); (iii) 180 community-based coastal resource management groups were formed (target not stated); and (iv) 1,609 community enterprise groups were created under the project (vis-à-vis a target of 1,800²).³
21. As per the CCDP's logical framework, successful achievement of Objective 1 was to be indicated by: (i) 60 per cent of project-funded enterprise groups operating profitably by project-end (as verified by an independent assessment of enterprise performance); and (ii) the maintenance or improvement of the health of marine resources in 80 per cent of areas managed by the project and adjacent villages (as verified by community perception-based resource inventory and assessment). Household-level economic impacts from CCDP implementation described in the PCR are discussed in the below section titled "Rural poverty impacts"; these include job creation, increased incomes and assets and an upliftment of the economic status

² The shortfall was explained in the PCR to have occurred as a result of a ministerial decision taken towards the end of project implementation to limit funding for certain project activities.

³ Other output achievements indicated in the PCR narrative for Component 1 were as follows: 181 village working groups, 181 infrastructure groups and 20 savings groups were formed, and 181 village information centres and 570 other village infrastructure units of various types were provided (with over 90 per cent of community infrastructure being operated and maintained at project completion, exceeding the target of 66 per cent).

within the target population, partly as a result of marine-based enterprise development activities.

22. The performance of enterprise groups, on the other hand, was only evidenced by self-reporting on the part of individual beneficiaries that responded to the 2017 AOS, whereby 170 of 180⁴ respondents stated that their enterprises were operating and profitable. While to a certain extent it might be inferred from these results that the enterprise groups established under the project would indeed have been profitable, this cannot be immediately confirmed by the AOS findings, also due to some methodological limitations (see below section "Rural poverty impact"). An independent assessment of enterprise performance, as provided for in the logical framework, was not undertaken. By the same token, the second indicator of the health status of marine resources in project areas was not reported on and could thus not be assessed; the PCR does not refer to any community perception-based resource inventory and assessment, as intended in the logical framework as a means of verification.
23. **Objective 2: Expansion of economic opportunities for sustainable, market-based, small-scale fisheries and marine operations.** Attainment of the second project objective of district-level expansion of economic opportunities for marine operations was to be indicated by a 10-per-cent increase in net returns from small-scale fisheries and marine-based activities, in terms of fisheries products sold by project districts on local, national and export markets. This indicator was to be verified by an impact survey on small-scale fishing landings and net returns, financial records from larger fishing vessels and project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) records.
24. The effectiveness evidence provided in the PCR for Component 2 comprised the numbers of: operational infrastructure investments financed at district-level by CCDP; marketing agreements signed between community groups and buyers; informal sales agreements brokered; infrastructure business plans developed; food safety and *halal* certificates issued; processing and marketing groups formed; and third-party buyers purchasing enterprise-group products.⁵
25. As with Objective 1, while the results presented for the second objective of economic opportunity enhancement were positive at the output level and certainly pointed to the enhancement of market access and economic opportunities, the showcased data did not lend themselves to an assessment of effectiveness in terms of net returns from fisheries activities and products sold by districts on domestic and international markets. Notably, verification of achievement of this indicator by way of an impact survey and financial records as described above was not undertaken. However, this PCRV considers that notable diversification and productivity impacts were achieved by CCDP (see below section "Rural poverty impacts"), which can be reasonably expected to have translated to increased net returns from market sales to a certain extent.
26. While CCDP scored considerable achievements with regard to output delivery, the degree of accomplishment of the two main project objectives was not assessed according to the intended indicators and means of verification: for Objective 1, only indirect evidence exists for the performance of fisheries enterprise groups, while

⁴ While the PCR reported a total of 180 survey respondents, the AOS Final Report (2017) specified 216 beneficiaries to have been interviewed.

⁵ The detailed outputs in support of CCDP's Component 2 are as follows: (i) 92 per cent of the 80 district-level infrastructure investments financed by CCDP were operational, maintained and used by third-party operators (greatly exceeding the target of 70 per cent); (ii) 83 memoranda of understanding (that is to say, marketing agreements) between community groups and buyers at the local, regional and national level were signed (again, exceeding the target of 40 agreements); (iii) 151 informal agreements for sales were made; (iv) the project developed business plans for 28 large infrastructure investments and supported 357 food safety certificates for processing enterprise group products and an additional 147 *halal* certificates, further supporting access to markets for enterprise group products; (v) 512 processing and marketing groups were formed, involving 4,869 households (exceeding the target); (vi) 235 third-party buyers were purchasing enterprise-group products on a routine basis at project completion.

the health status of marine resources was not assessed; evidence presented for the achievement of Objective 2 was confined to output levels, which, albeit impressive, are not an exact indicator of increased net returns from market sales as a result of economic opportunity expansion. *This PCRV therefore rates the effectiveness of CCDP as moderately satisfactory (rating 4), in contrast with the satisfactory rating (5) provided by PMD.*

Efficiency

27. As indicated in the above section titled "Delivery of outputs" and "Effectiveness", output targets across all three project components were exceeded in many cases. The PCR indicated several reasons for the project's impressive achievements with regard to output delivery, including: efficient mobilization activities, awareness by partners of targets and timeframes, high standards of project management, staff performance assessments, a transparent M&E system and ongoing results communication on the CCPD Website, incentivization of Project Management Units through allocation of additional funds on the basis of implementation performance and close monitoring of output delivery schedules.
28. **Project management costs.** Actual project management costs for CCDP at project closure amounted to 17.3 per cent of total project cost, consistent with the budgeted funds at appraisal (17.9 per cent for Component 3 – Project management). This may be considered rather high when considering cost levels typically incurred for IFAD-financed projects, but nonetheless appear reasonable in light of the scattered geographic coverage and the decentralized implementation and project management modalities.
29. **Economic rate of return.** The economic rate of return at completion was calculated in the PCR to be 18.4 per cent against the appraisal target of 19.6 per cent. The PCR thus considered the financial and economic viability of the project activities validated.
30. **Time lapse between approval and effectiveness.** CCDP had an impressively short time lapse between the project's approval and effectiveness dates by any measure, i.e., 1 month or 1.7 per cent of total project duration. This is substantially shorter than typically observed for IFAD-financed projects.
31. In view of the exceeding output delivery rates, operational efficiency, satisfactory economic rate of return and exceptional speed of project inception, *this PCRV rates the efficiency of CCDP as satisfactory (rating 5), in agreement with the PMD rating.*

Rural poverty impact

32. Data showcased in the PCR in support of the project's claims of rural poverty impact were derived from two sources, namely the Result and Impact Management System (RIMS) and AOS surveys. This PCRV notes several limitations of these two sets of survey data, which impinge on the level, strength and robustness of the impact evidence presented to a certain extent. With regard to the 2017 AOS; (i) while random cluster sampling was specified to be the methodology for selecting project (and non-project) villages for the survey, the AOS Final Report does not specify how the farmers in each village were selected; and (ii) the sample size of the study (between 180 and 216 respondents) was relatively small. As for the RIMS surveys, it is noted that non-beneficiaries were not included in the survey design and comparisons with "control" or "without-intervention" communities could therefore not be made.⁶ The respective sources of the specific survey results across outcomes and impacts were largely not indicated in the PCR (i.e., whether these were derived from RIMS or the AOS), rendering a specific assessment of these

⁶ PMD clarified that the project had been approved under IFAD's previous RIMS guidelines, with a focus on contribution rather than attribution. Government and CCDP recognized this weakness and therefore tried to introduce a "control group" approach for AOS.

results problematic, in that the particular survey-specific limitation that would apply to the data under discussion was not known in many cases.

33. **Food security and agricultural productivity.** The PCR stated that 96 per cent of households participating in project-supported enterprises experienced productivity increases as a result of CCDP interventions (between 2015 and 2017): an increase in the order of 80 per cent was described for capture-fishing groups, 450 per cent for freshwater aquaculture groups, 71 per cent for processing groups and 42 per cent for marketing groups. It is not clear from the documentation whether these sample observations are representative of the whole project. Notwithstanding the latter consideration, these reported productivity increases are considerable (while bearing in mind the above-mentioned survey design limitations).
34. With regard to the attribution of fishery yields to CCDP interventions, the PCR states that beneficiaries attributed 96 per cent (presumably on average) of their production gains to the project. Capture fishery improvements were thus described to stem from enhanced fishing technologies and equipment upgrades provided by CCDP. By the same token, pond aquaculturists attributed the large productivity increases⁷ to the improved water management practices, seed quality and culture techniques promoted by the project, along with equipment provision. Lastly, increased production levels for marine culture (albeit not quantified in the PCR) were attributed to CCDP's introduction of culture systems for marine fish, sea cucumbers and crabs, which were reportedly not undertaken by non-beneficiary fisherfolk to a large extent and which resulted in a considerable diversification of fisheries products⁸, far outnumbering the types of products generated by non-beneficiary processors.
35. The PCR cited strong impacts of the project on food security levels and nutritional status among the beneficiary communities. The prevalence of experiencing hunger periods thus reportedly declined drastically, as follows: in 2013, 34.2 per cent of households experienced one hunger period and 11 per cent two such periods, while in 2017 these numbers had decreased to 2.2 and 0 per cent, respectively. The PCR concludes, in view of these results, that food insecurity was almost entirely eliminated from project areas, although it is not clear whether this can be fully attributed to the project. The number of underweight children was documented to have decreased by 80 per cent, chronic malnutrition (i.e., height for age) by 30 per cent and acute malnutrition (i.e., weight for age) by 32 per cent (presumably in the same timeframe).
36. With regard to the achievement of the food security and nutrition-related indicators in the logical framework, a 40-per-cent reduction in the prevalence of chronic and acute child malnutrition was almost reached based on the survey results stated in the PCR, while the number of households for whom food security had improved was not quantified (against a target of 13,200 households). Notwithstanding, an extrapolation of the survey results to the entire beneficiary population of 18,925 households would render the target to have been considerably exceeded.
37. **Household incomes and assets.** The AOS and RIMS surveys conducted by the project showed an average increase in the beneficiaries' income levels by 132 per cent over the implementation period (from 2013 to 2017). Fisherfolk involved in marine capture-fishing and processing achieved the largest increase, while those engaged in seaweed aquaculture saw their incomes slightly decreasing, owing to a bacterial disease affecting seaweed during certain periods.⁹ Further, most members of enterprise groups described to have experienced an increase in household

⁷ Nineteen per cent of interviewed aquaculture group members reported production increases of more than 50 per cent, 50 per cent of farmers reported gains between 26 and 50 percent, and 31 per cent of farmers reported increases between 5 and 25 per cent.

⁸ Diversified fisheries products include: salted fish, smoked fish, fish nuggets, fish balls, shredded fish, fish paste, fish crackers, dried seaweed and other products.

⁹ Actual figures not quantified in the PCR.

assets.⁸ The PCR reported a marked decrease in the poorest quintile (from 27.1 per cent in 2013 to 18.9 per cent in 2017), as well as an increase in the richest quintile (from 15.3 per cent to 23.6 per cent). The PCR also stated that the project activities had resulted in observable employment multipliers, notwithstanding that these impacts were not quantified.

38. In respect of the level of achievement of the economic impact indicators provided for in the logical framework, this PCRV considers that: (i) a quantification of households with improvement in their asset ownership index (against a target of 9,900) was not undertaken, although most of the survey respondents reportedly gained household assets; (ii) the average increase in the value of marine and fisheries products sold by participating households (vis-à-vis a target of 30 per cent) was not determined and reported in the PCR. The report did, however, state in its "Access to markets" section that 93 per cent of respondents to the 2017 AOS experienced an increase in sales (compared with 35 per cent in the non-beneficiary group).
39. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** The impact evidence with regard to human and social capital and empowerment was largely anecdotal, with most statements in the PCR made without references to the sources for the information. As such, the project was described as having ensured that poor rural women and men enjoyed increased control over economic dealings and influence in local decision-making processes, and at project-end they were in a strengthened position to access essential social and productive services and resources compared to the pre-project situation. The community reportedly perceived the benefits of working together as a group rather than individually and proactively accessed markets and policy and economic networks.
40. The 2,181 community groups formed under the project were described as having built social cohesion, resilience and self-help capacity (with the latter two aspects not described in further detail in the PCR), and all the groups reportedly provided input to local government institutions.
41. Uptake levels were seen as a measure of success of the training activities conducted by CCDP, with about 50 per cent of project beneficiaries reported as having adopted new technologies and approaches relating to aquaculture, processing, marketing, organizational management and compliance with product quality and traceability standards.
42. **Institutions and policies.** The PCR noted that community-level institutional capacity improved during the lifetime of the project. However, the examples provided in support of this outcome were limited to the formation of the village-level production and resource management groups (which has already been duly considered under the impact domain "Human and social capital and empowerment" above). Further, CCDP's support of integration of project communities' development priorities into village-level medium-term development plans was highlighted, yet further details, such as the prevalence of this result across the project locations, were not provided.
43. A major accomplishment of the project was its impact on local policies, resulting in many villages instituting marine conservation areas (see below section "Environment and natural resources management"), in some cases with intended linkages to national-level legislation on marine conservation, supported by village decrees and district level regulation (which is understood by this PCRV to have been in planning at project-end).
44. The legacy of CCDP was noted in the PCR to be the government's development of an innovative approach to combining sustainable marine and coastal natural resource management (NRM) with economic and livelihood development, which is understood to have resulted from the project's successful demonstration of its

intervention model that integrated those same aspects. Supervision mission reports documented the high appreciation by local policy makers of the project approach and its strong integration of local policy priorities and initiatives.

45. In view of, on the one hand: (i) the substantial reported productivity increases; (ii) key impact indicator targets for food and nutrition security having been met or exceeded; (iii) the doubling of average incomes and enhancement of asset levels; and (iv) the major policy impacts that were achieved at local and national level; and, on the other hand: (a) the limitations of the conducted outcome and results surveys; (b) key economic impact indicators not having been directly reported on; and (c) the weak evidence for human and social capital and empowerment, *this PCRV rates the overall rural poverty impact of CCDP as satisfactory (rating 5)*. This is in agreement with the rating provided by PMD.

Sustainability of benefits

46. **Community engagement, participation and ownership.** The PCR noted the prevalence of high levels of project ownership and buy-in on the part of the beneficiaries, in part owing to CCDP's efforts in ensuring that awareness was raised among the communities about the benefits of collective enterprises. The report further listed some of the human and social capital and empowerment impacts discussed in the corresponding section above, which in the view of this PCRV do not directly speak to social sustainability. Lastly, the PCR highlighted the project's development of a 30-step "sustainability path" for community empowerment as part of its exit strategy; further information as to the specifics of this provision and the mechanism with which it would enhance social sustainability was not provided.
47. **Technical viability.** The participatory planning process and a keen awareness of the communities' capabilities was described in the PCR as having ensured the selection of appropriate technologies that could be easily understood and utilised by end-users, supported by training. Further, requisite materials were sourced locally and the technologies were designed such that they could be managed considerably easily and used flexibly, thus lending themselves to be converted according to the changing needs. Notwithstanding, it was pointed out that a certain degree of technical support might still be required for community groups to meet future market demands and ensure infrastructure utility and durability.
48. **Partner commitment towards sustainability.** Project activities were reported to have been mainstreamed into existing government work programmes, with related budgets having been provided for. For instance, ecotourism, targeting strategies and community-support initiatives were incorporated by district fisheries agencies into their work plans and budgets, and, at village level, community leaders were reported to have sourced other village funds to support CCDP-founded community groups, thus ensuring their viability beyond the project duration. The PCR also indicated the building of strong partnerships between district-level cooperatives¹⁰ and village groups as an outcome of the project that would provide for enhanced sustainability of the activities put in place by CCDP, by way of access to skills training, input supplies, marketing and funding.
49. **Financial sustainability.** The financial sustainability of project activities was deemed in the PCR to have hinged largely on the viability of enterprise groups and district-level infrastructure investments. To this end, financial viability prospects had been considered already at selection stage, third-party operators were specifically included in the investment proposals, and business and operating plans for district investments were commissioned. By project-end, all district investments were reported to be operational, and 80 per cent of enterprise groups were considered financially sustainable, with viable cash flow and satisfactory levels of savings. This PCRV considers that the latter figure is slightly inconsistent with

¹⁰ CCDP assisted in the development of cooperatives in all 12 project sites.

another, similar statement in the PCR section on technical sustainability, where 86 per cent of enterprise groups were reported as viable in terms of continued production, savings and market and credit access. Provision of the sources for these figures, as well as definitions of the different viability aspects mentioned, would have been useful in interpreting the information.

50. In view of the adequate provisions made for ensuring sustainability of benefits across the spectrum of social, technical, institutional and financial aspects, *this PCRV rates the sustainability of the benefits of CCDP as satisfactory (5)*, in agreement with the rating provided by PMD.

B. Other performance criteria

Innovation

51. The following three novel practices indicated in the PCR were deemed by this PCRV to be key innovations introduced by the project: (i) a management strategy and action plan specific to fragile species threatened by over-exploitation (applied to crab production in one project locality), which was reported to have enhanced fisheries resources and raised awareness about resource fragility; (ii) promotion of ecotourism as a novel community development opportunity to enhance rural incomes, protect natural resources and raise environmental awareness, resulting in 35 effective and financially-viable marine ecotourism investments in 11 project locations; and (iii) five fisheries products pioneered by CCDP, which were new to the market and succeeded after extensive testing and piloting, with enterprise groups routinely producing and selling these by project-end. In addition, the PCR noted that innovative income-generating activities were introduced in combination with environmental protection to improve the health of marine resources, although it was not clear to what extent these differed from the afore-mentioned practices.
52. Several project management innovations were also listed in the PCR, notably including: (i) a performance incentive system, rewarding high-achieving Project Management Units (based on progress made on key performance indicators) with additional fund allocations, leading to all PIUs attaining satisfactory or excelling levels of performance by the last year of project implementation; and (ii) a comprehensive management information system (MIS) that provided publically-accessible, real-time management information related to project implementation, with inputs to the system contributed by project staff, government officers and consultants hired on the project and thousands of internal and external stakeholders reported to have accessed this information.
53. A number of other aspects of project management and implementation were described under the PCR narrative section on innovations, which this PCRV does not, however, view as convincing in terms of the description of their novelty and/or the results obtained from any piloting.
54. In view of the successful innovations introduced under the project, ranging from project management strategies to diversified coastal livelihood and NRM practices, *this PCRV rates CCDP innovation as satisfactory (5)*, in agreement with the rating provided by PMD.

Scaling up

55. The PCR noted that, based on the results achieved under the project, a pilot scaling-up initiative in East Kalimantan province was undertaken to implement CCDP activities with funding from the Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction (which is managed by the Asian Development Bank). This pilot was expected to provide the government with lesson-learning for the support of CCDP initiatives without IFAD financing. In other project districts, scaling-up of project interventions, including its strategy for targeting and demand-driven initiatives, was enabled by village funding allocations. The enhanced outcomes and funding effectiveness of the model employed by CCDP was reported to have been recognized by a district

fisheries agency in one locality in South Sulawesi province, modifying its approach to development planning from a "top-down" to a "bottom-up" strategy.

56. In view of the reported scaling-up of the project's interventions, targeting strategy and participatory and demand-driven approach in several locations by another financial institution, decentralized government agencies and village authorities, *this PCRV rates the scaling-up criterion for CCDP as satisfactory (5)*, in agreement with the rating provided by PMD.

Gender equality and women's empowerment

57. **Women's access to resources, assets and services.** CCDP promoted the economic empowerment of women beneficiaries, the majority of whom had not been involved in any income-generating activities before the start of the project. Women thus made up almost 30 per cent of enterprise group members; they were particularly well-represented in the processing and savings groups (constituting 86 and 90 per cent of the total number of members, respectively), while being under-represented in capture-fishing and infrastructure groups (six and five per cent, respectively). The PCR noted that the latter finding reflected the socio-cultural gender-based norms prevalent in coastal communities. Further, the project reportedly provided women with improved access to basic infrastructure and services, including water supply, energy, roads and transport,¹¹ but it is not clear in the PCR what would have been the benefits *particularly for women* from improved road and transport access, rather than for the generality of the beneficiary communities.¹²
58. **Women's influence in decision-making.** The PCR described women's influence as having been strengthened by the project, in that women constituted 33 per cent of the CCDP village working groups and the 2017 AOS showed that project activities reflected the priorities of almost all women respondents.
59. **Workload distribution among household members.** The afore-mentioned access to assets and resources was described in the PCR to have contributed to the reduction of women's daily workloads, especially in view of their dual role domestically and productively. This PCRV considers that this statement would have benefited from an explanation of the mechanism behind increased access leading to reduced workloads, as this is not self-evident.
60. **Women's skills and income.** According to the PCR, women beneficiaries reported significant increases in incomes and savings (presumably of households), as well as skill enhancement relating to fisheries production and processing, bookkeeping and marketing. This PCRV notes that a quantification of the income and saving increments was not provided in the PCR, which would have added weight to the evidence provided for this impact claim. The PCR further mentioned anecdotal evidence of many women group members displaying enhanced self-esteem, confidence and pride in their newly-gained ability of providing resources to their households; further information on how this assessment was made and the extent to which it held true across the beneficiary communities was not available.
61. **Gender relations within households, groups and communities.** The PCR described anecdotal reporting of improved intra-household relationships as a result of the women's enhanced economical contributions; this finding was, however, not elaborated further as to the source and prevalence of the reported outcome.
62. In summary, while the project succeeded in: (i) engaging a considerable proportion of women in marine-based economic activities; (ii) affording the latter access to resources, assets and services in the context of fisheries-based livelihoods; and (iii)

¹¹ In reviewing this PCRV, PMD explained that women beneficiaries were also provided with market infrastructure and post-harvest processing facilities (which had not been noted in the relevant section in the PCR).

¹² In reviewing this PCRV, PMD clarified that the improved road and transport access constituted an enabling factor for enterprise development and NRM activities on the part of women beneficiaries.

strengthening women's influence in village-level decision-making, insufficient evidence or detail was provided in support of claims of: (a) reduced workloads for women; (b) significant income and savings increases, as well as a personal sense of empowerment; and (c) improved intra-household relationships. *This PCRV rates CCDP performance with regard to gender equality and women's empowerment as moderately satisfactory (rating 4), in contrast with the satisfactory (5) rating provided by PMD.*

Environment and natural resources management

63. **Measures for sustainable NRM.** Designed specifically as a project aimed at improved coastal resource management, CCDP adopted a wide range of measures for sustainable NRM, including: the establishment of community-based resource management groups; replacing destructive and unsustainable fishing practices with sustainable technologies; litter clean-up and collection and processing of waste products; mangrove restoration; establishment of coastal marine resource management areas (of which 20 were ratified by local ordinances during the project implementation period and a further 13 were expected to be ratified by project-end); the instituting of marine conservation areas, including no-take or no-fishing zones, as well as mangrove planting/rehabilitation areas.
64. Furthermore, innovative income-generating activities were introduced, including ecotourism, to sustain environmental protection. As such, 35 viable community-level ecotourism investments were made, thereby protecting local resources, while concomitantly boosting local incomes. According to the PCR, some data indicated that the health of marine resources had improved; however, no further information or details were provided as to the source of the data or the exact nature of the reported improvements. The project also placed a strong emphasis on sustainable aquaculture, for instance by selectively supporting only such projects that did not reduce mangrove cover. Some groups reportedly benefited from environmental improvements, such that these enabled, for instance, the harvesting of wild crabs.
65. In the context of NRM, this PCRV deems the innovative practice affording fragile species particular attention by developing specific management and actions plans noteworthy (see above section "Innovation").
66. **Long-term environmental and social sustainability.** The project contributed to long-term environmental and social sustainability by raising community awareness regarding the environment and, specifically, the marine and fisheries resource base; and by strengthening the capacity of community-based NRM groups to develop and implement coastal marine co-management plans and ICM plans.
67. In view of the significant measures introduced by the project to foster sustainable coastal and marine NRM and its consideration of the long-term environmental and social sustainability of these practices and strategies, *this PCRV rates CCDP performance with regard to the environment and NRM criterion as satisfactory (5), in agreement with the rating provided by PMD.*

Adaptation to climate change

68. **Climate risk awareness and analysis.** Notwithstanding that the project design did not provide for a particular focus on addressing climate change impacts, CCDP raised community awareness of climate change and related environmental issues in particular through its ecotourism activities, which were often coupled with environmental education. Furthermore, the PCR noted that the project's impacts on rural incomes and access to finance, as well as the support of mangrove rehabilitation and preservation, contributed to the beneficiary communities' adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change impacts.
69. The PCR further considered that the production of seaweed and coral transplantation supported by the project would lead to carbon sequestration and thus contribute to climate change mitigation.

70. In view of the importance of mangrove management in the context of disaster risk mitigation for coastal communities and the efforts made to raise community awareness of climate change impacts despite the lack of consideration of these aspects in the project design, *this PCR rates CCDP performance with regard to adaptation to climate change as satisfactory (5)*, in agreement with the rating provided by PMD.

C. Overall project achievement

71. CCDP's goals and objectives were well-aligned with government and IFAD development objectives, and several appropriate design adjustments were made to ensure continued high relevance of the interventions. Delivery rates against appraisal targets were considerably high, with most output targets met or exceeded. Substantial productivity increases were reported; key impact indicator targets for food and nutrition security were met or exceeded; a doubling of incomes and enhancements of assets were stated to have been accomplished; and major policy impacts were achieved at local and national level. Adequate provisions were made to ensure the social, technical, institutional and financial sustainability of project benefits.
72. Successful project management, fisheries technology and income-generating innovations were introduced by CCDP, and scaling-up of the project's interventions, targeting strategy and participatory and demand-driven approach was reported in several locations. The project succeeded in affording women access to resources, assets and services and engaging women in marine-based economic activities and village-level decision-making. The project promoted sustainable coastal and marine NRM with a view towards long-term environmental and social sustainability, raised community awareness of climate change impacts and contributed to disaster risk mitigation through mangrove conservation.
73. On the other hand, key outcome indicators intended at design were not assessed or only inferred indirectly, including the performance of fisheries enterprise groups, the health status of marine resources and net returns from market sales. Certain limitations were noted in the methodologies of the outcome and results surveys, key economic impact indicators were not directly reported on and the evidence for human and social capital and empowerment was considered weak. Lastly, insufficient evidence or detail was provided in support of certain reported impacts on women, including reduced workloads, increased income and savings, personal empowerment and improved intra-household relationships.
74. In view of the high achievements against most of the performance criteria evaluated, *this PCR rates the overall project achievement of CCDP as satisfactory (5)*, in agreement with the rating provided by PMD.

D. Performance of partners

IFAD

75. **Supervision and implementation support.** The PCR noted that the supervision and implementation support provided by IFAD was provided in a regular and timely fashion and was deemed of adequate quality. The establishment of an IFAD office in Jakarta in 2015 was described as having enabled IFAD to engage with the project more closely and address arising issues expeditiously. The follow-up on the agreed actions following supervision missions and the provision of targeted implementation support were deemed particularly effective. Comprehensive and relevant training (as well as any required follow-up) was provided by IFAD in connection with the RIMS and AOS surveys, as well as procurement and financial management, including loan administration.
76. IFAD financial advisory support, both from its headquarters and the country office, was provided in a timely and effective manner and were deemed essential for avoiding implementation bottlenecks arising from procurement and cash-flow

constraints. IFAD further worked closely with the project to assist with the development of annual workplans and budgets and procurement plans, as well as with the revision of financing plans through reallocation of resources between expenditure categories.

77. Between 2013 until project completion in 2017, IFAD fielded six supervision, implementation support and review missions and a mid-term review at the project mid-point (2015). The supervision missions and mid-term review were adequately detailed and informative, and included challenges, weaknesses and recommendations. These missions consistently included highly-skilled professionals and were deemed in the PCR to have been effective and efficient. In addition to the agreed actions, the PCR found the recommendations made in mission reports particularly helpful in guiding the implementation activities under the project components and subcomponents.
78. IFAD also assisted CCDP in refining its ecotourism activities and its knowledge management programme by way of provision of technical assistance; the afforded media support ensured that the project received international coverage.
79. In view of the adequate administrative, supervision and implementation support the project benefited from, *this PCR rates IFAD's performance on CCDP as satisfactory (5)*, in agreement with the rating provided by PMD.

Government

80. **Baseline survey and M&E systems.** A baseline survey was undertaken by CCDP in the first year of the project (2013). A comprehensive M&E plan was developed from the start of project implementation, with data cascading upwards from village level (through community facilitators) to the district-level PIUs, where the data were verified and collated by the M&E officers of the district fisheries agencies before being forwarded up to the national-level PMO. The M&E unit in the PMO was composed of a government M&E officer, a consultant for Web-based M&E and two information technology experts. In 2014, the latter set up a Web-based MIS to allow for the provision of real-time information related to project implementation. RIMS and AOS surveys were carried out in 2013, 2015 and 2017 to monitor the outcomes and impacts of the project.
81. The PCR noted that CCDP's M&E system was considered to be very innovative by Government's standards and those of other IFAD-financed projects in the country and further afield. The system was described as being considerably simple, user-friendly, cost-effective and requiring few human resources. Weekly dashboards provided reliable and up-to-date information on CCDP's physical and financial progress, accessible at any time from any geographic location. This information was shared widely within and outside the project using a variety of mobile social-media applications. The M&E system notably allowed for expeditious corrective action when needed, generated key knowledge management outputs and was used to underpin an innovative, transparent and performance-based incentive system that resulted in strengthening district-level project management capacities (see above section "Innovation").
82. **Counterpart resources.** The Government contributed counterpart funding in line with the project financing agreement (ca. US\$7.046 million, or 99.4 per cent of the planned commitment; see section "Financing"). The Government also provided counterpart staff.
83. **Audit reports.** The PCR notes that the project was effectively audited annually and that all reports were unqualified. The audit management letters were reported to have drawn attention to some cases of ineligibility of expenditure, mostly at district level, and the Ministry of Finance undertook to refund these amounts to IFAD. The PCR further noted that the project's financial statements were prepared in a timely manner for the statutory audits.

84. **Funding flow and procurement procedures.** The PCR noted that improvements in financial reporting and satisfactory overall financial management performance led to CCDP's financial management risk being set to "low" in 2016. Requirements to submit supporting documentation with disbursement requests were reduced and liquidity was increased. These measures facilitated the flow of disbursements and reportedly meant an end to the suspension of payments by the Ministry of Finance owing to low liquidity, which had caused bottlenecks in 2015 and 2016.
85. The PCR stated that the project design provided for adequate human resources for effective project administration, including procurement, and that any encountered procurement challenges were effectively addressed. The financial control system employed by CCDP was described as functioning effectively, allowing, *inter alia*, the execution of over 100 tenders in compliance with the government's and IFAD's procurement requirements.
86. **Project implementation capacity.** MMAF was the lead implementing agency for CCDP and the Ministries of National Development Planning, Finance and Internal Affairs were stated in the PCR as active implementing partners. The government was noted to be responsive to IFAD's recommendations throughout the project duration and proactively addressed implementation issues. Notwithstanding, the PCR pointed to one issue that had a negative bearing on project implementation, namely the ministerial decision to withdraw all foreign-financed projects from the Ministry; although this was eventually resolved, it resulted in a delay in implementation during the project's final year.¹³
87. In view of the effective M&E system and the adequate reporting, audit compliance, counterpart contributions, funding flows, procurement procedures and implementation capacity, *this PCR rates government performance on CCDP as satisfactory (rating 5)*, in agreement with the PMD rating.

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

Scope

88. The PCR contained all chapters, sections, and annexes as per the Guidelines for Project Completion Review (2015) and provided substantive and relevant content. *This PCR rates the scope of the PCR as satisfactory (rating 5)*.

Quality

89. The PCR was produced in a timely manner in June 2018 and was found to be satisfactorily detailed and informative and of high quality.
90. **Inclusiveness of PCR process.** The PCR process was inclusive of a variety of stakeholder groups, in that a series of stakeholders' workshops was held in late 2017 to sensitize local government authorities and ensure the post-project sustainability of results and investments.
91. **Data robustness, reliability, and adequacy.** As outlined in the above section "Baseline survey and M&E systems", regular and systematic data collection was undertaken by the project to monitor continued project progress. RIMS and AOS surveys were conducted in three years of the project cycle in an effort to capture outcomes and impacts of the project. Although an array of important information was captured, certain methodological constraints of the surveys were noted in this review that, to a certain degree, impinged on the level, strength and robustness of the impact evidence presented (see above section "Rural poverty impact"). Furthermore, this PCR considers that several key outcome indicators were not captured by the project's M&E activities (see above section "Effectiveness").
92. *This PCR rates the quality criterion for the PCR as moderately satisfactory (rating 4)*.

¹³ Further details regarding this matter were not available in the PCR.

Lessons

93. Out of the twelve items presented in the PCR's "Lessons learned and knowledge generated" section, most were considered observations on best practice or documentation of project results (or shortcomings), rather than true lessons to be learnt from the performance of CCDP. The remaining three lessons (see below section "Lessons learned") were deemed adequate and were derived from project design and implementation considerations.
94. *This PCRV rates the lessons criterion for the PCR as moderately satisfactory (rating 4).*

Candour

95. **Narrative objectivity and candour of results reporting.** The PCR narrative was perceived by this PCRV to be generally objective and to have struck an appropriate balance between showcasing achievements and describing shortfalls.
96. *This PCRV rates the candour criterion for the PCR as satisfactory (rating 5).*

V. Final remarks and lessons learned

Lessons learned

97. Key lessons extracted from the PCR comprise the following:
 - a) The risk geographical dispersion across remote project locations can pose to successful project implementation can be effectively mitigated by way of: (i) a phased approach to project implementation from few to a larger eventual number of project villages; and (ii) the use of mobile social-media applications and a Web-based MIS to facilitate close communication, collaboration and coordination.
 - b) Strong partnerships with a variety of relevant ministries, local government authorities, financial institutions, the private sector, universities, non-governmental organizations and other development partners enhances implementation effectiveness and sustainability prospects.
 - c) Direct fund allocation to communities and local-level procurement (provided adequate supervision is afforded) circumvent lengthy government procurement processes, lead to increased ownership and enable expeditious project implementation.

Definition and rating of the evaluation criteria used by IOE

Criteria	Definition *	Mandatory	To be rated
Rural poverty impact	Impact is defined as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions.	X	Yes
	<i>Four impact domains</i>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household income and net assets: Household income provides a means of assessing the flow of economic benefits accruing to an individual or group, whereas assets relate to a stock of accumulated items of economic value. The analysis must include an assessment of trends in equality over time. 		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food security and agricultural productivity: Changes in food security relate to availability, stability, affordability and access to food and stability of access, whereas changes in agricultural productivity are measured in terms of yields; nutrition relates to the nutritional value of food and child malnutrition. 		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutions and policies: The criterion relating to institutions and policies is designed to assess changes in the quality and performance of institutions, policies and the regulatory framework that influence the lives of the poor. 		No
Project performance	Project performance is an average of the ratings for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of benefits.	X	Yes
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, institutional priorities and partner and donor policies. It also entails an assessment of project design and coherence in achieving its objectives. An assessment should also be made of whether objectives and design address inequality, for example, by assessing the relevance of targeting strategies adopted.	X	Yes
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.	X	Yes
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.	X	Yes
Sustainability of benefits	The likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. It also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.	X	Yes
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	The extent to which IFAD interventions have contributed to better gender equality and women's empowerment, for example, in terms of women's access to and ownership of assets, resources and services; participation in decision making; work load balance and impact on women's incomes, nutrition and livelihoods.	X	Yes
Innovation	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

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

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

Rating comparison^a

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Programme Management Department (PMD) rating</i>	<i>IOE Project Completion Report Validation (PCRVR) rating</i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (PCRVR-PMD)</i>
Rural poverty impact	5	5	0
Project performance			
Relevance	5	5	0
Effectiveness	5	4	-1
Efficiency	5	5	0
Sustainability of benefits	5	5	0
Project performance^b	5.0 ¹	4.75	-0.25
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	5	4	-1
Innovation	5	5	0
Scaling up ²	5	5	0
Environment and natural resources management	5	5	0
Adaptation to climate change	5	5	0
Overall project achievement^c	5	5	0
Performance of partners^d			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	5	5	0
Average net disconnect			-0.17

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

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

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

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

¹ An overall project performance rating was not provided by the PMD; the arithmetic average across the four components was computed by the PCRVR evaluator.

² This criterion read as "Potential for scaling up" in the PMD rating matrix.

Ratings of the project completion report quality

	<i>PMD rating</i>	<i>IOE PCRVR rating</i>	<i>Net disconnect</i>
Candour		5	
Lessons		4	
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)		4	
Scope		5	
Overall rating of the project completion report		5	

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.

Output Delivery

Output	Unit	Target	Actual	% Delivery
Component 1: Empowerment, development and resource management				
Marine and fisheries households' development priorities identified, agreed and documented (among them, the percentage of female-headed households contributing to this exercise indicated in <i>italics</i>)	Percentage	70% <i>(50%)</i>	100% <i>(100%)</i>	143% <i>(200%)</i>
Community-based marine resource management areas demarcated, declared and ratified	Number	40	20	50%
Village-level Integrated Coastal Management Plans in place	Number	90	174	193%
Enterprise groups established by the project	Number	1,800	1,609	89%
Community-infrastructure built, used and maintained	Percentage	66%	90%+	136%+
Component 2: District support for marine-based economic development				
Facilities, services and infrastructure financed by the project implemented, maintained and used by third-party operators	Percentage	70	92	131%
Memoranda of Understanding signed between village level enterprise groups and third-party buyers	Number	48	83	173%
Component 3: Project management				
Decision Letters obtained and Annual Work Programs and Budgets and procurement plans implemented by PMO and PIUs	Number	13	13	100%
Project consultants and Community Facilitators with contracts up for renewal, or reviews of performance on completion of contract assignments, assessed by PMO and PIUs as satisfactory	Percentage	75%	90%+	120%+
All PIUs (excluding Badung Learning Centre) evaluated by PMO to be either in category 1 (best) or 2 (good) in the project reward and sanction scheme	Number	12	12	100%
National-level workshop held with relevant partners to identify appropriate new districts for implementation of CCDP models during the last year of the project	One-off count	1	1	100%
District level workshops held with relevant partners to discuss potential replication of CCDP models in existing CCDP districts during the last year of the project	Number	12	12	100%
PMO support for replication in one new district	Number (Districts)	1	1	100%

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AOS	Annual outcome survey
CCDP	Coastal Community Development Project
CPE	Country Programme Evaluation
ICM	Integrated coastal management
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MIS	Management information system
MMAF	Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NRM	Natural resource management
PCR	Project Completion Report
PCRV	Project Completion Report Validation
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PMD	Programme Management Department
PMO	Project Management Office
RIMS	Results and Impact Management System

Bibliography

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2015. *Guidelines for Project Completion Review*.

_____. 2012. *President's report, Proposed loan and grant to the Republic of Indonesia for the Coastal Community Development Project*, September 2012.

_____. 2012. *Republic of Indonesia, Coastal Community Development Project, Design Completion Report*, August 2012.

_____. 2013. *Results and Impact Management System (RIMS) Survey – 2013, Final Report, Ministry of Maritime and Fisheries Affairs*, December 2013.

_____. 2014. *Republic of Indonesia, Country Programme Evaluation*, February 2014.

_____. 2015. *Annual Outcome Survey of CCDP-IFAD 2015: Executive Summary*.

_____. 2015. *Results and Impact Management System (RIMS) Survey – 2015, Interim Report, Coastal Community Development Project (CCDP), Ministry of Maritime and Fisheries Affairs*.

_____. 2017. *Final Report, Results and Impact Management System (RIMS) Survey, CCDP-IFAD, Fiscal Year 2017*.

_____. 2018. *Republic of Indonesia, Coastal Community Development Project, Project completion report, Main report and annexes*, June 2018.