

Project Completion Report Validation

**Agricultural, Fishery and Forestry Productive Systems Development Programme
in RAAN and RAAS Indigenous Territories – NICARIBE**
Republic of Nicaragua
Date of validation by IOE: November 2019

I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m)		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	Latin America and the Caribbean	Total project costs	14.94		14.01	
Country	Nicaragua	IFAD DSF-loan and percentage of total	4.00	27%	3.99	28%
Loan and grant number	L-I-830; G-I-DSF-8071	IFAD DSF-grant and percentage of total	4.00	27%	3.99	28%
Type of project (subsector)	Rural Development	Government of Nicaragua	1.41	9%	1.14	8%
Financing type	IFAD initiated and co-financed	BCIE/CABEI	4.00	27%	3.65	26%
Lending terms*	DSF-Highly Concessional/Grant					
Date of approval	15 Dec 2010					
Date of loan signature	27 Sept 2011	Beneficiaries	1.53	10%	1.24	9%
Date of effectiveness	11 Jan 2012	Other sources				
Loan amendments	2	Number of beneficiaries	10,580 families or 55,016 people		14,072 families or 73,174 people	
Loan closure extensions	1	Project completion date	31 Mar 2017		30 Sep 2018	
Country programme managers	Juan Diego Ruiz Cumplido (2017-) Ladislao Rubio (2002-2016)	Loan closing date	30 Sept 2017		31 March 2018	
Regional director(s)	Rossana Polastri Joaquin Lozano Josefina Stubbs	Mid-term review			02 Sept 2015	
Project completion report reviewer	Jorge Carballo	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)			99.99%	
Project completion report quality control panel	Fumiko Nakai Fabrizio Felloni	Date of the project completion report			30 March 2018	

Source: Project Completion Report-NICARIBE 2017.

* There are four types of lending terms. Under the Debt Sustainable Framework, this was a 50 per cent grant and a 50 per cent special loan on highly concessional terms, free of interest but bearing a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75 per cent) per annum and having a maturity period of 40 years, including a grace period of 10 years.

II. Programme outline

1. **Introduction.** IFAD's Executive Board approved the Agricultural, Fishery and Forestry Productive Systems Development Programme in the North Caribbean Coast Autonomous Region (RACCN) and the South Caribbean Coast Autonomous Region (RACCS) Indigenous Territories (NICARIBE) in December 2010. The financing agreement was signed in September 2011 and it became effective in January 2012. The programme's completion was in September 2017, after a six-month extension, for a total duration of 5.7 years.¹ The financing was closed in March 2018.
2. The programme came as a response to one of the priorities for the Government of Nicaragua, which focused on promoting local economic development, poverty reduction, sustainable human development and governance improvement in the Autonomous Regions and the *Alto Wangki-Bocay* region. The programme identified five key areas for economic development: i) sustainable exploitation of forest resources; ii) sustainable exploitation of fisheries; iii) cocoa production; iv) root and tuber production; and v) value adding.
3. **Programme area.** NICARIBE covered seven territories: i) the Territory of Laguna de Perlas and Kukra Hill, in the RACCS; ii) the Territory of Wanky Maya in the Coco River, Municipality of Waspan, (RACCS); and iii) four indigenous territories (Matumbak, Tuahka, Mayangna Sauni Bas and Tasba Pri) in the Municipalities of Bonanza, Rosita and Puerto Cabezas (RACCN). The Caribbean Coast Region has a special autonomous status defined by the Constitution of 1987 (Law 28 and Law No. 445) which recognizes *to the indigenous people and ethnic communities, the right of use, administration and management of traditional lands and their natural resources*.²
4. The RACCN and RACCS regions have 12 of the 15 poorest municipalities in Nicaragua and 14 of the 20 municipalities in these regions have a low Human Development Index (less than 0.5). According to the World Food Programme, half of the population living in the Caribbean Coast suffers from food insecurity (in normal production and climate conditions) and 29.3 per cent of children (less than 5 years old) suffer from chronic malnutrition. According to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, 23 per cent of the country's rural poor (341,000 people) and 19.6 per cent of the extreme poor population (119,000 people) live in the Caribbean region.
5. Historical, economic, political and environmental factors have triggered and increased poverty in the Caribbean Coast. Displacement of rural population during the war period (1981-1986), weak land tenure's rights for indigenous and afro descendant population, limited productive infrastructure and access to market and recurrent natural disaster damaging infrastructure and agricultural production are some of the challenges faced by the rural areas in these regions.
6. **Programme goal, objectives and components.** The *programme goal* was to improve the income levels of 10,580 families in indigenous and afro-descendants territories of Caribbean Coast selected for the intervention of the programme, promoting increased production and sustainable management and use of natural resources.
7. The programme *specific objectives* were to: i) raise the incomes of beneficiary families; ii) strengthen the management capacity of local organizations and the seven territorial governments; and iii) build institutional capacity on fiduciary issues.
8. The programme had *three components*:

¹ From effectiveness date to completion date.

² NICARIBE Project Design 2010.

- Component I: *Productive development*. This component supported activities for the implementation of Territorial Plans that would be in line with the projects proposed by groups of beneficiaries, women, rural youth and communities. The component included a capitalization fund to finance investment and technical assistance.
 - Component II: *Strengthening of institutions capacities*. This component included the activities aimed at strengthening capacity of beneficiaries, communities, territorial authorities and organizations, as well as the support for developing project proposals and Territorial Development Plans.
 - Component III: *Programme management, monitoring and evaluation*. This component was to support a National Coordination Committee located in the Ministry of Development of the Caribbean Coast and two Regional Coordination Committees, one in each Regional Government, as well as the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.
9. **Target group.** The target group included: i) the poor rural indigenous and Afro-descendant population of three agro ecological zones; and ii) the rural poor population who are not indigenous or Afro-descendant but settled in the programme area and recognized by the territorial authorities.³ There are approximately 100 communities in the targeted territories, with a total of 70,000 people and approximately 20,000 families. Agricultural production of these families is highly vulnerable due to adverse weather conditions (tropical storms) and risk of floods even under normal weather conditions.
 10. Under the autonomous status previously described in paragraph 3, agriculture is practiced through family farming. Their plots vary in size but on average, the area is considerable, approximately 35.25 hectares or more. However, the cultivated area is significantly smaller (3.52 hectares on average). The indigenous and Afro-descendant production system is diversified and includes the production of grains, tubers, banana, plantains, fruit trees, pig farming and, to a lesser extent, small herds of cattle.
 11. **Financing.** At design, NICARIBE had a total budget of US\$14.95 million (see Table 1) financed as follows: IFAD financing through the Debt Sustainable Framework with a loan of US\$4.00 million and a grant of US\$4.00 million (amounting 54 per cent of total cost); a loan from the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI) of US\$4.00 million (26 per cent of total cost); a government counterpart of US\$1.41 million (9 per cent of total cost); and contribution from beneficiaries of US\$1.53 million (10 per cent of total cost).
 12. At completion, the total programme cost was US\$14.03 million financed as follows: an IFAD loan of US\$3.99 million and a IFAD grant of US\$3.99 million (amounting a 56 per cent of total cost); a CABEI loan of US\$3.65 million (26 per cent of total cost); a government contribution of US\$1.14 million (8 per cent of total cost); and a beneficiary contribution of US\$1.24 million (9 per cent of total cost). Table 2 shows the component costs at design and at completion. It can be noticed that the budget for component 1 was reduced significantly due to a reallocation that took place in 2017 (further details will be given under the project implementation section).

³ NICARIBE Project Design 2010.

Table 1
Project costs

<i>Financier</i>	<i>Appraisal (in 000' US\$)</i>	<i>Percentage of appraisal costs</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Percentage of actual costs</i>	<i>Disbursement rate (%)</i>
IFAD loan	4,000	27%	3,999	28%	99.98%
IFAD grant	4,000	27%	3,999	28%	99.98%
Government of Nicaragua	1,417	9%	1,141	8%	80.52%
BCIE/CABEI	4,000	27%	3,650	26%	91.25%
Beneficiaries	1,537	10%	1,244	9%	80.94%
Total	14,954		14,033		93.84%

Source: Project Completion Report NICARIBE-2017.

Table 2
Component costs

<i>Component</i>	<i>Adjusted appraisal* (in 000' US\$)</i>	<i>Percentage of appraisal costs</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Percentage of actual costs</i>	<i>Disbursement rate (%)</i>
I. Productive development	11,385	76%	8,668	62%	76.1%
II. Strengthening of institutions capacity	1,697	11%	1,560	11%	92.9%
III. Programme management, monitoring and evaluation	1,872	13%	3,805	27%	203.3%
Total	14,954		14,033		93.8%

Source: Project Completion Report NICARIBE-2017.

*The component cost revision was in 2017.

13. **Programme implementation.** Initially, the Rural Development Institute (IDR) was the implementing agency responsible for NICARIBE. In 2012, the IDR became the Ministry of Family, Community and Cooperative Economy (MEFCCA); becoming the new implementing institution. The National Coordination Committee⁴ was the entity responsible for the general programme policies, while the National Coordination Unit⁵ had the main role of ensuring a proper coordination, articulation and management of the programme. Additionally, the Regional Coordination Units,⁶ one for each autonomous region, were responsible for the operationalization of the programme in their respective territories and to establish the necessary communication links between sectoral offices of each Regional Government, community and territorial authorities and organizations.
14. The Capitalization and Territorial Development Fund was the main instrument under MEFCCA to transfer funds. The purpose of these funds was to: (i) finance activities to increase and diversify production; (ii) access to markets; (iii) finance small rural infrastructure; (iv) develop initiatives for value-added processes and income increase from forestry resources; and (v) access to productive and administrative technical assistance.

⁴ Formed by: MEFCCA, Ministry of Development of the Caribbean Coast and Regional Autonomous Governments, the Ministry of Finance and Public Credit, the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Institute of Agricultural Technology.

⁵ Formed by: one coordinator, three specialists for monitoring and evaluation (M&E), administration and procurement.

⁶ Formed by: one coordinator, an administrator, an M&E officer, a technician responsible for component 1, a technician responsible for component 2 and a procurement officer.

15. The programme suffered from programme implementation delays during its initial stages. Some of these delays were caused by the following events: (i) the transformation from IDR to MEFCCA which involved institutional reorganization; (ii) the territorial governments were relatively new and required a consolidation period; (iii) the time required to build a relationship between the local organizations and the programme in order to develop trust and credibility between them; and (iv) the lack of communication and transport infrastructure and the geographical dispersion of the target population. In 2015, after mid-term review, MEFCCA decided to involve the Regional Autonomous Governments in the implementation of the programme in order to start a "direct administration"⁷ modality to speed up implementation.
16. Some of the significant changes/developments during implementation were:
 - i. First loan amendment (November 2012): the executing agency (IDR) transformed into MEFCCA.
 - ii. Second loan amendment (December 2016): a six-month extension was approved.
 - iii. Component cost reallocation (2017): component I decreased by 21.8 per cent; component II decreased by 2.8 per cent and; component III increased by 135 per cent.
 - iv. Additional outputs not included in the log-frame: even though "infrastructure investments" were not part of the original design, the programme deemed necessary to invest on productive and public infrastructure (see section on "delivery of outputs").
17. **Intervention logic.** In order to increase the income level of 10,580 families living in indigenous and afro-descendant territories, the programme would start by targeting three specific areas that required support, namely: i) strengthening of local organizations; ii) increase in production; and iii) better management and sustainable use of natural resources. The strengthening of local organizations would entail strengthening the organizational, productive, marketing and governance capacity of targeted groups. Two key actors would lead this process: community and territorial leaders and MEFCCA technical teams (from central to territorial level).
18. This would be accompanied by the component on productive development, through investment sub-projects, which would act as a catalyst to reach the overarching goal of the programme. The component strategy involved: i) the diversification of agricultural and forestry production systems with better market options and adaptable to the respective soil purposes, climate and traditions of rural communities and families living in the programme territories; and ii) in the sustainable use of forest and fishery resources. The main elements of NICARIBE's productive strategy would be based on principles of endogenous development and the introduction of appropriate technology as key elements for change.
19. It was envisaged that the programme would be supported by an existing legal framework that would establish and protect the autonomy of the Costal Caribbean Regions, promote territorial and communal governance of indigenous and afro-descendant groups, recognize their ownership over the lands where they have lived since ancient times, and promote the protection of their natural resources.
20. **Delivery of outputs.** Annex III presents an overview of outputs delivered by the programme. The results show that out of the nine expected outputs, two were overachieved, two were achieved, and five were achieved more than 75 per cent of target. Additionally, the output on "village/community plans formulated" under component 1 achieved only 53 per cent of target, while the output on "the

⁷ The entity requesting funds met the requirements established by the programme in order to administrate resources.

implementation of a fiduciary manual for territorial government in the first two years” was not achieved.

21. In the case of the formulation of village/community plans, the programme was able to elaborate seven territorial development plans (one for each area of intervention) and 50 community plans. The target for this indicator may have been overambitious and, as the programme completion report (PCR)⁸ mentioned, the Programme Management Unit had focused on a specific number of local organizations with critical needs and that were adapted to their territorial situation.
22. *Outputs delivered and not included in the original log-frame:*
 - Road rehabilitation sub-projects: 29 kilometers of road were rehabilitated in the Wangki Twi and Wangki Maya.
 - Storage (i.e. seed banks), commercial and transformation infrastructure sub-projects: the programme built and equipped a 5,124.5-mt² market to improve community access to market, built 20 storage facilities⁹ and two transformation facilities for bamboo and cabinet making.
 - Government and technical service infrastructure: the programme invested in the construction of an “information and training centre” in Bonanza, a “Community technological development centre for marine fish production” in Laguna de Perlas and a “territorial government centre” in Tasba Pauni.

III. Review of findings

A. Core criteria

Relevance

23. **Relevance of objectives.** The programme objectives proved to be relevant and aligned with national policies such as the National Human Development Plan 2012-2016 that gave high priority to economic growth, employment creation, and poverty and inequality reduction. More importantly, the programme was created within the framework of the Caribbean Coast Development Strategy that aimed to develop the Autonomous Regions and the Alto Wangki as one of the main priorities for the government of Nicaragua.
24. The programme was also aligned with the strategic objectives of the IFAD’s 2012 country strategic opportunities programme, which focused on: (i) ensuring social inclusion of rural families by facilitating their access to assets, markets and income generation activities, and increasing employment opportunities; (ii) increasing productivity and accessing information technology and technical services; and (iii) improving the environmental, fiscal and institutional sustainability. Additionally, the Nicaragua Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation undertaken by the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD in 2017 found the programme to be consistent with the IFAD Policy on Engagement with Indigenous People (2009).¹⁰
25. **Relevance of design.** The design of the programme was relevant to the main rural poverty issues in the region. It tackled key thematic areas of intervention that required specific attention in the targeted territories, such as: food security, agricultural production, organizational strengthening, sustainable fishery, gender equality and sustainable use of natural resources. The component and the activities planned at design were relevant to the programme goal and the specific objectives. The logical framework had a reasonable number of indicators having, in most cases, realistic targets. Additionally, the indicators were gender disaggregated and accompanied by a number of risks and/or assumptions.

⁸ Project Completion Report - NICARIBE 2017 - Effectiveness.

⁹ For seeds and basic grains.

¹⁰ https://www.ifad.org/documents/38714170/40709745/IFAD+Policy+Brief+on+IFAD%27s+Engagement+with+Indigenous+Peoples_e/a2f4d8cb-b383-450b-9f31-e45a888833d0

26. The programme design included a gender strategy which was based on “the Equal Rights and Opportunities Law” under the Nicaraguan constitution. This was intended to promote the participation and decision-making role of women in the different productive and investment processes conducted by the programme. As established by the national policies on gender, the programme set an indicator in which “at least 40 per cent of participants were women”. Due to the nature and focus of the programme, the design also took into consideration specific activities in terms of natural resource management. However, the design did not take into consideration the potential impacts due to climate change. These were considered later on during implementation.
27. The *programme’s targeting strategy* aimed for territorial economic development and took into consideration two approaches: direct¹¹ and demand-driven. The community-driven development approach proved to be highly relevant for indigenous communities’ participation and organization, also to identify key issues and action plans to address them. Furthermore, the design took into consideration relevant territorial elements for the targeting strategy, such as: (i) ethnic diversity; (ii) population dispersion; (iii) limited infrastructure; and (iv) the advance of the agricultural frontier.
28. The design discussed the elaboration of an *exit strategy* that would establish alliances with the main actors¹² involved and their role in order to achieve sustainable results. According to the design report, the strategy was planned to be ready within the first two years of implementation; however, a consolidated strategy was still not available at completion. As a result, there was a missed opportunity to address key elements for sustainability such as a clear strategy to have access to markets considering the current context.
29. As mentioned in the “programme implementation” section, the programme design was not revised during implementation despite the implementation of additional infrastructure outputs. Nonetheless, considering that 37.5 per cent of the target population benefited from these activities, this PCRV considers that the original log-frame required a revision for strategic and accountability purposes.
30. **Overall**, the programme objectives were aligned with the main government policies and strategies for poverty reduction in Nicaragua, and more specifically, in the Caribbean Cost region. The programme was also consistent with IFAD’s country strategic opportunities programme and key strategies such as gender and indigenous people. The two approaches for the targeting strategy provided flexibility to the programme and was relevant to target key territorial needs. The programme missed the opportunity to develop an exit strategy that would target key issues such as access to markets. This PCRV agrees with the Programme Management Department (PMD) and rates the relevance of the programme as **satisfactory (5)**.

Effectiveness

31. This section presents the effectiveness of each component of the programme, in relation to the outcomes of the programme design and the delivery of outputs presented in section II. The programme benefited 14,072 rural families (133 per cent of target) of which 43 per cent were women-headed households (107 per cent of target). Additionally, the programme increased rural employment (including youth and women) by 46 per cent (156 per cent of target). It is important to mention that 5,276 families (37.5 per cent of total) were counted as families that benefited from the infrastructure investments mentioned in the “delivery of

¹¹ Based on the strategic targeting criteria used by the National Human Development Plan and Caribbean Coast Development Strategy.

¹² The Ministry of Agriculture, the National Institute for Agricultural Technology and the National Institute for Fishery.

outputs" section. Below, NICARIBE's outcomes are presented according to their respective strategic objective.

32. **Objective 1: Raise the incomes of beneficiary families.** The programme implemented 23 productive sub-projects (no target set at design) which benefited 6,452 families (230 per cent of target) by increasing their food security and diversifying their agri-food production. The programme invested in different productive models including cocoa, coconut and agri-food (basic grains,¹³ vegetables, *musaceae*¹⁴ and roots and tubers),¹⁵ agroforestry (orange, lemon, tangerine, avocado and pineapple), fisheries and agricultural community projects (livestock and poultry). In total, the programme helped to establish 11,628.4 ha of plantations, including 1,817.9 ha (i.e. medicinal plants) for reforestation (181.8 per cent of target). A total of 100 indigenous communities (125 per cent of target) implemented initiatives to commercially take advantage of forest products and to minimize the adverse impact of climate change on agricultural production. On the other hand, only 120 out 1,600 ha of cocoa (7.5 per cent of target) were planted. The PCR explained that the cocoa production was affected by the "Nate" hurricane in 2017, which caused considerable damage on these plantations. However, there is not yet an official estimation of the production lost due to the hurricane.
33. **Objective 2: Strengthen the management capacity of local organizations and the seven territorial governments.** At completion, the programme implemented 50 community development plans and seven territorial development plans (53.3 per cent of target), one for each of the seven territorial governments. The PCR stated that the reduced amount of plans achieved was due to a prioritization of local organizations and a strategy to avoid an excessive territorial dispersion. Additionally, 110 organizations (107 community organizations established by the programme and three existing organizations strengthened) were managing natural resources. Women were in leadership position in at least 40 per cent of these organizations (78.6 per cent of target). The rural poverty impact section will further analyse the results on social capital achieved by the programme. Through this strategic objective, NICARIBE strengthened the management capacity of 2,344 community leaders (women and men).
34. **Objective 3: Build institutional capacity on fiduciary issues.** At completion, the programme implemented seven territorial government plans (100 per cent of target). The territorial assemblies approved these plans, which met the required fiduciary capacity to manage sub-projects. The plans included a strategy to implement activities, investments and a monitoring and evaluation system. At the end of the programme, 28 representatives from territorial governments (100 per cent of target) received training on financial management and procurement. Furthermore, both regional autonomous governments provided fiduciary support to the territorial governments (100 per cent of target).
35. **Overall,** the programme achieved most of its indicators at the outcome level. The productive sub-projects increased production and food security of indigenous communities through agricultural diversification. However, the results achieved for the indicator on cocoa production was considerably low, which was mainly attributed to the hurricane in 2017. The strengthening of local organizations and territorial authorities was possible due to the implementation of communities and territorial development plans. However, the programme was able to implement only 53 per cent of community plans; although, NICARIBE gave priority to the most communities in need. This PCR agrees with PMD and rates NICARIBE's effectiveness as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

¹³ Rice, beans and maize.

¹⁴ Banana and plantain.

¹⁵ Cassava and malanga.

Efficiency

36. IFAD's Executive Board approved NICARIBE on 15 December 2010 and the IFAD financing became effective on 11 January 2012, experiencing an effectiveness lag of 13 months. NICARIBE executed its first disbursement on 1 June 2012, only six months after the programme became effective. This compares favourably with the regional average for the Latin America and the Caribbean Division of IFAD, which has a slightly higher effectiveness lag of 13 months and first-disbursement lag of 7.3 months. The programme completion date was on 30 September 2017 for a total implementation period of 5.7 years.
37. The programme's disbursement rate was satisfactory. At mid-term (2015), NICARIBE had already disbursed 51 per cent of the total IFAD funds, which continued to increase considerably reaching 75 and 99 per cent in 2016 and 2017, respectively. However, it is important to mention that most of the funds disbursed during the first two years were allocated to programme management cost and the high disbursement rates in the last two years were attributed to the high concentration of implementation of sub-projects during those years, including the construction of infrastructure (see paragraph 22). At completion, NICARIBE disbursed 100 per cent of the total IFAD funds.
38. The programme management cost was US\$3.08 million (27 per cent of total cost) in comparison to US\$1.53 million budgeted at design (12.5 per cent of total cost). NICARIBE's management cost is considerably higher in comparison to the average programme management cost of previous IFAD-supported interventions¹⁶ implemented in the country, which range from 12.9¹⁷ to 27.0¹⁸ per cent of total project cost. However, this PCRV recognizes the fact that NICARIBE was implemented in a context with limited infrastructure and considerable distances between communities, which consequently increased these costs.
39. At completion, the cost per benefited family was US\$997.3, which translate into a reduction in the original unit cost by 30 per cent. This cost compares favorably with the average cost per benefited family (US\$1,080) estimated in the Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation published in 2017. One of the main reasons of the reduced cost was the implementation of infrastructure sub-projects that allowed NICARIBE to reach 37.5 per cent of the total beneficiary families.
40. Based on four economic activities supported by NICARIBE (agri-food, seed banks, coconut and fisheries) and by using a Social Discount Rate of 8 per cent, the PCR calculated an internal rate of return (IRR) of 24.4 per cent, 25.86 per cent, 35.93 per cent and 24.17 per cent, respectively. The (global) IRR calculated at design was 24.8 per cent, which means that the activities supported by NICARIBE were economically viable. However, the PCR missed the opportunity to calculate the IRR of the agricultural community project where a substantial amount of funds and beneficiaries were involved.
41. **Overall**, NICARIBE was efficient in conducting administrative processes for the programme start-up, which was below national and regional average. The disbursement of funds was consistent with the annual disbursement plan and resulted in 100 per cent of IFAD-funds disbursed at completion. The programme management cost was double the estimated amount at design and was higher than the country average. The cost per family was 30 per cent less than the cost estimated at design as a result of the implementation of infrastructure plans, which, by itself, covered 37.5 per cent of beneficiaries. At completion, most of the activities supported by the project proved to be economically viable. This PCRV

¹⁶ Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation Nicaragua 2017.

¹⁷ Inclusion of Small-Scale Producers in Value Chains and Markets Access Project (PROCAVAL).

¹⁸ Programme for the Economic Development of the Dry Region in Nicaragua (PRODESEC).

agrees with PMD and rates NICARIBE's efficiency as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

Rural poverty impact

42. The analysis for this section is based on the data collected by the baseline survey (2015) and the end-line survey (2017) conducted by NICARIBE (as a part of the Results and Impact Management System-RIMS) and presented in the PCR. The end-line survey was conducted with a treatment group of 900 families (or 4,935 household members) from 30 communities that benefited from the programme sub-projects. However, it is important to take the following results with caution due to limitations such as lack of control groups and the partial coverage of impact domains in the end-survey analysis and the late implementation of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, which resulted in a late implementation of the baseline survey.
43. **Household income and assets.** The end-line survey reported that household income increased from US\$2,323.10 (in 2015) to US\$2,736.18 (in 2018), which translate into a 17.7 per cent nominal increase, which in real terms¹⁹ would become a 5.7 per cent increase. Despite the increase in household income, the report also emphasizes each family member were living under a US\$1.52 per day income, which is US\$0.30 higher than in 2015, but still below the national average. The main sources of income were (in descending order): fisheries, rice, musaceae, fruits and beans.
44. One of the main achievement in terms of productive assets was the increase in average of productive land units,²⁰ which increased from 3.64 hectares (in 2012) to 12.37 hectares (in 2018). This increase was mainly attributed to the increased areas under cultivation and diversification, including community productive projects with agro-forestry systems. Another important impact on assets was the increase in farm animals,²¹ which ranged from 18-75 per cent (2018) in comparison to 12-44 per cent (2015). On the other hand, there was a decrease of 2.2 per cent in house ownership.
45. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** The impact survey showed that families receiving technical assistance increased by 55.5 per cent in 2018 in comparison to 2015. The surveyed families acknowledged an increase in technical capacities for areas such as pest control, livestock management, and basic grain management. In average, each family benefited from NICARIBE participated in seven technical assistance events and four trainings.
46. As a key element of NICARIBE's overall framework, the strengthening of social capital was possible through the support of 110 community organizations. These communities were capable of structuring administration committees for key components of the economic activities supported by the project such as machinery management,²² seed bank management, agricultural production, wood and bamboo processing, sewing workshops (led by women), and fisheries. The implementation of these committees started a process to empower indigenous and afro-descendant youth and women to become active members of their community organization.
47. **Food security and agricultural productivity.** The data on food security presented in the PCR and the end-line survey are inconsistent and rather confusing. The end-line survey analyzed food security based on four criteria:

¹⁹ Considering that, between 2015 to 2018, the accumulated inflation in Nicaragua has been approximately 12 per cent (World Bank).

²⁰ 89.9 per cent were community lands.

²¹ i.e. Livestock, goats, sheep, pigs.

²² Thresher machine for agri-food projects.

availability of food, access to food, utilization,²³ and vulnerability.²⁴ The PCR presents a positive assessment indicating a reduction of families suffering from the first hungry season (from 73.3 per cent in 2012 to 39 per cent in 2017),²⁵ referring to the end-line survey as a source. However, these data are not consistent with those found in the end-line survey report, according to which the families experiencing a hungry season reduced from 34 per cent in 2015 (and not 2012) to 29 per cent in 2017. The end-line survey also showed mixed results on other indicators: on one hand, increase in self-produced food availability from 28.1 to 35.89 per cent and slight reduction in chronic malnutrition²⁶ from 18.5 to 17.8 per cent; on the other hand, increase in "general malnutrition"²⁷ (from 4.6 to 7.05 per cent) and some decrease in food consumption (from 14.99 to 13.63 per cent). With data inconsistencies and questions on their reliability, it is difficult to validate the PCR assessment on project impact on food security.

48. According to the RIMS study 2017, NICARIBE achieved mixed results also in terms of agricultural productivity. Increased agricultural productivity was more visible in sub-projects supporting rice, fish, roots and tubers, poultry, and pig cattle; their production reportedly increased by 29.2 per cent, 2.3 per cent, 75.4 per cent, 180.6 per cent, and 457.4 per cent, respectively. On the other hand, other production areas such as maize, beans, and musaceae had a decrease in production of 27.3 per cent, 9.6 per cent, and 32.3 per cent, respectively. However, this PCR acknowledges the fact that some of these results may have been affected by natural disasters that happened between the implementation periods of the baseline and end line surveys, as well as the short period elapsed between the two surveys (2015-2017).
49. **Institutions and policies.** One of the key contribution from NICARIBE to government institutions is the support provided to territorial governments to set the bases for intercultural autonomous governance. While it is still a work in progress, some of the key NICARIBE's contributions to the autonomous institutions of the Caribbean Coast were: (i) the implementation of capacity strengthening plans on self-management for territorial and community governments; (ii) the elaboration of community development plans; (iii) the update of norms, regulations and manuals; (iv) the methodological support to M&E; and (v) the support to strengthening fiduciary aspects. The evidence presented in the PCR did not show specific results in terms of policy impact.
50. **Overall,** the results on rural poverty impact achieved by NICARIBE varies across domains and require caution when interpreting them due to the limited quality of data generated by the M&E system, including inconsistencies in the data presented in the PCR and the end-line survey. Benefited families showed positive results in terms of household income and assets, human and social capital and empowerment and institutions; while for food security and agricultural productivity, the available data show mixed results and it would have required more solid evidence to arrive at a conclusive analysis. The programme activities had positive impact on the institutional strengthening of autonomous governments. On the other hand, this PCR did not find specific results in terms of policy impact. This PCR agrees with PMD and rates NICARIBE's rural poverty impact as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

²³ Person's capacity to select, ingest, and absorb nutrients from food.

²⁴ Physical, environmental, economic, social and health risks that might affect availability, access and utilization.

²⁵ On the other hand, the PCR also noted that the proportion of families experiencing second hungry season increased from 16.7 per cent in 2012 to 24 per cent in 2017.

²⁶ The RIMS report defined it as the average malnutrition percentage in the population who are younger than five years old.

²⁷ "Desnutrición general" in Spanish, but how this is defined is not clear.

Sustainability of benefits

51. At completion, productive sub-projects supported benefited families to improve their opportunities to increase household income and food security. These sub-projects were key to support agricultural diversification and to improve management and storage capacities, which allowed communities to stock up on seeds. According to the PCR, the productive infrastructure implemented by the programme was still operational at completion. The PCR provided an analysis to determine the sustainability risk (high, medium and low) of each of the investments supported by the NICARIBE. This analysis indicated that investments such as coconut and market infrastructure sub-projects (8 per cent of total) showed a low sustainability risk, while cocoa and feeder roads sub-projects (8 per cent of total) present high sustainable risk. The remaining 84 per cent of investment sub-projects implemented were marked as medium risk level.
52. As mentioned under the section on effectiveness (paragraph 32), the coconut sub-projects achieved limited results due to natural phenomena. However, it was also identified that the sustainability of these plantations was affected by the land where these were located, which were areas close to a river that can get easily flooded. Natural disasters also present high risk for feeder roads built under the infrastructure sub-projects. However, the sustainability of this infrastructure will also depend on two other factors: (i) relationship between the Regional Autonomous Government from the North Caribbean Coast and the Municipal Government of Waspam,²⁸ who are the entities responsible for its maintenance; and (ii) clear understanding of the local and regional markets by elaborating and implementing a realistic “market strategy”.
53. Even for those investment classified as “medium sustainable risk”, extreme climatic events remain one of the most critical concerns, *inter alia* flooding in the areas where crops and farm animals have been established. This factor does not only put in danger the sustainability of community organizations and their production, but also, as a domino effect, brings uncertainty in the sustainability of the rural families’ well-being (i.e. food security and household income). This PCRV agrees with PMD and rate the sustainability of benefits as **moderately unsatisfactory (3)**.

B. Other performance criteria

Innovation

54. The PCR and the Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation 2017 considered NICARIBE an innovative programme in terms of rural poverty alleviation and rural development in Nicaragua.²⁹ The implementation of this programme was a Government pilot to support the rural areas in the Caribbean Coast. This support was based on the development of indigenous and afro-descendant communities in areas with the highest incidence of poverty in the country and with a complex social, geographic and political context.
55. The programme worked as a platform that allowed MEFCCA to support Regional Autonomous and Territorial Governments by strengthening their institutional capacities for rural territorial development and those of their rural communities. As a result, both governments benefited from a more consolidated institutional relationship that became a key element for the implementation of investment sub-projects.
56. Additionally, the community demand-driven approach was an innovation in the context by allowing the targeted population to be at the centre of the decision-making and implementation activities for the development of their communities and their territorial governments. However, this approach showed limited results

²⁸NICARIBE PCR 2018.

²⁹ Country and Strategy Programme Evaluation Nicaragua, 2017.

and required further technical assistance in terms of the monitoring and evaluation function of local governments. This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates NICARIBE's innovation as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

Scaling up

57. The Caribbean Coast Food Security Project (PAIPSAN) is a US\$42 million intervention financed by the World Bank (US\$33.9 million). Building on NICARIBE's experience, the project focuses on enhancing food and nutritional security in selected communities of the Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua, as well as on increasing the production and commercialization capacity of rural producers and enterprises through the implementation of innovative development plans. NICARIBE has "broken the ice" in the international development community and has set the bases for further agricultural, community and institutional development. This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates scaling up as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

Gender equality and women's empowerment

58. As previously mentioned under paragraph 26, the programme based its overall gender strategy on an existing national policy on gender equality. Therefore, NICARIBE included one of the main indicators and target of this policy, which required that "at least 40 per cent of beneficiaries were women". The programme overachieved this target by reaching 5,998 women headed households or 43 per cent of total families benefited.
59. NICARIBE gave a strong focus on strengthening the capacities of women in terms of their decision-making role in productive activities such as seed selection and plantation area selection, as well as in strengthening their management capacities as territorial and community leaders.
60. Despite these efforts, in the geographical areas targeted by NICARIBE, indigenous and afro-descendant women remain disadvantaged when it comes to availability and access to productive and non-productive assets. In these territories, men are more likely to assume that role. In addition, the PCR identified the need to better systematize the results and lessons learned, mainly regarding access to land and finance, through a gender lens. This would inform future approaches to ensure the participation and leadership of rural women.
61. **Overall**, the national policy on gender equality defined and reinforced NICARIBE's gender strategy. The programme was able to overachieve the target set by such policy. Women received trainings in order to improve their technical capacity, and most importantly, their capacity to actively participate in the community and organizational decision-making processes. Unfortunately, the "traditional" role of men as leaders of the communities limited the decision-making role of women. Finally, there is a need to reinforce the monitoring and systematization of women participation and role in the different socio-economic and productive activities. This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates gender equality and women's empowerment as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

Environment and natural resources management

62. NICARIBE included a specific indicator (families implementing innovative initiatives to manage forest resources) and target (7,900 families) to monitor results in terms of environment and natural resources management, which achieved 85 per cent of target. This indicator took into consideration the fact that, for the indigenous and afro-descendent population, natural resources in forests, lands, rivers and lakes are closely associated with their well-being. By supporting agro-diversification, the programme was consistent with the indigenous and afro-descendant production systems, which rely heavily on the production of basic grains, roots and tubers, masaceae, fruits, fishery and small-scale livestock. Therefore, NICARIBE's implementation of trainings and technical assistance plans for natural resource management were highly relevant. These included harvest and post-harvest

management, pest and disease control, preparation of organic fertilizers, farm planning and the promotion of agro-forestry systems.

63. As highlighted by the design report, these communities had a number of ancestral agro-ecological practices that are positive for the environment. However, it was not clear from the available documentation how these practices were integrated into NICARIBE's efforts towards natural resource management. This PCR rates environment and natural resource management as **moderately satisfactory (4)**, one point higher than PMD. The PCR considered that the PCR narrative did not corresponded to the rating assigned by PMD.

Adaptation to climate change

64. As stated by the PCR, the programme design did not include specific actions about adaption to climate change. However, the design report does include a section on Climate Change (page 47, NICARIBE design report) that discusses some of the major risks involving climate change such as: high precipitations, hurricanes, tropical storms, floods, forest fires, and in some cases droughts. During implementation, NICARIBE was able to include some activities for climate change adaptation such as validation of improved seeds, creation of bank seeds, and utilization of technology for cocoa grafting, among others.
65. On the other hand, as mentioned under the section on "sustainability of benefits", the programme did not take proper measures to reduce the impact caused by climate change. The most relevant case was the implementation of cocoa (eco-forestry) plans, which apart from being damaged from the hurricane, it also suffered from high sustainability risk. This is caused mainly due to close vicinity of plantations with the Matagalpa River, which become vulnerable to flooding after medium to high precipitations. This issue also presented a significant threat to other productive plans implemented by the programme close to the river area. This PCR rates the adaptation to climate change as **moderately unsatisfactory (3)**, one point lower than PMD.

C. Overall project achievement

66. NICARIBE, more than a pilot programme, became the basis for a territorial development strategy to improve the socio-economic conditions of indigenous and afro-descendant communities in the north and south autonomous regions of the Nicaraguan Caribbean Coast. The community-driven development approach enhanced the participation and interaction between communities, local and regional authorities. As a result, the programme implemented several productive, infrastructure, community and territorial plans that benefited 14,072 rural families. Additionally, the programme strengthened the capacity of territorial and communal governments, which provided them the tools to plan, manage and implement activities supported by NICARIBE.
67. Through the implementation of 23 productive sub-projects, the programme promoted agro-diversification and good agricultural practices for an adequate use of natural resources. Subsequently, despite an unfortunate natural event, the benefited communities experienced an increase in household income and assets, while results for agricultural productivity and food security were mixed or inconclusive. Climate change continues to be a threat for the sustainability of results and would have required more specific actions by NICARIBE.
68. While infrastructure investments were not part of the programme design, these plans turned out to be a key element for economic development. Nonetheless, it is important to highlight that the lack of an "access to market" strategy could jeopardize the sustainability of productive and market infrastructure. Additionally, NICARIBE's monitoring and evaluation function was weak throughout most of the project life cycle, which collected and systematized limited data. This PCR agrees

with PMD and rates the overall project achievement as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

D. Performance of partners

69. **IFAD.** As mentioned in different parts of this report, IFAD was considered a key partner to implement NICARIBE as a promoter of Nicaragua's national and regional strategy. The government of Nicaragua highly recognized the knowledge and lessons learned provided by IFAD during the implementation of NICARIBE. The acquired knowledge through NICARIBE's experience brought the attention of key development partners, such as the World Bank, to continue the agricultural and rural development processes in the region.
70. IFAD also played a proactive role at the strategic level by accompanying the programme through 10 supervision and implementation support missions. These missions closely followed the compliance with the loan agreement and disbursement procedures, and actively provided technical support and suggestions in areas such as fiduciary aspects, audits, management, environment and natural resource management and gender. The supervision mission reports included recommendations that had to be followed-up and complied by the programme implementation teams. Although IFAD does not have a country office in Nicaragua, NICARIBE was supported by a team of consultants including a liaison officer, a finance specialist and a procurement specialist. The team was under the direct supervision of the country programme manager located in headquarters (Rome, Italy) until 2017, when handed to a country programme manager located in the regional office in Panama as a part of IFAD's decentralization process.
71. On the other hand, there were areas that required further attention. First, it was important to make sure that an "exit strategy" was prepared and implemented in a timely manner in order to enhance the sustainability of results achieved by the project. Additionally, given the resources invested and the outreach of the infrastructure sub-projects, a revision of the programme's logical framework should have been considered. This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates IFAD's performance as **satisfactory (5)**.
72. **Government.** The government of Nicaragua showed a pro-active role in bringing together all different government levels, institutions and communities participating in the programme. The Ministry of Finance and Public Credit (as the main IFAD counterpart) actively monitored NICARIBE's implementation and issues affecting it. As a result, the government was able to mobilize some of the counterpart funding which was delayed during the first two years of implementation. At completion, the government of Nicaragua disbursed 80 per cent of committed funds.
73. The Caribbean Coast Development Secretariat was the entity responsible for the coordination and facilitation of the Autonomous Regional Councils of the Caribbean Coast and MEFCCA and provided technical and strategic support. MEFCCA, as the implementing agency, had difficulties caused by an institutional transition period (see section on programme implementation) that resulted in a slow start-up phase of the programme, which was further affected by the limited operational and organizational capacity of territorial governments. However, necessary measures were taken after mid-term review (see paragraph 15) which led to a faster implementation of programme activities, including the capacity strengthening of territorial governments.
74. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) was one of the weakest areas of NICARIBE. During the first three years of implementation, the programme was running without an M&E system. It was only in 2015 that the programme managed to conduct a baseline survey and by 2016, the programme had an operational M&E system. Nonetheless, there were important efforts to collect data from benefited families and organizations and the elaboration of an end-line survey, although its

quality was limited in terms of data and analysis. This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates the performance of government as **satisfactory (5)**.

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

Scope

75. The report covered all sections requested by the PCR guidelines. The PCR presented relevant and detailed annexes that included important data to understand different topics and contexts. This PCRV rates the PCR scope as **satisfactory (5)**.

Quality

76. The PCR shows both qualitative and quantitative analysis throughout the whole report. The qualitative data presents important information in order to understand some of the project results, as well as issues and implementation changes that affected the programme. The section on rural impact had some limitations in terms of data and its consistency with the end-line survey. Household income could have benefited from a deeper analysis. Similarly, the analysis on sustainability could have been extended by mentioning, for example, current limitations and future risks that could jeopardize the sustainability of indigenous and afro-descendant organizations. This PCRV rates the PCR quality as moderately **satisfactory (4)**.

Lessons

77. The PCR provides detailed and accurate lessons related to the challenges faced by the programme, even if some additional lessons are proposed in this PCRV. This PCRV rated the PCR lessons as **satisfactory (5)**.

Candour

78. The PCR provides candour in the assignation of ratings throughout the different criteria and describes issues encountered by the programme highlighting the positive and negative sides. However, this PCRV noticed that the discussion on some criteria, involving key issues, was rather inclined to the positive side. For example, the "Sustainability" section deserved more attention and candour given that the rating provided by PMD is moderately unsatisfactory (3), but the text only focuses in the positive aspects and leaves areas for improvement outside the analysis. This PCRV rates the PCR candour as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

V. Lessons learned

79. The following lessons learned expand the analysis on two main issues gathered from the PCR (access to markets and sustainability of benefits) and adds a new lesson learned (monitoring and evaluation) drawn from the findings of the PCRV.
80. **Access to market.** Despite the fact that the programme design includes "access to market" as a key element under the first strategic objective, NICARIBE put more emphasis on production having a negative effect on some of the productive plans. While it is true that the programme made some efforts to create some conditions to support commercialization through the implementation of infrastructure plans, there was no comprehensive local and regional market analysis for potential agricultural products. It is important for a programme aimed at improving access to markets to include a clear and realistic strategy to guide an inclusive commercialization process.
81. **Sustainability of benefits.** In order to improve the sustainability of results, it is important to timely design and implement an exit strategy. Even though it was planned at design, NICARIBE struggled to launch such strategy during implementation. This could jeopardize the sustainability of some positive results such as diversified agricultural production, household income, as well as some results achieved in terms of food security and community organization.

Additionally, an exit strategy could have been essential to target some of the potential risk faced by the Nicaraguan Caribbean Coast in terms of climate change.

82. **Monitoring and evaluation.** The M&E function of NICARIBE was one of the most challenging areas for the programme management team. NICARIBE experienced a significant delay that affected the information flow during implementation. It is key to have specialized and dedicated teams to be responsible to monitor and generate information on indicators and the achievement of the overall objectives. It is important for programmes like NICARIBE, considering the context, to monitor the technical capacities of programme staff in charge of the M&E function.

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. <i>Four impact domains</i>	X	Yes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household income and net assets: Household income provides a means of assessing the flow of economic benefits accruing to an individual or group, whereas assets relate to a stock of accumulated items of economic value. The analysis must include an assessment of trends in equality over time. 		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human and social capital and empowerment: Human and social capital and empowerment include an assessment of the changes that have occurred in the empowerment of individuals, the quality of grass-roots organizations and institutions, the poor's individual and collective capacity, and in particular, the extent to which specific groups such as youth are included or excluded from the development process. 		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food security and agricultural productivity: Changes in food security relate to availability, stability, affordability and access to food and stability of access, whereas changes in agricultural productivity are measured in terms of yields; nutrition relates to the nutritional value of food and child malnutrition. 		No
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutions and policies: The criterion relating to institutions and policies is designed to assess changes in the quality and performance of institutions, policies and the regulatory framework that influence the lives of the poor. 		No
Project performance	Project performance is an average of the ratings for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of benefits.	X	Yes
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, institutional priorities and partner and donor policies. It also entails an assessment of project design and coherence in achieving its objectives. An assessment should also be made of whether objectives and design address inequality, for example, by assessing the relevance of targeting strategies adopted.	X	Yes
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.	X	Yes
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.	X	Yes
Sustainability of benefits	The likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. It also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.	X	Yes
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	The extent to which IFAD interventions have contributed to better gender equality and women's empowerment, for example, in terms of women's access to and ownership of assets, resources and services; participation in decision making; work load balance and impact on women's incomes, nutrition and livelihoods.	X	Yes
Innovation	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction.	X	Yes
Scaling up	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have been (or are likely to be) scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and others agencies.	X	Yes
Environment and natural resources management	The extent to which IFAD development interventions contribute to resilient livelihoods and ecosystems. The focus is on the use and management of the natural environment, including natural resources defined as raw materials used for socio-economic and cultural purposes, and ecosystems and biodiversity - with the goods and services they provide.	X	Yes
Adaptation to climate change	The contribution of the project to reducing the negative impacts of climate change through dedicated adaptation or risk reduction measures.	X	Yes

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

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

Rating comparison^a

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Programme Management Department (PMD) rating</i>	<i>IOE Project Completion Report Validation (PCR) rating</i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (PCR-PMD)</i>
Rural poverty impact	4	4	0
Project performance			
Relevance	5	5	0
Effectiveness	4	4	0
Efficiency	4	4	0
Sustainability of benefits	3	3	0
Project performance^b	4	4	0
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	4	4	0
Innovation	4	4	0
Scaling up	4	4	0
Environment and natural resources management	3	4	+1
Adaptation to climate change	4	3	-1
Overall project achievement^c	4	4	
Performance of partners^d			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	5	5	0
Average net disconnect			0/12=-0.00

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

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

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

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

Ratings of the project completion report quality

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

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.

Overview of the project's key outputs

<i>Outputs*</i>	<i>Targeted</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Component I. Productive Development			
a. People receiving training for agricultural production practices and technologies ³⁰	2,800	6,452	230 %
b. Group members managing natural resources (cocoa, forestry, agro-businesses) ³¹	9,000	6,452	71 %
c. Land with improved management practices ³²	1,000	1,817	182%
Component II. Strengthening of institutions capacities			
a. Village/community plans formulated	107	57	53 %
b. Natural Resource Management groups with women in leadership positions	140	110	79 %
c. People involved in climate risk management, natural resources management (NRM) or disaster risk reduction (DRR) activities	39,520	33,550	85 %
Component III. Programme management, monitoring and evaluation			
a. Territorial governments managing territorial development plans approved by territorial assemblies and with fiduciary capacity	7	7	100 %
b. At the end of the second year of implementation, the programme has fiduciary manual appropriate for territorial governments	1	0	0 %
c. Regional Autonomous Governments support the fiduciary function of territorial governments	2	2	100 %

³⁰ Includes agrifood, seed banks, coconut, cocoa, whole grains and fishery

³¹ Includes agrifood, seed banks, coconut, cocoa, whole grains and fishery

³² Includes cocoa and whole grains

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CABEI	Central American Bank for Economic Integration
IDR	Rural Development Institute
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation
IRR	Internal rate of return
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEFCCA	Ministry of Family, Community and Cooperative Economy
NICARIBE	Agricultural, Fishery and Forestry Productive Systems Development Programme in RAAN and RAAS Indigenous Territories
PCR	Programme Completion Report
PCRv	Programme Completion Report Validation
PMD	Programme Management Department
RACCN	North Caribbean Coast Autonomous Region
RIMS	Results and Impact Management System

Bibliography

International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2010. President's Report- NICARIBE.
Rome, Italy.

_____. 2010. Design Report – NICARIBE. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2010. Financing Agreement – NICARIBE. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2012-2017. Supervision missions - NICARIBE. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2012. Country Strategic Opportunities Programme. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2015. Mid-term review. NICARIBE. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2017. Project Completion Report – NICARIBE. Rome, Italy.

Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD. 2016. Evaluation Manual-Second edition.
Rome, Italy.