

Project Completion Report Validation

Rural Rehabilitation and Community Development Project

Guinea Bissau

Date of validation by IOE: August 2020

I. Basic project data

| | | | Approval (US\$ m)* | | Actual (US\$ m) | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------|--|-------|
| Region | West and Central Africa Division | Total project costs | 6.86 | | 4.13 | |
| Country | Guinea Bissau | IFAD grant and percentage of total | 4.78 | 70% | 3.31 | 80.2% |
| Grant number | DSF 8007-GW | Government of Guinea Bissau | 0.936 | 13.5% | 0.24 | 5.8% |
| IFAD project ID | 1278 | Swedish Complementarity Grant** | 1.050 | 15.2% | 0.46 | 11.1% |
| Type of project (subsector) | Rural Development | Beneficiaries | 0.092 | 1.3% | 0.12 | 2.9% |
| Financing type | Debt Sustainability Framework Grant | | | | | |
| Lending terms | Not applicable | | | | | |
| Date of approval | 12/09/2007 | | | | | |
| Date of loan signature | Not applicable | | | | | |
| Date of effectiveness | 30/04/2008 | | | | | |
| Grant amendments* | 1 | Number of beneficiaries (households) | 13000 households comprising 100,000 persons | | 9938 12554 households (97%) comprising 75324 persons, 51% of whom were women | |
| Grant closure extensions | 1 | | | | | |
| Country programme managers ¹ | Gianluca Capaldo (current); | Grant closing date | | | 31/12/2013 | |
| Regional director(s) ² | Lisandro Martin (current) | Mid-term review | | | October 2011 | |
| Project completion report reviewer | Tullia Aiazzi | IFAD grant disbursement at project completion (%) | | | 60% | |
| Project completion report quality control panel | Eoghan Molloy; Fabrizio Felloni | Date of the project completion report | | | 21 December 2013 | |

* The figures correspond to the amounts approved in USD updated according to effective disbursement rate (Montant approuvé en USD actualisé selon taux de décaissement effectif).

** This was an additional Swedish grant approved in October 2010.

Source: Project Completion Report (PCR), Annex 7, Actual project costs.

¹ Previous Country Programme Managers: Ambrosio Barros, Aissa Toure, Vincenzo Galastro.

² Previous Regional Directors: Mohamed Beavogui; Ides de Willebois.

II. Project outline

| | |
|--|---|
| Country & Project Name | Guinea Bissau, Rural Rehabilitation and Community Development Project (RRCDP) |
| Project duration | Total programme duration: five years; Date of effectiveness: 30 April 2008; Completion date: 30 June 2013; one-year extension granted; Effectiveness lag seven months; Time from entry into force to first disbursement of funds: four months. |
| Project goal, objectives and components | The goal in the project appraisal report was to reduce rural poverty and improvement of livelihoods and incomes of the target population, in particular women and youth, through long-term sustainable and rational management of natural resources. The specific objective was to strengthen the capacity of the target population, to become the drivers of local development, supported by private and public sector partners. Initial focus was to be on rehabilitation, followed by emphasis on capacity development to trigger local development processes. The project had four components: (i) rehabilitation of road infrastructures and basic social services; (ii) capacity-building of grassroots organizations; (iii) reactivation and development of the rural economy; and (iv) project management. |
| Project area and target group | The project intervened in the Tombali and Quinara regions, the poorest in the country. The target population comprised approximately almost 100,000 persons in 13,000 rural households owning less than five hectares. Priority was intended for: adult women, 27 per cent of the target; young men, 7 per cent of the target; large and young households, with an unfavourable ratio of labour force versus household members. Less endowed areas in terms of natural resources were to be prioritized. Finally, communities were expected to prioritise participation of poorer households. |
| Project implementation | The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development was the Executing Institution. An independent Project Coordination Unit (PCU) was established and delegated significant decision-making autonomy. Governmental institutions, NGOs, rural organizations and the private sector were all expected to be key stakeholders in implementation. A Steering Committee was established to provide strategic guidance and supervision to the PCU and an Orientation Forum, comprising local stakeholders, had a consultative role. Each community had to elect a Village Integrated Development Committee (CDIT). |
| Changes during implementation | The main changes in the project during implementation were: a Swedish-funded additional grant; the suspension of all project disbursement between 2012 and 2013, following a military coup; a one-year extension of the project; the interruption of all contracts for Component 3, recommended by the Supervision Mission in March 2013, and recovery of related funds, due to lack of time to carry out foreseen activities before project closure. In addition, high staff rotation happened in both the Government and IFAD and the country suffered serious political instability, including an attempted and a successful putsch. |
| Financing | The appraisal report set total project cost at US\$5.577 million; IFAD Debt Sustainability Framework grant represented 84 per cent of the total and the Government's and beneficiaries' contributions were 14.4 per cent and 1.7 per cent respectively. In October 2010, a Swedish Complementarity Grant of US\$1.05 million was approved and a few adjustments were made to contributions by Government and IFAD. The allocated budget was US\$6.86, of which 70 per cent from IFAD grant, 15.2 per cent from the Swedish grant, 13.5 per cent from the Government and 1.3 per cent from beneficiaries. At completion, US\$4.1 million, representing 60 per cent, had been disbursed. Deliveries by source of funding over the allocations were: IFAD grant, 69 per cent; Swedish grant, 44 per cent; Government's contribution, 25 per cent; and beneficiaries' contribution, 122 per cent. |

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 grant | 4.78 | 70% | 3.31 | 80.2% | 69% |
| Government | 0.93 | 13.5% | 0.24 | 5.8% | 25% |
| Beneficiaries | 0.09 | 1.3% | 0.12 | 2.9% | 122% |
| Swedish Complementarity Fund | 1.05 | 15.2% | 0.46 | 11.1% | 44% |
| Total | 6.86 | 100% | 4.13 | 100% | 60% |

Source: Project Completion Report (PCR).

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> |
|---|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| (i) rehabilitation of road infrastructures and basic social services; | 1.67 | 24.2% | 0.38 | 10.1% | 22.7% |
| (ii) capacity-building of grassroots organizations; | 1.62 | 23.8% | 0.98 | 26.1% | 60.5% |
| (iii) reactivation and development of the rural economy | 1.07 | 15.7% | 0.35 | 0.09% | 32.7% |
| (iv) project management | 1.88 | 27.5% | 2.02 | 53.9% | 107.4% |
| Non allocated funds | 0.6 | 8.8% | 0 | | |
| Total | 6.86 | 100% | 3.75 | 90% | |

Source: PCR. The difference between the total actual disbursement in this Table and Table 1 was due to residual funds in the bank accounts that had not yet been disbursed by the time of the PCR completion.

III. Review of findings

| PCR finding | Rating |
|--|---------------|
| A. Core Criteria | |
| Relevance | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The project was aligned with Government's strategies by addressing poverty reduction, reduction of food insecurity and by targeting women and youth. RRCDP was also aligned with the IFAD 2003 COSOP for Guinea Bissau and intervened in the poorest regions of the country. RRCDP was relevant by focusing on key bottlenecks to local development that had been expressed by the local population, i.e. lack of rural roads and schools. However, the project appraisal document did not analyse to any extent the capacity – or lack thereof - of the governmental organization responsible for building road infrastructures (<i>Direction Générale des ponts et chaussées</i>), which proved to be a major bottleneck during implementation. Other priorities were limited access to water and education services and limited capacity to establish income-generating activities. The project also correctly envisaged close collaboration with NGOs and local social organizations, that proved to be more active than other stakeholders. However, project design was over-optimist by planning the rehabilitation of rural infrastructures and the establishment of sustainable local development processes in four years, a short time in a country with capacity constraints at all levels. | 5 |

| PCR finding | Rating |
|--|---------------|
| <p>3. The project Steering Committee selected the villages for project intervention, prioritizing isolated communities, with high levels of food insecurity and poor natural resources management. At village level, CDITs were responsible for identifying beneficiaries, but no specific targeting approaches and tools were developed, which could have led to significant diversion of resources. A mitigating factor in this regard apparently was the decision to support the development of mangrove rice growing, horticulture and raising of small animals for food security and income generation. These activities facilitated the participation of women and youth, who had been identified by the project as primary beneficiaries, although the project appraisal report did not explicitly link the selection to preferences expressed or to specific knowledge and information about their usefulness for these social groups.</p> <p>4. The PCR rated the criterion as <i>satisfactory/highly satisfactory</i> (5/6), whereas the final rating in IFAD Operational Results Management System (ORMS) is highly <i>satisfactory</i> (6). However, considering the unrealistic design and planning related to the construction of road infrastructures and the establishment of sustainable local development processes in four years in a country with very limited institutional capacity at all levels, as well as the lack of evidence that the supported activities were indeed the most relevant for the intended primary beneficiaries, the PCRV rates the criterion as <i>satisfactory</i> (5), one point below the rating in IFAD ORMS.</p> | |
| Effectiveness | |
| <p>5. Project implementation was affected by several factors and results were short of plans.</p> <p>6. Within Component 1 no road was built, although preparatory studies were completed. Conversely, 74 per cent of planned drinking water infrastructures were completed, reaching 34 villages where safer drinking water became available; and a few pump mechanics, latrine builders and community social workers were trained.</p> <p>7. Component 2 was reasonably effective and the number of participants in capacity development activities was between two to ten times higher than the established target. More than 10,000 persons including CDIT members and NGO staff were trained on technical and management aspects for water and natural resources management, social and road infrastructures, agricultural production. This resulted in 319 micro-projects approved and funded through the project Local Initiatives Development Fund (FIDL). Many CDITs were established, but late in the project life and no information was available on their robustness. Three local community radio broadcasters were also supported, and 28 programmes produced.</p> <p>8. Component 3 delivered, among others, 305 ha of irrigated lots for small-scale producers, improved seeds for several crops, small livestock, fishing kits and partial rehabilitation of two national agricultural research stations. Only anecdotal information on few success stories was reported in the PCR, including a significant increase in mangrove rice yields, diversification of horticultural species grown by women and the introduction of small livestock keeping both for home consumption and market. No evidence was available on number of participants benefitting of these results and immediate subsequent effects.</p> <p>9. Regarding reached beneficiaries, the PCR reports three different sets of figures (see Aperçu du Projet, Résultats et Impact and Annex 1, which respectively report: 79,502 persons and 9,938 households; 22,550 persons; and 75,324 persons and 12,554 households). This raises some doubts on the accuracy of the information made available to the PCR team.</p> <p>10. The PCR rating was moderately unsatisfactory (3), whereas the ORMS rating was moderately satisfactory (4). Based on the available evidence, the PCR assesses effectiveness as <i>moderately unsatisfactory</i> (3).</p> | 3 |

| PCR finding | Rating |
|--|---------------|
| Efficiency | |
| <p>11. Project efficiency was affected by several factors: i) significant delays, 15 months, at start-up before the PCU Coordinator settled in Buba and the unit became operational; ii) cancellation of Component 3 activities following the March 2013 IFAD supervision mission, due to lack of progress; iii) frequent vacancies of technical and monitoring and evaluation staff in the PCU organigram, with consequent task-overload of staff in service; four different IFAD Country Directors during project implementation, and significant delays in the Non-Objection process. In addition, following the April 2012 military coup carried out after a period of political instability, IFAD suspended the loan disbursement until 2013. All this resulted in an overall low disbursement rate of 60 per cent, and 69 per cent for the main IFAD grant.</p> <p>12. Disbursement rates varied significantly across technical components: very low for infrastructures (23 per cent) and economic development (33 per cent), reasonable for capacity development of grassroots organization (60 per cent) and very high for Project management (107 per cent). The latter was partly due to the initial financing of NGO contracts through the Salaries account. Furthermore, the project was extended by one year without additional investments. This resulted in a ratio operating costs/investment of 56.8 per cent, the double of the 23 per cent estimated at appraisal.</p> <p>13. The PCR however notes that the annual audit reports were all positive and that account management and book-keeping were accurate and reliable.</p> <p>14. Thus, the PCRV agrees with the PCR and ORMS assessment of efficiency and rates the criterion as <i>moderately unsatisfactory</i> (3).</p> | 3 |
| Rural poverty impact | |
| <p>15. The discussion of impacts could only be based on the Results and Impact Management System data. These show that the project contributed to: improved marketing through the feeder roads; better access to safe drinking water and to telecommunication through telephones and TV sets in the community cultural centres. The project appears to have significantly contributed to improved household food security, resulting in shorter lean periods, and strong increase in agricultural and animal production and fish catches. Anecdotal evidence of income increases from several initiatives is also reported, including from processing of rice and palm-oil. Conversely, despite the support to school rehabilitation, literacy levels appeared to have decreased over time.</p> <p>16. The project had a positive impact in supporting the creation of grassroots organizations and associations bringing together producers of specific crops or animals, students' parents, users of infrastructures or natural resources, youth. The establishment of CDIT contributed to improving the transparency of community development processes, the emergence of young leaders and the level of intra-community cohesion and collaboration and the FIDL enabled access to finance for micro-projects.</p> <p>17. Male youth appear to have benefitted most from project initiatives, also thanks to the specific focus of the project on this social group. The project was perceived by many of them as an opportunity to engage in productive activities and generate employment and income.</p> <p>18. Keeping in mind that positive impacts were limited in depth and extent and that only limited related evidence was available, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the PCR and ORMS ratings as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4).</p> | 4 |
| Sustainability of benefits | |
| <p>19. The PCR is very critical of the potential sustainability of the positive results achieved by the project. Main reasons comprise the late establishment of the grassroots organisations and institutions, including the CDIT; the persistent isolation of the communities, linked to the failed road construction, and that will affect access to markets; the absence of other planned interventions in the</p> | 3 |

| PCR finding | Rating |
|--|---------------|
| <p>same area that could contribute to consolidate results; the chronic institutional weakness and the uncertain perspectives for political stability.</p> <p>20. The PCRV agrees with and confirms the PCR rating of sustainability as <i>moderately unsatisfactory</i> (3), despite the final ORMS rating for this criterion as moderately satisfactory (4).</p> | |
| B. Other performance criteria | |
| Innovation | |
| <p>21. The PCR considered the project highly innovative. At the national level, its main innovative features included the local development approach, its engagement with and responsibility given to communities in micro-projects identification and management, its multidimensional partnership approach, and its competitive process for the selection of implementation partners. At the regional level, the FIDL was highly innovative thanks to its flexible and inclusive approach to support a variety of micro projects. The PCR thus rated the criterion as highly satisfactory (6), whereas the ORMS rating of the criterion is satisfactory (5).</p> <p>22. With basis on the information available and taking into account that in Guinea Bissau development approaches implemented by IFAD in other countries may have been less common, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the ORMS rating of this criterion as <i>satisfactory</i> (5).</p> | 5 |
| Scaling up | |
| <p>23. The PCR assessed scaling-up as <i>satisfactory</i> (5) in terms of potential scaling up of the innovative features of the project within the country and beyond. The PCR Digest stated that the PCR had not discussed the criterion but assessed it as moderately satisfactory (4). Both analyses however appear to be based only on the potential upscaling that the project experience would deserve, rather than on real evidence of scaling up. Furthermore, the PCR excluded any possible up-coming initiative that would scale-up the innovative aspects of the project and the PCR Digest pointed to the need for more time required to better test the approaches.</p> <p>24. Nevertheless, by the time of writing this PCRV the project 'Economic Development Project for the Southern Regions' - <i>Projet d'appui au développement économique des régions du Sud (PADES)</i> – had been conceived in 2015 to consolidate and upscale the achievements of RRCDP, particularly in the regions of Quinara and Tombali, with a targeted extension in the Bolama-Bijagos. PADES sought to improve and scale up the CDIT model, through significant cofinancing by OPEC (US\$6 million).</p> <p>25. Thus, in the long-term IFAD succeeded in launching a new initiative that aimed at scaling up the RRCDP experience. This meets IOE definition of 'scaling up', based on the actual achievements in terms of uptake of models. Thus, the PCRV assesses this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4).</p> | 4 |
| Gender equality and women's empowerment | |
| <p>26. The PCR reports different figures, in the range 51 to 57 per cent, regarding women's share among the beneficiaries of the project. Most useful to women were the literacy courses, which were also assessed as empowering, the drinking water infrastructures and the health centres.</p> <p>27. Although women were a slight majority of their membership, they represented only 25 per cent of the grassroots organization leadership, usually in the role of treasurer. Similarly, women were 12.8 per cent of NGO staff trained by the project.</p> <p>28. The ORMS rating of the criterion, however, is satisfactory (5), based on the emphasis in the PCR Digest on the positive project results on youth, taken as a uniform category whereas the PCR was quite clear about youth beneficiaries being mostly young men.</p> | 4 |

| PCR finding | Rating |
|---|----------------|
| 29. The PCRV concludes that although the project did engage with women thanks to its choice of crops and income-generating activities and the literacy courses, it did not really contribute to women's empowerment and that positive effects on male youth should not be accounted as positive for women. Hence, the PCRV agrees with the PCR and assesses the criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4). | |
| Environment and natural resources management | |
| 30. The PCR states that the project had limited negative impact on the environment, considering the focus on non-intensive agricultural and animal production practices. In addition, one project component contributed to the sustainable management of the Cantanhez forest, by developing capacities and fostering collaborative management among the riverine communities. | 4 |
| 31. Overall, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the PCR and ORMS ratings as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4). | |
| Adaptation to Climate Change | |
| 32. The project did not take climate change into account, as it was designed between 2003 and 2007, when climate change was not yet a priority for international organisations. The PCR does not make any single reference to the issue nor provides any insight on possible links between project activities, results and climate change. The ORMS does not rate the criterion either, which therefore cannot be assessed by this PCRV. | Not applicable |
| C. Overall Project Achievement | |
| 33. The RRCDP was an innovative, challenging and relevant project. It aimed at enabling access of isolated communities to markets and communication opportunities, through road and social infrastructures, capacity development and empowerment, while also addressing basic needs such as safe drinking water and improved agricultural production. | 3 |
| 34. The context of implementation was difficult, by targeting the poorest regions of a very poor country at a time of high political instability that culminated in the military coup in 2012. A one-year extension meant to compensate for delays in starting implementation, did not enable achieving the established objectives. | |
| 35. No rural roads were built and only a fraction of the planned social infrastructures was completed. Thus, although communities could improve their social and productive infrastructures through many micro-projects, the major challenges they faced were not removed. Data suggest that agricultural production grew and food security improved; youth engaged and took advantage of the opportunities, also through the local grassroots organizations that emerged to implement the various activities. Women also participated in large numbers, but no information is available on results and impacts from their viewpoint. The PCR itself was very critical of the sustainability of project achievements. | |
| 36. Taking all this into account, the PCRV rates RRCDP's overall achievements as <i>moderately unsatisfactory</i> (3), one point below the PCR and ORMS assessment. | |
| D. Performance of Partners | |
| IFAD | |
| 37. The PCR is quite critical of IFAD performance, starting from the observation of the low number of supervision missions, six out of 10 due. It also states that the supervision mission team composition was not always appropriate to the needs and fiduciary aspects were not adequately addressed. IFAD was also late in responding to the requests for No Objection and in some cases, there was no reply at all. | 3 |

| PCR finding | Rating |
|--|---------------|
| <p>38. These gaps in performance do not appear to be justified, as they all pertain to lack of compliance with corporate procedures. The low level of IFAD's attention to the project was evident in the significant delay in the formal financial closure of the project, that happened in 2020, seven years after actual completion, whereas the PCR was finalized in 2013.</p> <p>39. On the basis of the evidence provided in both PCR and PCR Digest, the PCRV agrees with the ORMS rating and rates this criterion as <i>moderately unsatisfactory</i> (3).</p> | |
| Government | |
| <p>40. The executing agency, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, fulfilled only to some extent the conditions of the loan agreement. Delays were experienced in making the project operational. The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development released only 25 per cent of its counterpart funds and did not implement the road construction component. The Government was not proactive throughout project implementation and bore some responsibility in the very late financial closure of the project.</p> <p>41. The Steering Committee met regularly and frequently, though less in the last year of implementation. Audits were conducted on a regular basis.</p> <p>42. The PCU performance was satisfactory, although it lacked experience in planning, coordination, evaluation and reorientation.</p> <p>43. Overall, the PCRV agrees with and confirms the ORMS rating of this criterion as <i>moderately unsatisfactory</i> (3).</p> | 3 |

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

| PCR finding | Rating |
|---|---------------|
| Scope | |
| <p>44. This PCR was written in 2013, when IFAD used a different template. Hence, the PCRV could not assess the compliance of the document with current standard. The PCR Digest noted that most annexes were missing. Nevertheless, the PCR paid limited attention to some aspects of the intervention which were already important for IFAD at the time, namely women's empowerment and climate change. Hence, the PCRV rates the scope of the PCR as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4), in line with the PCR Digest.</p> | 4 |
| Quality | |
| <p>45. The PCR process appears adequate. Nevertheless, the report presents some weaknesses. The main issue was that the PCR narrative matched its own ratings, several of which were changed in the final PMD assessment as reported in ORMS. This entailed that the PCRV assessed in several cases, narrative and ratings that did not match.</p> <p>46. In terms of PCR contents, the discrepancy in the figures reported in different sections of the report on number of beneficiaries and households reached, including in the percentage of women benefitting of the interventions.</p> <p>47. Moreover, the analysis of gender equality and women's empowerment in the PCR is shallow and weak. Last, by the time the PCR was prepared IFAD had had a climate change strategy for three years, but no mention is made in the report of the criterion.</p> <p>48. The PCRV thus rates the quality of the PCR as <i>moderately unsatisfactory</i> (3).</p> | 3 |
| Lessons | |
| <p>49. The PCR formulates internal and external lessons, which largely discuss the main weaknesses that emerged during implementation and how these should have been addressed. One of the points raised, as an example, was that sufficient supervision missions should be carried out during a project; and that PCU staff</p> | 5 |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>who had not previous experience with IFAD projects should be better supported. The PCR also identifies improvements regarding the implementation model and procurement strategy for rural infrastructures rehabilitation.</p> <p>50. At the same time, a few external lessons highlight the RRCDP positive features, which could be usefully replicated elsewhere. These include the CDIT and FIDL models, the delegation of decision-making authority and the implementation responsibility for micro-projects to communities, and the usefulness of providing incentives to researchers to engage with producers.</p> <p>51. The PCRV rates the quality of the lessons in the PCR as <i>satisfactory</i> (5).</p> | |
| Candour | |
| <p>52. The PCR is reasonably critical and objective in its assessment of project implementation and achievements and IFAD's performance, though it tended to be slightly biased in favour of the Government. Consequently, the PCRV rates the candour of the PCR as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4).</p> | 4 |

V. Final remarks

| | |
|--|--|
| Issues for IOE follow up (if any) | |
| <p>53. This PCR was written in 2013 but the project was financially closed only in 2020 and there are many discrepancies between the PCR and ORMS ratings. These seem to be matters of compliance with corporate rules and procedures that may deserve some flagging by IOE.</p> | |

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 other agencies. | X | Yes |
| Environment and natural resources management | The extent to which IFAD development interventions contribute to resilient livelihoods and ecosystems. The focus is on the use and management of the natural environment, including natural resources defined as raw materials used for socio-economic and cultural purposes, and ecosystems and biodiversity - with the goods and services they provide. | X | Yes |
| Adaptation to climate change | The contribution of the project to reducing the negative impacts of climate change through dedicated adaptation or risk reduction measures. | X | Yes |

| <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 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Project performance | | | |
| Relevance | 6 | 5 | -1 |
| Effectiveness | 4 | 3 | -1 |
| Efficiency | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Sustainability of benefits | 4 | 3 | -1 |
| Project performance^b | 4.25 | 3.5 | -0.75 |
| Other performance criteria | | | |
| Gender equality and women's empowerment | 5 | 4 | -1 |
| Innovation | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Scaling up | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Environment and natural resources management | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Adaptation to climate change | n.a. | n.a. | |
| Overall project achievement^c | 4 | 3 | -1 |
| Performance of partners^d | | | |
| IFAD | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Government | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Average net disconnect | | | 0.36 |

^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 PCRVR rating</i> | <i>Net disconnect</i> |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Candour | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Lessons | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Quality (methods, data, participatory process) | 6 | 3 | -3 |
| Scope | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Overall rating of the project completion report | 4.5 | 4 | -0.75 |

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

| | |
|-------|--|
| CDIT | Village Integrated Development Committee |
| FIDL | Local Development Initiatives Fund |
| IOE | Independent Office of Evaluation |
| ORMS | Operational Results Management System |
| PCR | Project Completion Report |
| PCRV | Project Completion Report Validation |
| PCU | Project Coordination Unit |
| RRCDP | Rural Rehabilitation and Community Development Project |

Bibliography

- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2007. Projet de Réhabilitation Rurale et de Développement Communautaire, Rapport de pré-évaluation.
- _____. 2007. Accord de Don entre la République de Guinée Bissau et le Fonds International de Développement Agricole, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2009. Projet de Réhabilitation Rurale et de Développement Communautaire Rapport de Supervision, Appendices, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2010. Projet de Réhabilitation Rurale et de Développement Communautaire Mission de Suivi, Aide mémoire, juin, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2010. Projet de Réhabilitation Rurale et de Développement Communautaire Rapport de Supervision, décembre, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2010. Amendement à l'Accord de Don entre la République de Guinée Bissau et le Fonds International de Développement Agricole, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2013. Projet de Réhabilitation Rurale et de Développement Communautaire Rapport d'Achèvement, décembre, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2014. Rural Rehabilitation and Community Development Project, Project Completion Report, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2014. Rural Rehabilitation and Community Development Project, Project Completion Report Digest, Rome: IFAD.