

## Project Completion Report Validation

### Livestock and Market Development Programme

#### Kyrgyzstan

Date of validation by IOE: October 2020

## I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m)		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	Near East and North Africa	Total project costs	25.9		21.3	
Country	Kyrgyzstan	IFAD loan and percentage of total	10	39%	9	42%
Loan number	L-I-891	IFAD Grant and percentage of total	10	39%	9.1	43%
Grant number	G-I-DSF-8113					
IFAD project ID	1100001626	National Government	0.6	2%	0.5	2%
Type of project	Livestock	Beneficiaries	5.2	20%	2.7	13%
Financing type	Loan and grant	Other financier	0.08	0.3%	0	0%
Lending terms	Highly concessional					
Date of approval	17/12/2012					
Date of loan signature	13/03/2013					
Date of effectiveness	17/07/2013	Number of beneficiaries	110 000 households** 531 240 beneficiaries (direct and indirect)		145 750 (direct beneficiaries) Males: 72 875 Females: 72 875	
Loan amendments	17/09/2018					
Loan closure extensions	One	Date of completion (original and actual)	30/09/2018		30/09/2019	
Country programme managers	Samir Bejaoui (current); Mikael Kauttu; Frits Andreas Stenbjerg Jepsen	Loan closing date	31/03/2020			
Regional director(s)	Dina Saleh (current); Khalida Bouzar (2020-2019); Nadim Khoury (2008-2011), Mona Bishay (2004-2011)	Mid-term review			29/11/2016	
Project completion report reviewer	Valentina Di Marco	IFAD disbursement: at project completion: Loan (per cent)* Grant (per cent)*			100% 99%	
Project completion report quality control panel	Eoghan Molloy; Fabrizio Felloni	Date of the project completion report			03/04/2020	

\*Source: Oracle Business Intelligence. \*\* Livestock and Market Development Programme (LMDP) Design Report (Logical framework in Project Completion Report (PCR) reporting same number of beneficiaries at appraisal and completion).

## II. Project outline

<b>Country &amp; Project Name</b>	Livestock and Market Development Programme (LMDP), Kyrgyzstan. <sup>1</sup>
<b>Project duration</b>	Total project duration: seven years. Date of effectiveness: 17/07/2013. Available for disbursement: 17/07/2013. Effectiveness Lag: seven months. Original completion date: 30/09/2018. Actual completion date: 30/09/2019. Number of extensions: one. Financial closure: 31/03/2020.
<b>Project goal, objectives, and components</b>	The goal of the programme was to contribute to the reduction in poverty and enhanced economic growth in pasture communities. The programme objective was to generate livestock productivity gains in Issyk-Kul and Naryn Oblasts, reflected in improved and equitable returns to livestock farmers, through three main complementary components and support for project management, namely: (i) community-based pasture management; (ii) livestock health and production services; (iii) market/value chain initiatives; and (iv) project management.
<b>Project area and target group</b>	LMDP covered the eastern regions of Kyrgyzstan (Issyk-Kul and Naryn oblasts, extended in 2014 to include a neighbouring district, Toguz-Toru in Jalalabad oblast). The project's target group comprised: (i) poor livestock households; (ii) small scale processors of livestock products, especially women; (iii) private veterinary service providers; (iv) community pasture committees. The population of the two main oblasts, around 154,000 households, with 71 per cent living in rural areas, were mostly livestock farmers found within 125 Pasture Committees areas. Pasture Committees were the executive body of Pasture User Unions, which represented the interests of all the households that used the pasture areas. On average a Pasture User Union had a membership of 900 households, or about 4,600 people.
<b>Project implementation</b>	The Ministry of Agriculture, Food Industry and Melioration was the lead agency for the overall management of the project, on behalf of the Government of Kyrgyzstan. The specific responsibility for implementation was entrusted mainly to two institutions: the Agricultural Project Implementation Unit (APIU), with the overall responsibility for project implementation, coordination, oversight and reporting to IFAD and the Government; and secondly, the Community Development and Investment Agency (ARIS), a large public organization focused particularly on community-based initiatives, responsible for the implementation and financial management of all project activities at the community level, in particular with regard to Pasture Committees and Pasture User Unions. ARIS was selected for implementing activities at field level, especially those related to support the Pasture User Unions, given its mandate to undertake social mobilization at grassroots level. The project relied on the Veterinary Chamber for training, and the State Veterinary Inspectorate for veterinary public health activities.
<b>Changes during implementation</b>	Two major project design changes occurred during implementation: a) under component 1 (community-based pasture management, and specifically sub-component 1.2: community pasture management and investments), IFAD approved that micro-projects (mostly for infrastructure), initially intended only for Pasture User Unions, be also extended to Pasture Union Associations at rayon level; and b) under component 3 (market/value chain initiatives), insufficient scope and ambitious targets for milk-related investments (i.e. milk collection centres) in the project area led to their replacement with other investments in agricultural and agro-processing enterprises, including crops, to support more diversification of livelihoods. Accordingly, Component 3 outcome was revised at mid-term review (MTR) and redefined as "additional market partnerships in the livestock and horticulture value-chain". The project log frame, however, was not amended to reflect this change.
<b>Financing</b>	The Livestock Market and Development Project was IFAD's fourth investment in the Kyrgyz Republic. It was approved by the Fund's Executive Board on 17 December 2012 and declared effective on 17 June 2013. The project completion date was extended by one year, to 30 September 2019, and financial closing date was 31 March 2020. It was financed by an IFAD loan and grant, each of ca. US\$10 million, (77 per cent of total project cost); a contribution by the Government of about US\$0.6 million (2 per cent of total cost); and a beneficiaries' contribution equivalent to US\$5.2 million (20 per cent of total project cost). An additional contribution of US\$0.08 million (less than 1 per cent of total cost) from the Veterinary Chamber was envisaged at design but did not materialize.

<sup>1</sup> LMPD has been included in the group of the 20 case studies conducted for the "Corporate Level Evaluation on IFAD's support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture". The project case study has benefitted from a field visit during the conduction of the corporate level evaluation.

Table 1  
Project costs (US\$ millions)

Funding source	Appraisal (US\$)	per cent of appraisal costs	Actual (US\$ after MTR)	per cent of actual costs	per cent disbursed
IFAD (loan)	10.0	39%	9.0	42%	100%
IFAD (grant)	10.0	39%	9.1	43%	99%
Government	0.6	2%	0.5	2%	76%
Beneficiaries	5.2	20%	2.7	13%	52%
Veterinary Chamber	0.08	0.3%	0.0	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82%</b>

Source: Operational Results Management System (ORMS), PCR.

Table 2  
Component costs (US\$ millions)

Funding source	Appraisal (US\$)	per cent of appraisal costs	Actual (US\$ after MTR)	per cent of actual costs	per cent disbursed <sup>d</sup>
Community based pasture management	13.1	51%	13.3	62%	102%
Livestock health and production services	10.0	39%	5.9	28%	59%
Market/Value chain initiative	1.3	5%	0.6	3%	43%
Project management	1.5	6%	1.5	7%	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>25.9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82%</b>

Source: ORMS, PCR.

### III. Review of findings

PCR finding	Rating
<b>A. Core Criteria</b>	
<b>Relevance</b>	
<p>1. The PCRV agrees with the PCR's assessment that the LMDP objectives were highly relevant due to the importance of the livestock sector in the Kyrgyz economy and the ongoing challenge to increase its low productivity caused by excessive animal numbers (winter pastures being severely overused and degraded causing declining productivity) and inadequate management.</p> <p>2. LMDP was designed within a sequence of other IFAD projects in the country addressing pasture management, animal health with implications for beneficiaries' livelihoods and market access issues. The Pasture law approved in 2009<sup>3</sup> was the background of IFAD's support for the transformation of the livestock system in Kyrgyzstan. Since its approval, IFAD has co-financed the Agricultural Investments and Services Project with the World Bank<sup>4</sup> and, during a second phase of engagement, LMDP and LMDP II (the latter to be completed by 31/03/2021), as two similar projects to be implemented in two different areas of the country, ensuring an extensive geographical coverage of the whole national area.</p> <p>3. Project objectives in LMDP were aligned with IFAD's strategy for Kyrgyzstan, outlined in the 2018-2022 Country Strategic Opportunities Programme (COSOP),<sup>5</sup></p>	6

<sup>2</sup> Source: PCR.

<sup>3</sup> Some of the important elements of the Law were linked to the transfer of authority for pasture management from oblast and rayon administrations to local government, the delegation of authority for pasture management to Pasture Committees, and compulsory preparation of Community Pasture Management Plans by Pasture Committees. All these elements were pioneered by LMPD and part of piloting technical solutions in the field.

<sup>4</sup> A World Bank project co-financed by IFAD, implemented between 2008 and 2013. It operationalized the Pasture Law approved in 2009 by adopting an adequate legal and institutional framework for the management and use of pastures. It also introduced Pasture User Unions, Pasture Committees and the veterinary services as a private system in Kyrgyzstan.

<sup>5</sup> This COSOP built on the strategic dimensions of the Country Strategy Note prepared in 2016, whose overall objective was to contribute to poverty reduction and enhance economic growth in pastoral communities. The Country Strategy Note had two strategic objectives. Strategic objective 1 was to improve livestock productivity and enhance the climate resilience of pastoral communities, reflected in improved and equitable

<b>PCR finding</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<p>as well as with the government’s priorities to support agricultural and livestock development.</p> <p>4. The LMDP objectives were highly relevant due to the importance of the livestock sector in the Kyrgyz economy. The component on community-based pasture management was designed within the institutional context of Kyrgyzstan’s Pasture Law and supported the piloting of technical solutions in the field for Pasture User Unions, such as improved access to summer pasture and pasture rotations. The component on animal health, based on the reform of the veterinary system and the national vaccination campaigns, addressed the absence of a solid public or private animal health system, and the resulting negative impacts on animal productivity and human health. Finally, the third component was ambitiously designed to create market partnerships in the milk value chain, providing incentives for productivity increases from dairy processing. At MTR, because of the insufficient scope for milk-related investments, the target was downscaled and investments diverted to support other types of agro-processing enterprises.</p> <p>5. The implementation arrangements for LMDP responded to the need of combining pasture management interventions and health plans at several levels (state, private and community). In particular, the APIU had the overall responsibility for project implementation, coordination, oversight and reporting to IFAD and the Government, while ARIS worked closely with Pasture User Unions to develop integrated pasture and animal health plans (Community Pasture Management Plans), with a community driven approach aiming to incorporate needs and priorities of poor and women. Furthermore, the partnership with the World Animal Health Organization (OIE) benefitted the institutional agenda on modernization and privatization of the veterinary system, as well as the alignment of the reforms with international standards.</p> <p>6. The targeting approach was relevant and in line with the 2018-2022 COSOP. The PCR highlighted the combination of a geographical targeting (based on poverty and livestock production indicators) and direct household targeting (Pasture User Unions living in the areas selected). Within these communities, project target groups were identified as vulnerable households, women headed households, other livestock producer households and community veterinarians. Despite the emphasis on the need for a youth strategy in the COSOP, LMDP did not specifically target this group and no disaggregated data was provided at project completion.</p> <p>7. LMDP’s design explicitly outlined its theory of change. The internal logic among components was overall coherent and adequate to meet the intervention’s outcomes and relied on strong linkages particularly between component 1 and component 2. As acknowledged by the PCR, value chain component 3 had to be revised at MTR, as the project came to realize that the set target was too ambitious as some key political and economic changes that occurred in the country (i.e. Kyrgyzstan joining the Eurasian Union and Kazakhstan’s ban on dairy imports from Kyrgyzstan) contributed to a drastic decrease in the volumes of milk processed by dairy processors.</p> <p>8. LMDP design was relevant in the context of previous projects and the evolving institutional framework of pasture management. The adjustments made at mid-term contributed to the responsiveness and flexibility of the project to retain relevance. Based on the above, the PCRV rates the relevance of LMDP as <b>highly satisfactory (6)</b>, in line with the PCR rating.</p>	
<b>Effectiveness</b>	
<p>9. According to the PCR and its logical framework,<sup>6</sup> LMDP reached the exact number of households planned (27,500 households, 145,750 individuals, of which 50 per cent women), because of the corresponding planned number of Pasture User Unions benefitting from the programme. The assessment of physical targets and outputs</p>	5

returns to livestock farmers. Strategic objective 2 was to improve access and integration of smallholder livestock farmers with remunerative markets for their products, leading to increased and equitable returns.

<sup>6</sup> Both in the PCR and in ORMS.

<b>PCR finding</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<p>achieved by LMDP is based on the review of the project logical framework (Appendix I of the PCR).</p> <p>10. Component 1 (community-based pasture management) was achieved through the development of community plans and micro projects. The target of 100 plans was surpassed with the 127 plans developed and implemented in all Pasture User Unions supported (100 per cent of target). The target of collection of fees was achieved as well (89 per cent in 2017 and 104 per cent in 2019, against a target of 92 per cent). Training sessions on technical subjects, governance matters, and financial issues were organized in support of Pasture User Unions. Component 1 was also achieved through the development of micro projects (target 100 projects), although the target's over-achievement (more than 700 projects) was justified by having Pasture User Unions implementing several projects at the same time.</p> <p>11. The results under component 2 (livestock health and production services) were led by ARIS. Several targets were achieved under this component (the number of private veterinarians trained with the cooperation of the Veterinary Chamber, the number of veterinary packages distributed, and the number of operational businesses established). The objective of providing educational support measured by the number of young veterinarians enrolled in University courses (37 out of the 120 originally planned actually graduated) was not fully achieved. It is notable to mention how the cooperation between LMDP and OIE resulted in a successful promotion of a nationwide vaccination campaign for brucellosis (sheep) and echinococcosis (dogs), implemented through private veterinarians and mobilized by the State Veterinary Inspectorate. These diseases ultimately affect the farmers' own health as well as their ability to export animals, meat and milk products. A nationwide campaign of vaccination of sheep against brucellosis was undertaken, targeting a total of 9.2 million heads from 2014 to 2018. In addition, 450,000 dogs were treated against echinococcosis and provided with dog identification documents. As a result, the prevalence of brucellosis in humans, which is directly linked to the prevalence in animals, decreased from 4,500 cases per year (2011) to 787 cases (2018), while the echinococcosis decreased from 1,181 cases in 2014 to 906 in 2018, meeting the log-frame target of 15 per cent.</p> <p>12. Component 3 on market and value chain represented the weak part of LMDP. The level of milk production was not significant enough to support market development and the original target was scaled down at mid-term, with the number of Milk Collection Centres reduced from 30 to 10. The PCR draws the lesson that, where large scale animal health and breeding operations are undertaken, the adequate surge in milk production for market surplus usually takes five to seven years to become a reality, hence market support would be more relevant for future IFAD projects. The design adjustment at MTR allowed diversification of investments through support to other agricultural and agro-processing enterprises, without, however, amending the project logframe.</p> <p>13. Based on the information available in the PCR, satisfactory levels of accomplishments are reported for most of the activities under the first and second components. In particular, the support to Pasture User Unions demonstrated effectiveness and replicability in future projects. Achievements under the third component were mixed, but the adjustments at MTR helped redirecting efforts towards other production activities for the diversification of livelihoods. Overall, effectiveness is rated <b>satisfactory (5)</b> by the PCR, in agreement with PCR rating.</p>	
<b>Efficiency</b>	
<p>14. LMDP effectiveness lag was seven months (lower than NEN region's average 11.2 months between IFAD8 and IFAD10). The project completion date was delayed one year (from 30/09/2018 to 30/09/2019) upon the Government of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan's request. The financial agreement was amended accordingly.</p> <p>15. Project management costs at completion were 7 per cent, slightly higher than the estimate at design (6 per cent), but still below the IFAD average.<sup>7</sup> A Project Coordination Group was established to provide guidance on project management.</p>	5

<sup>7</sup> Estimated at 12.7 per cent in the 2019 Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRI) produced by IOE.

<b>PCR finding</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<p>The two implementation entities (ARIS and APIU) had adequate staffing and were able to remain on track with the project's implementation. An issue was raised in the 2017 supervision report regarding a cautionary assessment related to the need to follow more strictly staff hiring procedures. The PCR concluded that the project responded in a timely manner by duly applying the remedial recommendations to solve the issue.</p> <p>16. LMDP procurement was set up by following IFAD's Guidelines with adequate procurement capacity in place. An adequate monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) system was established and staff in the M&amp;E unit comprised a Chief M&amp;E and Gender Specialist, an M&amp;E and Knowledge Management Specialist and an M&amp;E Assistant. LMDP adopted a Knowledge Management strategy which supported the national vaccination campaign with several information and communication. The project M&amp;E system also incorporated data from an outcome survey (2018), a mid-term survey (2016) and a baseline survey (2014). However, the PCR acknowledged that the three surveys were conducted late into the project by three different service providers.</p> <p>17. The project internal rate of return was estimated at 18 per cent at completion (net present value 10 per cent, for a period of 10 years of benefits' amortization), below the initial target of 28 per cent at the time of project design. According to the PCR, this difference was attributable to some key political and economic changes that occurred in the country, i.e. Kyrgyzstan joining the Eurasian Union and Kazakhstan's ban on dairy imports from Kyrgyzstan, which affected the Kyrgyz economy in the middle of project implementation. The PCR calculated quantifiable benefits with different internal rate of return models (Appendix 4 of the PCR) and, for all activities, incremental benefits were estimated: (i) pasture user unions (58 per cent); (ii) milk processing (52 per cent); and (iii) gardening as a value chain initiative (25 per cent).</p> <p>18. Based on the performance in efficiency above described, this PCRV rates the criterion as <b>satisfactory (5)</b>, in line with the PCR rating.</p>	
<b>Rural poverty impact</b>	
<p>19. The assessment of the project's impact on rural poverty in the PCR is based on the data retrieved from the project M&amp;E system, which incorporated data from an outcome survey (conducted only for component 1 and 2) undertaken in 2018, a baseline survey in 2014 and a mid-term survey in 2016.</p> <p>20. According to the PCR, the three survey reports were of good quality, adequate rigour and depth, confirmed by the detailed description of outcomes under Appendix 4 of the PCR (project detailed analysis on internal rate of return). However, some figures provided more conclusive results for some activities (increase of supplementary feed for livestock, payment of pasture fees, pasture related conflicts, zoonotic diseases, market partnerships) than others (better access to summer pastures, with no specific information on the season when surveys were conducted).</p> <p>21. With reference to household incomes and assets, the project was expected to increase the household asset ownership index by 25 per cent of total target households (27,500). However, according to the outcome survey results, when compared with the baseline and mid-term values, only 10.2 per cent target was achieved. The PCR did not mention any additional impact data for this indicator and no specific additional information supported the assumption of an increase in the target population's incomes and asset ownership.</p> <p>22. LMDP contributed to human and social capital development by establishing the Pasture User Unions and supporting them to become operational. The participation of the beneficiaries ensured ownership and the establishment of best practices in pasture management. Private veterinarians received technical and capacity building training through the Veterinary Chamber and by institutions such as the Kyrgyz National Agrarian University and the Kyrgyz Scientific Research Veterinary Institut. Significant impact on human capital has also been obtained through the drastic reduction in human brucellosis, as a result of the wide national awareness and vaccination campaigns promoted by LMDP. The reduction of human brucellosis</p>	5

<b>PCR finding</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<p>(from 4,500 cases in 2011 to 787 in 2018) had an impact on livelihoods as well as animal health, allowing to address both production diseases affecting productivity, through the private veterinarians, and zoonotic diseases affecting public health, through public services.<sup>8</sup> Animal and pasture productivity, as well as measurement of daily milk yields were partially assessed in the PCR, due to late database set up only towards project's completion (limited to 2018 and 2019). The PCR itself recommended to fill the gap by compiling the data for the whole project duration.</p> <p>23. According to the PCR, LMDP reported a satisfactory impact on food security, linked to the objective of improving livestock productivity and securing a better diet. The log frame indicators assessed a positive impact on food security by measuring the monthly consumption of meat and dairy products increased by 10 per cent for 30 per cent of households (target 15 per cent of households). The PCR also indicated the results from the outcome survey against the log-frame indicator on nutrition, i.e. 'Reduction on the prevalence of child malnutrition by 10 per cent' by project end: (i) undernourishment reduced by 30.9 per cent in 2014 and by 20.2 per cent in 2018; (ii) child underweight halved (from 6.5 per cent to 3.2 per cent); and (iii) severe acute malnutrition unvaried (3.5 per cent). However, Appendix 4 of the PCR does not include more detailed information on the methodology underpinning the measurement of these nutrition-specific results.</p> <p>24. Finally, as for institutions and policies, LMDP contributed to the development of the legal framework governing the use of pastures (providing training and legal expertise to Pasture User Unions) and the establishment of private veterinary practices (based on the new Veterinary Law signed in 2014). A project contract with OIE helped align the veterinary legal framework with international standards. Furthermore, LMDP supported the establishment of the Pasture Users Association to represent the Pasture User Unions at the national level.</p> <p>25. Based on the above findings, this PCRV rates rural poverty impact as <b>satisfactory (5)</b>, in agreement with the PCR rating.</p>	
<b>Sustainability of benefits</b>	
<p>26. According to the PCR, the following factors have contributed to the increased likelihood of LMDP's benefits being sustained: (i) the community-driven approach based on the development of Pasture User Unions, involved in prioritization and decision-making processes from the outset; (ii) increased collection of pasture fees supporting Pasture User Unions in managing, implementing and maintaining their projects; (iii) establishment of the Community Seed Fund programme, a revolving fund managed by the local community; (iv) cooperation with the Veterinary Chamber to register and develop training modules for private veterinarians; (v) supply of veterinary kits and motorbikes as well as establishment of veterinary clinics, combined with state animal disease control programmes to increase outreach and income for private veterinarians; (vi) support to pasture research programmes in cooperation with state organizations, such as the State Veterinary and Phytosanitary Security Inspectorate and Veterinary Research Institute; (vii) establishment of appropriate systems for operation and maintenance of the equipment and infrastructure provided under the project, with the support of Pasture User Unions.</p> <p>27. The PCR highlighted how some of the activities under LMDP may need further support to become sustainable in the long-term, such as the Community Seed Fund or the pasture research programmes. However, LMDP has contributed to create an enabling environment in a solid legal framework based on a participatory process and strong commitment by implementers.</p> <p>28. Based on the above, this PCRV rates sustainability as <b>satisfactory (5)</b>, in line with the PCR rating.</p>	5

<sup>8</sup> The responsibilities of the Republican Health Centre were to support the Village Health Committees in the Project areas and help ensure that they worked closely with the Animal Health Sub-Committees and the Community Veterinarians with particular attention to the project implementation of the National Disease Control Programme, for which the project focused on brucellosis and echinococcosis (PCR, para 36).

<i>PCR finding</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<b>B. Other performance criteria</b>	
<b>Innovation</b>	
<p>29. LMPD was designed to scale up innovative interventions in community-based pasture management and animal health, as well as nutrition, which have successfully been piloted by the IFAD/World Bank co-financed Agricultural Investments and Services Project. The programme promoted the implementation of the innovative approach to pasture management introduced by the Pasture Law of 2009 and supported the development of a private community veterinary service based on a fee-for-service business model.<sup>9</sup> These steps have resulted in improved management of pastures and benefits to local smallholders through better grazing management, including use of pasture rotations, enhanced access to summer pastures and improved balance between forage supply and livestock numbers. In addition, LMDP has paved the way in privatising and modernizing veterinary services in the region. The development of Pasture User Unions has also led to the increased payment of pasture fees, the reduction of pasture related conflicts and, due to the Animal Health Sub Committees, to the reduction in incidence of two important animal health issues (brucellosis and echinococcosis). As a result of forward-thinking legislation (2009 Pasture Law, 2018 Veterinary Law and 2019 Animal Identification Law), supported by projects such as LMDP, Kyrgyzstan is now seen as a regional leader in pasture management and development. Finally, the public private partnership model of contracting private veterinarians to work alongside the public veterinary system, or for the government to pay private vets a fee per vaccine for mass vaccination campaigns can be considerate innovative (and sustainable) channels recognised by OIE as a successful example of public private partnerships.</p> <p>30. Based on the above, this PCRV rates the criterion <b>satisfactory (5)</b>, in line with the Programme Management Department (PMD) rating.</p>	5
<b>Scaling up</b>	
<p>31. LMDP has contributed to the dissemination of Kyrgyzstan’s experience by guiding similar reforms and programmes in other countries, especially in Central Asia and Caucasus countries that have similar backgrounds and issues.<sup>10</sup> It should be noted that, under LMDP, multiple knowledge management events and visits took place with a similar programme on pasture reform in Tajikistan, with LMDP providing operational and policy guidance and mentoring on its successful experience, ultimately bringing positive outcomes to the Tajik programme itself.</p> <p>32. Within Kyrgyzstan, following piloting of institutional and technical arrangements for pasture management reform, effective approaches were upscaled countrywide and embedded in new policy and legislation. The Government of Kyrgyzstan and other development partners (World Bank, the German Agency for International Cooperation and the Food and Agriculture Organization) replicated pasture management approaches in other target areas. At project completion, a total of 454 Pasture Users Unions had been formed in Kyrgyzstan with most pasture communities receiving support under three projects – IFAD’s LMDP and LMDP II, and the World Bank Pasture and Livestock Management Improvement Project. LMDP has also benefitted from consistent government endorsement of project goals and mechanisms from the start, which represented a major contributory factor to the project success.</p> <p>33. In alignment with the PCR, this PCRV rates scaling up <b>highly satisfactory (6)</b>.</p>	6

<sup>9</sup> IOE “Corporate Level Evaluation on IFAD’s support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture” defined LMDP as an innovative project in the categories of social and economic capital innovations.

<sup>10</sup> Case study on LMDP with the IOE “Corporate Level Evaluation on IFAD’s support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture” established that LMDP was in the group of projects that contributed to scaling up and dissemination within the region of the pasture management system and its resulting approach (Tajikistan adopted a national law on pastures in 2013, in 2015 it was the turn of Turkmenistan and in 2017 that of Kazakhstan. Lastly, Uzbekistan approved a pasture law in 2019).



<b>Gender equality and women's empowerment</b>	
<p>34. The project was designed with a central focus on improving gender roles and gender relations in the target communities, a priority which was supported during project implementation. LMDP had one M&amp;E and Gender Specialist at the APIU and one Gender/Poverty Specialist in ARIS. However, a Gender Strategy and Action Plan for LMDP-I was developed and approved by IFAD only following the supervision mission in 2017, after the issue of a lacking gender strategy had already been raised during the supervision mission in 2014.</p> <p>35. LMDP has mostly contributed, under component 3, to establish women's participation through partnerships between farmer groups and processor/market intermediaries and by increasing the number of women groups able to reinvest profits (162 per cent of target achieved). The introduction of 30 per cent minimum women membership quotas in Pasture Committees yielded the tripling of their membership over the 2016-2019 period. Furthermore, the outcome survey showed an increase in fixed assets of Women Headed Households, over the 2014-2018 period, by 8.5 per cent, against 7.4 per cent of Men Headed Households over the same period.</p> <p>36. However, the targeted number of women as member of Pasture User Unions has been reached by 65 per cent and only 1 Pasture User Union out of 127 had a woman as chair. Similarly, animal health committees on animal health concerns, functioning to provide support to Pasture Committees, reached only 40 per cent of targeted member groups of women. The target of new female private veterinarians with upgraded skills entering practice has only reached 10 per cent of target, justified in the PCR by the lack of interest in a traditionally male profession.</p> <p>37. The above being said, there is a need to support further women's economic empowerment and leadership through an inclusive and more gender-sensitive social mobilization approach within Pasture User Unions communities. The design completion report of LMDP II has built on the lessons and findings of LMDP to ensure that women are able to play as active roles as possible in ensuring their priorities are heard, offering an opportunity to scale up the comprehensive gender strategy set out in the LMDP. Because of the limitations indicated above, this PCR rates the criterion <b><i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i></b>, one rating below the PCR.</p>	4
<b>Environment and natural resources management</b>	
<p>38. According to the PCR, LMDP has supported the sustainable governance and integrated management of pasturelands by targeting pastoral communities with innovative approaches to adopt sound productive herding practices, which contribute to significantly improving rangelands and the quality of livestock. Investments in pasture infrastructure to support businesses of rural communities were compliant with national regulations on environment, labor and occupational safety. The protection of pasture also contributed to preserve the biodiversity by increasing the diversity of flora and by protecting insects and even fauna. The pastures effectively managed showed a greater aerial and underground biomass, with a positive impact on the environment.</p> <p>39. The establishment of Pasture User Unions and the development of Community Pasture Management Plans have significantly contributed to improve pasture management; because of poor vegetal cover and nature of soils, pastures are indeed subject to severe degradation and erosion processes, mostly due to overgrazing and excessive trampling of animals.</p> <p>40. According to the PCR,<sup>11</sup> reports from supervision missions and interviews with beneficiaries demonstrated that LMDP has contributed to positive outcomes on the environment, despite not having any indicators in the logical framework to support these claims. Nonetheless, the improved environmental conditions of pasture lands still represent a challenge without a meaningful change in husbandry practices, whose common strategy is to access continuously to new pasturelands.</p> <p>41. LMDP has started a work in progress to tackle several main environment issues related to pasturelands by establishing Community Pasture Management Plans and Pasture User Unions and by building environmental awareness through a national</p>	5

<sup>11</sup> PCR, Appendix 5: Environmental social and climate impact assessment.

<p>pasture management strategy. Despite the few shortcomings described above, this PCRV rates environment and natural resources management as <b>satisfactory (5)</b> in line with the PCR.</p>	
<b>Adaptation to Climate Change</b>	
<p>42. The project was designed before requirements of social, environmental and climate assessment procedures were put in place; therefore, no specific adaptation strategy was developed for the project and there was no clear analysis of climate risks to determine the most appropriate responses to climate change. Despite this, interventions of LMDP have contributed to increasing the resilience of livestock herders to respond to climatic shocks such as drought. Well-managed pastoral systems, as supported by LMPD, are adaptive forms of agriculture in areas that are too dry, cold, or mountainous to practice crop farming. LMDP contribution to infrastructure also provided livestock stakeholders with more options to react to changing environmental conditions – in particular, to weather hazards induced by climate change, raising communities’ awareness of the risks of climate change and adaptation options.</p> <p>43. Micro project activities provided trainings to 10,000 Pasture User Unions’ members on climate change and adaptation as of 2018. LMDP has also collaborated with the Kyrgyz Scientific Research Livestock and Pasture Institute and the Association of Pasture User Unions “Kyrgyz Jaiyty” to undertake together the collection and re-seeding of natural pasture plants in selected degraded areas as a result of climate change. The project has also introduced the use of Geographic Information System technology to better assess the availability of fodder over different periods of the year.</p> <p>44. Under LMDP, APIU hired a national climate change specialist in 2016, to undertake a review of climate related policies and investment projects in Kyrgyzstan, as well as to support the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Industry and Melioration in the development of Strategy for Pasture Management and Livestock Development 2019-2023, which included a section on climate change adaptation.</p> <p>45. Despite not having a detailed climate change strategy, LMDP has contributed to create a favourable environment for LMDP II (currently mainstreaming climate change with the establishment of warning systems for extreme climatic events). On balance, this PCR rates adaptation to climate change as <b>moderately satisfactory (4)</b> in line with the PCR.</p>	4
<b>C. Overall Project Achievement</b>	
<p>46. At the end of project life, LMDP displayed a picture of a solid success. The project developed the legal framework governing the use of pastures, by piloting a new institutional and operational community-driven model of Pasture User Unions. The development of Community Pasture Management Plans, inclusive of both Pasture Management and Animal Health Plans, as well as micro-projects, strengthened the community-based management of collective pastures, advocating for government support to Pasture User Unions for investments in pasture facilities and infrastructure. LMDP also played a crucial role in privatizing and modernizing the veterinary services, including contracting private veterinarians to carry out state-mandated vaccination and disease control programmes, a first-time initiative for the country. Finally, the partnership with OIE paved the way in the adoption of international standards.</p> <p>47. The PCRV rates the overall programme achievement as <b>satisfactory (5)</b>, in line with the PCR rating.</p>	5
<b>D. Performance of Partners</b>	
<b>IFAD</b>	
<p>48. IFAD was proactively engaged throughout the implementation of LMDP. The adjustments under component 3 at MTR demonstrated IFAD’s flexibility to change project approach vis-a-vis the ambitious initial targets. IFAD conducted four supervision missions, one implementation support mission and a MTR, all timely</p>	5

<p>organized and supported by adequate international expertise. The continued engagement of the same core team over the years were critical in addressing the main implementation issues faced during project life, while ensuring continuity and depth in the support, and providing hands-on training and expanding local capacities. IFAD was responsive and prompt regarding procurement reviews, annual work plan and budget reviews and loan administration, which have been satisfactory over the years.</p> <p>49. During the implementation of LMDP, IFAD has established relevant partnerships with local institutions, such as: (i) the National Pasture User Association, to support capacity building and protect rights of Pasture User Unions; (ii) the State Veterinary Inspectorate, the main implementing partner for the national disease control campaigns; (iii) the Veterinary Chamber, in charge of registering the private veterinarians, assessing their qualifications, and monitoring the implementation of the professional code of conduct; (iv) the Kyrgyz Veterinary Research Institute, in charge of conducting post-vaccination monitoring campaigns; (v) the Kyrgyz National Livestock and Pasture Research Institute, showcasing demonstrations on pasture restoration techniques; (vi) the Pasture Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, mostly involved in policy formulation, and pasture monitoring; and finally (vii) the Kyrgyz National Agrarian University – Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, mobilized by the project to train the young veterinarians originating from LMDP regions.</p> <p>50. The PCRV rating for the performance of IFAD is <b>satisfactory (5)</b>, in line with the PCR rating.</p>	
<b>Government</b>	
<p>51. According to the PCR, consistent government support, full endorsement of the project goals, and institutional backing from the outset was a major contributory factor to the project success. The Government of the Kyrgyz Republic was proactive in fulfilling its functions during project implementation and adequate funds were released on time for project implementation. It also adequately addressed project supervision and implementation support recommendations throughout project life. Most local government units were supportive of Pasture User Unions activities. It is likely that agreements in the future between local government units and Pasture User Unions will be operational on a long-term basis.</p> <p>52. A constructive tripartite partnership amongst IFAD, the Kyrgyz government and OIE has been established during LMDP implementation, as an example of a comprehensive holistic approach to work actively in pasture and forest management. In particular, this partnership has led to institutional reforms and ensured a high level of commitment of the Government to undertake them (i.e. improving the compliance of veterinary services with international standards).</p> <p>53. In light of the ongoing support from the government, this PCRV rates government performance as <b>satisfactory (5)</b>, in line with the PCR.</p>	5

#### IV. Assessment of PCR quality

<b>PCR finding</b>	<b>Rating</b>
<b>Scope</b>	
<p>54. The PCR contains all chapters, sections, and annexes as per the Guidelines for Programme Completion Review (2015) and provides substantive and relevant content. This PCRV rates the scope of the PCR as <b>satisfactory (5)</b>.</p>	5
<b>Quality</b>	
<p>55. The completion report is overall well-written and provides a good picture of the project's main achievements, including strengths and weaknesses. The document is well balanced between quantitative and qualitative data. This PCRV rates the completion report quality as <b>satisfactory (5)</b>.</p>	5

<b>Lessons</b>	
56. The PCR contains relevant lessons and knowledge generated from the project. The completion report provides important inputs for future projects in areas such as community-driven approach, partnerships, government support. The PCRV rates the lessons of the completion report as <b>satisfactory (5)</b> .	5
<b>Candour</b>	
57. The PCR narrative is objective and conducts a fair balance between the achievements and shortcomings. The PCRV rates the candour of the completion report as <b>satisfactory (5)</b> .	5

## V. Final remarks

<b>Issues for IOE follow up (if any)</b>
No issues have been identified for follow up by IOE.

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

Criteria	Definition *	Mandatory	To be rated
<b>Rural poverty impact</b>	Impact is defined as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions.	X	Yes
	<i>Four impact domains</i>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household income and net assets: Household income provides a means of assessing the flow of economic benefits accruing to an individual or group, whereas assets relate to a stock of accumulated items of economic value. The analysis must include an assessment of trends in equality over time.</li> </ul>		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human and social capital and empowerment: Human and social capital and empowerment include an assessment of the changes that have occurred in the empowerment of individuals, the quality of grass-roots organizations and institutions, the poor's individual and collective capacity, and in particular, the extent to which specific groups such as youth are included or excluded from the development process.</li> </ul>		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Food security and agricultural productivity: Changes in food security relate to availability, stability, affordability and access to food and stability of access, whereas changes in agricultural productivity are measured in terms of yields; nutrition relates to the nutritional value of food and child malnutrition.</li> </ul>		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutions and policies: The criterion relating to institutions and policies is designed to assess changes in the quality and performance of institutions, policies and the regulatory framework that influence the lives of the poor.</li> </ul>		No
<b>Project performance</b>	Project performance is an average of the ratings for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of benefits.	X	Yes
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, institutional priorities and partner and donor policies. It also entails an assessment of project design and coherence in achieving its objectives. An assessment should also be made of whether objectives and design address inequality, for example, by assessing the relevance of targeting strategies adopted.	X	Yes
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.	X	Yes
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.	X	Yes
Sustainability of benefits	The likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. It also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.	X	Yes
<b>Other performance criteria</b>			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	The extent to which IFAD interventions have contributed to better gender equality and women's empowerment, for example, in terms of women's access to and ownership of assets, resources and services; participation in decision making; work load balance and impact on women's incomes, nutrition and livelihoods.	X	Yes
Innovation	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction.	X	Yes
Scaling up	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have been (or are likely to be) scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector, and 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>
<b>Overall project achievement</b>	This provides an overarching assessment of the intervention, drawing upon the analysis and ratings for rural poverty impact, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of benefits, gender equality and women's empowerment, innovation, scaling up, as well as environment and natural resources management, and adaptation to climate change.	X	Yes
<b>Performance of partners</b>			
• IFAD	This criterion assesses the contribution of partners to project design, execution, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation. The performance of each partner will be assessed on an individual basis with a view to the partner's expected role and responsibility in the project life cycle.	X	Yes
• Government		X	Yes

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

## Rating comparison<sup>a</sup>

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Programme Management Department (PMD) rating</i>	<i>IOE Project Completion Report Validation (PCRVR) rating</i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (PCRVR-PMD)</i>
<b>Rural poverty impact</b>	5	5	0
<b>Project performance</b>			
Relevance	6	6	0
Effectiveness	5	5	0
Efficiency	5	5	0
Sustainability of benefits	5	5	0
<b>Project performance</b>	5.25	5.25	0
<b>Other performance criteria</b>			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	5	4	-1
Innovation	5	5	0
Scaling up	6	6	0
Environment and natural resources management	5	5	0
Adaptation to climate change	4	4	0
<b>Overall project achievement<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Performance of partners<sup>d</sup></b>			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	5	5	0
<b>Average net disconnect</b>			<b>-0.08</b>

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

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

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

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

### Ratings of the project completion report quality

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

## **Abbreviations and Acronyms**

APIU	Agricultural Projects Implementation Unit
ARIS	Community Development and Investment Agency
COSOP	Country Strategic Opportunities Programme
LMDP	Livestock and Market Development Project
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR	Mid-term Review
PMD	Programme Management Department
OIE	World Animal Health Organization
ORMS	Operational Results Management System
Rayon	District level of administration



## **Bibliography**

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2010. RBDP Project Concept Note.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2012. LMDP Project Design Report.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2013. LMDP II Project Design Report.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2014. LMDP Supervision Report.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2015. LMDP Supervision Report.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2016. LMDP Mid-Term Review.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2017. LMDP Supervision Report.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018-2022. Kyrgyz Republic: Country strategic opportunities programme.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2020. LMDP Project Completion Report.