

Project Completion Report Validation

**Support to Farmers' Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services
Project – *Projet d'Appui au Renforcement des Organisations Professionnelles et
aux Services Agricoles (AROPA) - Madagascar***
Date of validation by IOE: May 2020

I. Basic project data

			Approval* (US\$ m)		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	East and Southern Africa Division	Total project costs	37.2		32.2	
Country	Madagascar	IFAD loan and percentage of total	28.5	76.6%	28.3	88.1%
Loan number	1000003171	Government of Madagascar	3.0	7.9%	1.5	4.7%
IFAD project ID	1100001429	European Commission	1.59	4.1%	1.2	3.7%
Type of project (subsector)	Rural Development	Beneficiaries	3.7	9.9%	0.6	1.9%
Financing type	Parallel financing	Other sources IFAD grant	0.5	1.4%	0.5	1.6%
Lending terms [†]	Highly concessional loans and grant					
Date of approval	11/09/2008					
Date of loan signature	01/10/2008					
Date of effectiveness	13/01/2009					
Loan amendments	1	Number of beneficiaries (households)	75,000		**49,000 men and 30,400 women, rounded to 80,000	
Loan closure extensions	1					
Country programme managers ¹	Ibrahima Bamba (current);	Loan closing date			30/09/2019	
Regional director(s) ²	Sara Mbago-Bhunu (current)	Mid-term review			07/10/2014	
Project completion report reviewer	Tullia Aiazzi	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)			99.5%	
Project completion report quality control panel	Eoghan Molloy; Fabrizio Felloni	Date of the project completion report			10/10/2019	

**At approval in 2009, the budget was US\$56.9, but foreseen parallel financing did not materialise; the table figures indicate the real final allocation.*

*** The Project Completion Report equates participants with household numbers.*

Source: Support to Farmers' Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services Project, President's Report and Project Completion Report, Main report and appendices; Madagascar Country Programme Management Team.

¹ Previous Country Programme Managers: Benoit Thierry; Nadine Gbossa; Haingo Rakotondratsima, Country Programme Officer.

² Previous Regional Directors: Ides De Willebois; Perin Saint Ange; Sana Jatta.

II. Project outline

Country & Project Name	Madagascar, Support to Farmers' Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services Project (AROPA).
Project duration	Total programme duration: 10 years; Date of effectiveness: 13 January 2009. Completion date: 31 March 2019, one extension granted (one year). Effectiveness lag four months. Time from entry into force to first disbursement of funds: two months.
Project goal, objectives and components	The project goal was to strengthen farmers' organizations in order to improve agricultural production and increase rural families' income. Specific objectives were to: (i) reinforce farmers and their organizations in order to better integrate them into the economy; (ii) facilitate farmers' access to services by matching demand and supply through the intermediation of Centres for Agricultural Services; (iii) increase the level of production by establishing financial mechanisms that respond to demand for services through the national and regional Agricultural Development Funds. It was structured in four components: formation of professional organizations and the professionalization of producers; intermediation and the development of agricultural services; financing of production and services; national policy on services and apex organizations.
Project area and target group	The project operated in 284 municipalities (communes) in 20 districts across three central regions (Amoron'i Mania, Haute Matsiatra, Ihorombe) and two southern regions (Androy, Anosy). The targeting methodology included: support to the development of pro-poor value chains; selection of three different categories of organisations: basic producers, professional producers and service oriented; financial and technical support to enable the most vulnerable farming households join the first level of producer organizations.
Project implementation	The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock was the executing institution; the direct responsibility for project execution moved across several divisions over time. Project management was entrusted to a project coordination unit; in total 18 supervision and implementation support missions were carried out. Implementation at community level was initially entrusted to international NGOs, then to private-sector service providers. The final, most effective approach entailed assigning implementation responsibility to the producer organisations themselves.
Changes during implementation	Supervision missions and the mid-term review in 2012 led to key changes to project approach and thrust, including: a shift towards results-based management and a significant reduction of the number of indicators for project achievements; the introduction of new tools and mechanisms for outreach, self-assessment of producer organisations and financing of micro-projects; a strengthened and restructured project coordination unit; mobilisation of additional financial resources.
Financing	The final approved budget amounted to US\$37.2 million; at completion, US\$32.2 million, or 80.3 per cent, had been disbursed. At appraisal in 2009, the budget of US\$56 million included: an IFAD loan of US\$18.6 million, or 33.1 per cent of the total; three parallel financing by the African Development Bank (14.5 per cent), the European Union (18.4 per cent) and the World Bank (16.5 cent) that did not materialise due to the political instability in the country from 2009 to 2013; a Government's contribution valued at 11.8 per cent of the total and beneficiaries' contribution at 4.7 per cent. In 2014, the European Commission contributed a new grant for food and nutrition security and in 2016, IFAD approved a loan amendment to extend activities to five additional districts.

Table 1
Project costs (US\$ millions)

<i>Funding source</i>	<i>Appraisal</i>	<i>% of appraisal costs</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>% of actual costs</i>	<i>% disbursed</i>
IFAD loans	28.5	76.6%	28.3	88.1%	99.5%
IFAD (grant)	0.5	1.4%	0.5	1.6%	99.76%
Government	3.0	7.9%	1.5	4.7%	50.91%
Beneficiaries	3.7	9.9%	0.6	1.9%	16.38%
European Commission	1.4	4.1	1.2	3.7%	78.02%
Total	37.2	100%	32.2	100%	80.31%

Source: IFAD Madagascar Country Programme Management Team, April 2020.

Table 2
Component costs (US\$ millions)

<i>Component</i>	<i>Appraisal</i>	<i>% of appraisal costs</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>% of actual costs</i>	<i>% disbursed</i>
Formation of professional organizations and the professionalization of producers	6.6	17.8%	5.8	17.9%	86.9%
Intermediation and the development of agricultural services	2.8	7.5%	1.0	3.1%	35.8%
Financing of production and services	19.8	53.2%	16.0	49.6%	80.7%
National policy on services and apex organizations	8.0	21.6%	9.0	29.4%	118.0%
Total	37.2	100%	32.2	100%	86.5%

Source: IFAD Madagascar Country Programme Management Team, April 2020.

III. Review of findings

PCR finding	Rating
A. Core Criteria	
Relevance	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The project main goal was to improve food security and incomes of poor farming households by integrating them into the market, based on an assessment of widespread low professionalization and limited access to technical and financial services for most agriculture smallholders. This was fully in line with national agricultural and rural development policies and strategies and with IFAD's Strategic Framework and its COSOP for Madagascar at the time of approval. The project design addressed the problem by identifying the Chambers of Agriculture at the different administrative levels as the entry points for the provision of support services to smallholders. This, although correct from a systemic perspective, led to a highly complex project design, that over-estimated the capacity of the Chambers to fulfil the planned role. The Logical Framework had to be revised four times and the number of indicators was significantly reduced to make it manageable. With regards to targeting, the project concept was relevant to the needs of vulnerable small-holders and the 2007 formulation report developed a detailed roadmap for identifying the most vulnerable. Adjustments over time recommended by the supervision missions and the mid-term review contributed to the improvement of the implementation strategy and enhanced the contribution of project activities to achieve its objectives. The Project Completion Report (PCR) analyses in detail the relevance of the project and its strengths and weaknesses. The Project Completion Report Validation (PCR V) agrees with the assessment and confirms the rating as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4). 	4
Effectiveness	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> There were mixed results across the project's four components. Component 1 focused on strengthening producer organisations and local and regional institutions. Physical delivery is assessed at 97 per cent, with numbers of households engaged and producer organizations established or strengthened exceeding targets, while a tool was developed to carry out organizational self-assessment. However, only three out of the ten indicators were reported in the PCR, in the absence of targets for the remaining seven. The PCR rated the performance under component 1 as <i>satisfactory</i>, while acknowledging that the basic producer organizations still required significant support. 	4

PCR finding	Rating
<p>7. The PCRV notes however that the nature and effects of the micro-projects are not adequately described in the PCR, despite their large number; furthermore, the 2019 Madagascar Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation (CSPE) observed that effects on vulnerable households were limited and shallow.</p> <p>8. There were promising results under Component 2, which aimed at enabling producer access to agricultural services, largely through capacity development. The PCR assessed physical delivery at 95 per cent, while costs were 35 per cent of the allocated budget. It is not clear from the PCR if the low actual costs for component 2 are a case of the project having 'achieved more with less' or, conversely, whether this was a missed opportunity to achieve greater results had the full budgetary allocation been disbursed. Five sub-components achieved established targets, two were short of targets, and one - the producer-trader links-over-achieved at 668 per cent of the target, leading to group sales and higher incomes. The component also contributed to strengthening 20 agricultural service centres, establishing a network of competent agricultural advisors, the participation of producers in fairs and markets, and the diffusion of relevant information.</p> <p>9. Component 3 aimed at improving access to financial services for small-scale producers. Physical achievements were assessed at 91 per cent, significantly exceeding targets for capacity development, small-scale irrigation schemes and stores. A mechanism was developed to reach out to the more vulnerable households and enable them raising their productivity and join producer organisations. However, evidence from the PCR itself, supervision mission reports and the 2019 CSPE indicate that the inclusion of vulnerable households started only after the first inter-phase review and remained limited throughout. Furthermore, the number of beneficiary vulnerable households may be over-estimated, due to the participation - confirmed by the country programme management team - of different members from the same household in project activities.</p> <p>10. Component 4 aimed at strengthening producer service organizations and the regional and national chambers of agriculture; providing institutional support at the ministerial level; and developing the national strategy for agricultural services. Positive achievements included strengthening the capacity of four out of six producer service organizations and setting-up market linkages for four products; strengthening the national and regional chambers of agriculture; and institutional development for the Agricultural Development Fund. In theory, these structures could lead to greater dialogue between the Government and producers at grassroots level. However, overall, there was limited progress with regards to policy dialogue and the institutional set-up of the chambers of agriculture was still uncertain at the time of project closure.</p> <p>11. Overall, while acknowledging the results achieved under Component 2, the PCRV notes the late and little progress in reaching out to the more vulnerable households under Components 1 and 3, the lack of information and limited results of micro-projects under Component 1, and shortcomings regarding institutional and policy development, especially under Component 4. On balance, AROPA's effectiveness is therefore rated by this PCRV as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>, one point lower than the PCR.</p>	
Efficiency	
<p>12. The 2009 appraisal budget was totally revised over time. Three parallel allotments of co-financing were cancelled due to national political unrest; in 2016 IFAD approved a loan extension of US\$11.3 million and the European Commission contributed a new grant. The Madagascar IFAD Country Programme Management Team in April 2020 indicated a final approved budget for AROPA of US\$37.2 million and total cost at closure of US\$32.2 million, 86.5 per cent of the revised budget.</p> <p>13. The PCR calculated an internal rate of return of 29.4 per cent, against 26.7 per cent at appraisal. Actual project costs by beneficiary, and administrative costs by household, were slightly lower than at design, ranking second smaller among four similar projects in African countries. Such comparisons should however be taken</p>	5

PCR finding	Rating
<p>with caution, considering the significant budget reduction and the possible over-estimation in the number of participating households.</p> <p>14. The actual Government's contributions were 50.9 per cent of allocation, due to delays in value added tax recovery for project items and no inclusion of a dedicated project allocation in the national budget. Beneficiaries' contributions were significantly under-estimated, at 16.4 per cent, because their in-kind contributions were not valued in monetary terms.</p> <p>15. Effectiveness lag was four months, while first disbursement came two months after entry-into-force. Most project activities were completed by closure, despite the weak implementation arrangements and national unrest until 2013. Project management costs amounted to 115.3 per cent of the allocation and represented 19.3 per cent of total costs.</p> <p>16. The PCRV, taking all this into account, agrees with and confirms the PCR rating as <i>satisfactory</i> (5).</p>	
Rural poverty impact	
<p>17. The PCR acknowledges a low reliability in the 2010 baseline measurement of income levels and focused its analysis on the data collected in 2018 and 2019 and comparison with control group.</p> <p>18. The PCRV notes, in addition, that the Impact Study commissioned by the project in February 2019 is not fully clear with regard to the profiling of the control group which has an impact on the calculation of the average income. This led the PCRV to exclude the Impact Study findings from its analysis.</p> <p>19. Thus, with basis only on the data available for participants in 2017 and 2018, the average household income levels for all participants increased by 28 per cent in one year; this enabled households to allocate financial resources to: food security and children education (38 per cent of households); expansion of livestock activities (29 per cent); purchase of housing facilities (25 per cent).</p> <p>20. However, the PCR also acknowledges that 29 out of 40 producer organizations have difficulties in finding market outlets for their production, due to their geographical isolation. In this respect, the CSPE noted that the income of better-off families, better connected and located in less remote areas, grew three times more than the income of the more vulnerable households. It also noted that impacts on poverty alleviation of these households were limited and fragile.</p> <p>21. Food security improved, with food availability over time doubling compared with the before-project situation and greater variety of food consumed, thanks to produce diversification, including fish, milk and chickens, plantation of fruit trees and cassava processing. The reported lean period decreased from 4.6 months to three months.</p> <p>22. Similarly, agricultural productivity reported significant improvements, above the initially established targets. This was also partly due to a decrease in losses for milk, onion and fingerlings.</p> <p>23. Impacts on social and human capital and on institutions and policies were reported at various levels. The 2019 CSPE noted some weaknesses in terms of the robustness of capacity development at the level of producers. The project also did not succeed in its commitment to contribute to the revision of the national Strategy for Agricultural Services.</p> <p>24. The PCR rates impacts overall as <i>satisfactory</i>. Nevertheless, taking into account the combination of increasing inequalities across households, the limited impacts on incomes and human capital, the significant number of producers that still do not have access to markets and the limited achievements on policy and institutions, the PCRV rates this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4), one point lower than the PCR.</p>	4

Sustainability of benefits	
<p>25. The PCR analyses all aspects of sustainability and recognizes that a key challenge to sustainability was the late implementation of several project activities, including infrastructures, micro-projects and inclusion of vulnerable households. Many producer organisations and other intermediate service-providing organisations were either established late in the project's life or have not yet been fully integrated in the national institutional set-up for agricultural development, e.g. the agricultural service centres and the agriculture development fund. All, moreover, still require significant support and capacity development on various fronts. The newly funded IFAD Inclusive Agricultural Value Chains Development Programme should contribute to further supporting and strengthening many producer organisations.</p> <p>26. At the same time, positive signals for sustainability were identified in the integration of some key innovative approaches in the national policies and strategies (see Scaling up). In addition, the links developed through producer organisations and buyers should ensure the economic sustainability of a number of value chains. In terms of environmental sustainability, the project introduced a number of positive practices; the PCR notes that these remain at the level of isolated actions and that a more coherent and comprehensive programme for adaptation to climate change is required to alleviate rural poverty.</p> <p>27. Thus, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the PCR rating as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4).</p>	4
B. Other performance criteria	
Innovation	
<p>28. The PCR presents a list of innovations, mostly adopted from other contexts, which typically focused on methodological and institutional development approaches aimed at improving targeting of vulnerable households, technical assistance to farming households, organizational diagnostic self-assessment, linkages between producer organizations and buyers, among others. The PCR also mentions that cassava processing to produce gari was introduced after a study tour to Benin and Nigeria.</p> <p>29. A confirmation of the innovative character in Madagascar of these approaches comes from the 2019 CSPE. Thus, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the PCR rating as <i>satisfactory</i> (5).</p>	5
Scaling up	
<p>30. The PCR highlights the integration of the producer organizations-buyers mechanism in the national policy for the agriculture, livestock and fisheries sector, and the integration of the project's experience in the new Agriculture Development Fund. The PCR mentions that these and other approaches were also adopted by on-going and new IFAD-funded projects, in particular the Inclusive Agricultural Value Chains Development Programme wherein the contributions by the Government, beneficiaries, the OPEC Fund for International Development and other development partners meet the IFAD definition for scaling-up.³</p> <p>31. The PCR also mentions the fingerlings production method adopted by three regional producer organizations.</p> <p>32. While the above-mentioned changes at the policy level may well allow for scaling up of one aspect of AROPA's approach, no mention is made of the actual or potential scaling up of other AROPA technologies or agricultural practices among producers, a point adequately raised by the CSPE.</p> <p>33. On balance, in light of the significant scaling up of AROPA's results through co-financing of the Inclusive Agricultural Value Chains Development Programme, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the PCR rating as <i>satisfactory</i> (5).</p>	5

³ IFAD's operational framework for scaling up of results, 2015.

Gender equality and women's empowerment	
<p>34. Among AROPA beneficiaries, 38 per cent were women and 8 per cent female heads of household, thanks to the focus on value chains that are traditionally women's responsibility, namely chicken and vegetable gardens, crop marketing and cassava processing.</p> <p>35. Women's participation in the AROPA organizational network varied from a low of 5 per cent in the unions to a high of 40 per cent in the producer service organisations; in the latter, women chaired two out of four of those supported by AROPA. Reportedly, women's influence on decision-making in the household also improved through the project.</p> <p>36. Overall, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the PCR rating as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4).</p>	4
Environment and natural resources management	
<p>37. The project design did not specifically address the environment and natural resources management, although it recognized environmental degradation as a structural challenge for better agricultural performance.</p> <p>38. The PCR reports of activities aimed at raising awareness on environmental issues at various institutional levels, including in the appraisal process by financial institutions of requests for funding. In addition, the project supported the establishment of tree nurseries for tree plantations and agroforestry, bushfire control, biological pest control for crops and bees, micro-irrigation, composting and crop rotation.</p> <p>39. However, there is no mention – and no sense - of the systematic integration of a holistic and comprehensive vision of environmentally sustainable agriculture in the project activities at all levels. The 2019 CSPE acknowledges achievements but found these to have limited geographical coverage, which led to intangible benefits. The CSPE also found little collaboration with the national environmental services.</p> <p>40. On the basis of the evidence available, the PCRV rates this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4), one point lower than the PCR.</p>	4
Adaptation to Climate Change	
<p>41. In 2009, climate change was not an IFAD priority and was not part of project design. Nevertheless, considering the challenges faced by producers in this regard, the project introduced a set of practices aimed at adaptation to climate vagaries, including: micro-irrigation, agro-forestry, zaï cultivation system, improved pasture, system of rice intensification, improved bee-hives, drought-resistant seed varieties and cassava cuttings, etc.</p> <p>42. Despite the likely limited geographical coverage of the techniques, the project's initiative to introduce appropriate measures to meet key local needs led the PCRV to agree with the PCR on its rating of this criterion as <i>satisfactory</i> (5).</p>	5
C. Overall Project Achievement	
<p>43. AROPA was conceived as a long-term intervention that would steer its thrust from one phase to the next, to better meet the needs of small-scale farmers in terms of services for agriculture. Ambitiously designed, the project aimed at revamping existing institutions and establishing new ones at different administrative and geographical levels, with the overall goal of integrating vulnerable small-scale agricultural producers into markets.</p> <p>44. Social unrest in the early years led to a significantly reduced budget and limited scope for action and flaws in the initial project execution and implementation set-up hindered implementation until the first inter-phase review.</p> <p>45. Since 2013, performance improved although the delayed implementation of several project activities has affected the likelihood of sustainability. The additional financial resources by IFAD were helpful, albeit approved slightly late. Improved practices for natural resources management and climate change adaptation were introduced, but diffusion was limited also due to lack of collaboration with the</p>	4

<p>national dedicated services. Targeting and inclusion of the most vulnerable households improved over time, but this remained an area of weak achievement that affected results and impacts for the poorer participants; markets remain distant from the majority of producers in remote areas. Shortcomings were also registered on the policy development front.</p> <p>46. In sum, while project performance improved after a difficult initial period, the various weaknesses identified, and also partly acknowledged by the PCR itself, constrained overall project achievement. Thus, the PCRV assesses AROPA's overall achievements as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4), one point lower than the PCR rating.</p>	
D. Performance of Partners	
IFAD	
<p>47. The PCR assesses IFAD's performance as satisfactory due to: IFAD's continued presence and operation in the country during the turmoil period; timely and competent supervision missions; the establishment of an IFAD country office, extensive effort towards capacity development of project staff and stakeholders; efficient project management and flexibility to adjust project resources to the national needs and context. Among the weaknesses, the high rotation of country programme managers (four country programme managers and one Associate country programme manager) is mentioned.</p> <p>48. Overall, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the PCR rating of this criterion as <i>satisfactory</i> (5).</p>	5
Government	
<p>49. The PCR lists the following among the positive features of Government performance: the sustained monitoring of project activities, active participation in and follow-up to IFAD's recommendations from the supervision missions and actions taken to improve the performance of the agricultural development fund.</p> <p>50. A few less positive features are also listed: six transfers of project execution responsibility across units; low compliance with, and delays in disbursement of its financial commitments for the project, and low engagement towards improving the effective functioning of the centres for agricultural services.</p> <p>51. Overall, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the PCR rating of this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4).</p>	4

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

PCR finding	Rating
Scope	
<p>52. The PCR contains all chapters, sections, and annexes as per the Guidelines for Programme Completion Review (2015) and provides substantive and relevant content. Unfortunately, a table of contents is missing, as is the breakdown of project expenditures by component. Nevertheless, the PCRV rates the scope of the PCR as <i>satisfactory</i> (5).</p>	5
Quality	
<p>53. The PCR process aimed at being inclusive, also through an inter-regional meeting with stakeholders. However, the mission schedule suggests that little time was spent in the communities.</p> <p>54. The PCR is reasonably comprehensive. More precise information would help regarding the number of direct beneficiaries and households, where double counting appears to have happened, and on micro-projects, environment and natural resources management.</p> <p>55. Furthermore, there are several discrepancies in the PCR financial information when compared to data provided in April 2020 by the IFAD Madagascar Country Project Management Team.</p>	4

56. Thus, the PCRV rates the quality of the PCR as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4).	
Lessons	
57. The PCR draws many interesting lessons, all from the project experience in testing a variety of approaches with regard to value-chain development, organizational development, interaction with the private sector, targeting and outreach for vulnerable households and women, and technical support to small-scale producers. It misses however the opportunity to draw lessons from the overall positive achievements in Component 2, at a third of the budgeted resources.	5
58. The PCRV rates the quality of the lessons in the PCR as <i>satisfactory</i> (5).	
Candour	
59. The PCR narrative is critical of the first phase of the project, whereas its narrative assessment provides a very positive picture of the project's performance and achievements in its second phase. This undoubtedly reflects the evolution of the project's life, however some of the initial weaknesses had a longer negative impact on some achievements which are not acknowledged, e.g. in terms of targeting and outreach and inclusion of the more vulnerable farming households.	4
60. Consequently, the PCRV rates the candour of the PCR as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4).	

V. Final remarks

Issues for IOE follow up (if any)
A few issues on which the PCR narrative is not fully convincing were adequately addressed by the Madagascar CSPE, which was completed at the same time as the PCR itself. Hence, the PCRV did not identify any additional topic requiring IOE follow-up.

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 (PCR) rating</i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (PCR-PMD)</i>
Rural poverty impact	5	4	-1
Project performance			
Relevance	4	4	0
Effectiveness	5	4	-1
Efficiency	5	5	0
Sustainability of benefits	4	4	0
Project performance^b	4.5	4.25	-0.25
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	4	4	0
Innovation	5	5	0
Scaling up	5	5	0
Environment and natural resources management	5	4	-1
Adaptation to climate change	5	5	0
Overall project achievement^c	5	4	-1
Performance of partners^d			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	4	4	0
Average net disconnect			-0.25

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

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

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

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

Ratings of the project completion report quality

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

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.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AROPA	Support to Farmers' Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services Project
CSPE	Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation
PCR	Project Completion Report
PCRV	Project Completion Report Validation

Bibliography

- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2009. *President's report. Proposed loan and grant to the Republic of Madagascar for the Support to Farmers' Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services Project*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2013-2018. *Supervision mission reports of the Support to Farmers' Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services Project*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2019. *Impact study of the Support to Farmers' Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services Project*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2019. *Project Completion Report of the Support to Farmers' Professional Organizations and Agricultural Services Project*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2020. Independent Office of Evaluation. *Republic of Madagascar Country Programme Evaluation*, Rome: IFAD.