

Project Completion Report Validation

Agricultural Intensification and Value-Enhancing Support Project/ *Projet d'appui à l'intensification et à la valorisation agricoles du Burundi (PAIVA-B)* Republic of Burundi

Date of validation by IOE: April 2020

I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m)		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	Eastern and Southern Africa	Total project costs	53.33		43.22	
Country	Republic of Burundi	IFAD DSF grant and percentage of total	13.60	26%	13.60	33%
IFAD project number	DSF-8031-BI	IFAD additional DSF grant and percentage of total	20.00	38%	17.19	41%
IFAD project ID	1100001469	EU	5.78	11%	5.78	14%
Type of project (subsector)	Agricultural Development	WFP	4.66	9%	1.55	4%
Financing type*	DSF grant	Canadian cooperation ¹	0.14	0.3%	0.12	0.3%
Lending terms	N/A	Government of Burundi	6.24	12%	3.28	8%
Date of approval	DSF grant: 30 April 2009 Additional Financing DSF: 16 September 2015	Beneficiaries	2.91	5%	1.70	3.9%
Date of signature	17 March 2009					
Date of effectiveness	21 July 2009					
Amendment ²	September 2015 with the Additional Financing					
Project closure extensions	Three	Number of beneficiaries	103 307 ³		126 597	
Country programme managers	Aissa Touré (current) ⁴	Project closing date			31/05/2020	
Regional director(s)	Sara Mbago-Bhunu (current) ⁵	Mid-term review			12/02/2014	
Project completion report reviewer	Chiara Calvosa	IFAD disbursement at project completion (%)			DSF: 100% DSF additional financing: 86%	
PCRV quality control panel	Eoghan Molloy Fabrizio Felloni	Date of the project completion report			06 December 2019	

* Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) grants are provided to countries with low level of debt sustainability, as ascertained by the annual debt sustainability assessments carried out by the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Source: PAIVA-B Project Completion Report, 2019.

¹ Carried over from the Rural Recovery and Development Programme (PRDMR).

² As reported in the PCR.

³ Source: 2015 President's Report to IFAD EB.

⁴ Previously: H. Haidara, R. Ben Zid, G. Kadari (Country programme manager *ad interim*).

⁵ Previous directors: I. de Willebois, P. Saint Ange, S. Jatta.

II. Project outline

Country & Project Name	Republic of Burundi, Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project (PAIVA-B).
Project duration	Total project duration: 10 years; EB Approval: 30 April 2009; Additional Financing EB approval: 16 September 2015; Date of Effectiveness: 21 September 2009; Actual completion date: 30 November 2019. Three extensions granted bringing the project completion from September 2017 to November 2019.
Project goal, objectives and components	The overall project objective was to develop organized and sustainable family farming to allow small-scale rural producers in the target area to increase their incomes. The project objectives were to: (i) support public and private institutions, civil society and organizations of the rural poor, making them stakeholders in quality partnerships to further the agricultural development process in pilot areas in ways that can be replicated at the national level; (ii) build the human, physical and technical capacity of poor small farmers to protect their productive assets, increase their productivity, improve their nutritional status and raise their incomes in a sustainable manner; and (iii) permit producers' organizations to make the most of value added to their produce through better market access. The project had the following three components: (i) strengthening and protection of productive capital; (ii) support for enhancement of the value of agricultural production and the development of infrastructure; and (iii) facilitation of project implementation and coordination.
Project area and target group	In its initial phase (2009), the project covered the provinces Gitega and Karuzi. Project area was then extended to the provinces of Cibitoke and Kayanza (2012) and, in its last phase (2016), to Bubanza and Muramvya provinces. The project's target group comprised: (i) hillside farmers owning less than 1 ha of land, or about 90 per cent of direct beneficiaries. Within this group, households with 0.5 ha to 1 ha, equal to 22 per cent of beneficiaries, were specifically targeted for cattle repopulation activities; and (ii) farmers in marshland to be rehabilitated or improved.
Project implementation	The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE) of the Government of Burundi was the lead programme agency. A project steering committee, chaired by the Ministry of Finance, was set-up in common with the three other ongoing IFAD-supported projects in the country (i.e. the Rural Recovery and Development Programme, the Transitional Programme of Post-Conflict Reconstruction and the Livestock Sector Rehabilitation Support Project) to ensure the political coordination. When specific issues relative to PAIVA-B were treated, the committee presidency was under the MINEAGRIE. For technical coordination, a technical committee, chaired by the General Director for Planning in MINEAGRIE, was developed jointly with the three ongoing IFAD-funded projects and its members were appointed by the Minister of Finance. The programme management unit (PMU) was established by MINEAGRIE decree in Bujumbura, while regional coordination units were established at local level. The community development committees at hill level ⁶ in the targeted provinces were in charge of coordinating and planning the activities in the different areas of intervention. Local producers and farmers' organizations and other implementing partners (such as the Agency for cooperation and research in development, the Confederation of agricultural producers' association, and the Burundi Institute of agronomy) were intended to be involved throughout the implementation.
Changes during implementation	Following mid-term review (MTR): the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system was revised to mainstream automatization and decentralization; the logical framework was amended to strengthen internal coherence; and, PMU staff reorganized to promote synergies with the Livestock Sector Rehabilitation Support Project and the Value Chain Development Programme (PRODEFI). Following the approval of the additional financing in 2015: project area was expanded; climate change adaptation activities were introduced; and, quantitative targets set at mid-term were increased.
Financing	Total approved budget was US\$53.33 million. The project was financed by an IFAD Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) grant of SDR9.3 million (US\$13.57 million) and an additional DSF grant financing of SDR14.25 million (US\$20 million). At appraisal, co-financing was expected by the World Food Programme (WFP) for US\$4.65 million, the European Union (EU) for US\$6 million and other potential co-financiers for US\$2.50 million. Total Government of Burundi counterpart financing was estimated at US\$6.24 million at appraisal. Further co-financing was also foreseen from beneficiaries for a total of US\$2.91 million. Overall, actual disbursement was lower than anticipated, although it

⁶ From French: *Comité de développement communautaire au niveau colline*.

	was 100 per cent of IFAD initial financing and 86 per cent of the additional financing (see Tables 1 and 2).
--	--

Table 1
Project costs (US\$ millions)

<i>Source of Funding</i>	<i>Appraisal</i>	<i>% of appraisal costs</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>% of actual costs</i>	<i>% disbursed</i>
IFAD	13.60	26%	13.60	31%	100%
IFAD additional financing	20.00	38%	17.19	40%	86%
EU	5.78	11%	5.78	13%	100%
WFP	4.66	9%	1.55	4%	33%
Canadian Cooperation	0.14	0.3%	0.12	0.3%	86%
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>44.18</i>	<i>83%</i>	<i>38.24</i>	<i>88%</i>	<i>87%</i>
<i>co-financiers</i>					
Government	6.24	12%	3.28	8%	53%
Beneficiaries	2.91	5%	1.70	3.9%	58%
Total	53.33	100%	43.22	100%	81%

Source: IFAD's Operational Results Management System; PAIVA-B Project Completion Report, 2019.

Table 2
Component costs (US\$ millions)⁷

<i>Components</i>	<i>Appraisal</i>	<i>% of appraisal costs</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>% of actual costs</i>	<i>% disbursed</i>
Strengthening of productive capital	33.92	64%	27.48	64%	81%
Value enhancement of agricultural produce and increased market access	12.97	24%	7.81	18%	60%
Project coordination and facilitation	6.44	12%	7.93	18%	123%
Legal Support	0.14	0.3%	0.12	0.3%	89%
Total	53.33	100%	43.22	100%	81%

Source: PAIVA-B Project Completion Report, 2019.

III. Review of findings

PCR finding	PCR Rating
A. Core Criteria	
Relevance	
1. The Project Completion Report Validation (PCR) agrees with the Project Completion Report's (PCR) assessment that the overall project design was relevant to addressing the needs of the rural poor in some of the most disadvantaged provinces of Burundi. It was also in line with key IFAD and government objectives for promoting sustainable agricultural development in the country. The target area at design was characterized by a very limited agri-food industry with rudimentary	5

⁷ Actual disbursement by component reported in the PCR is updated to June 2019. The difference with actual expenditures at completion reported in the Operational Results Management System has been proportionally spread among components.

PCR finding	PCR Rating
<p>levels of processing. The focus on enhancing agricultural productivity, developing the value chain and increasing market access was particularly relevant.</p> <p>2. Project objectives were aligned with IFAD’s strategy for Burundi outlined in the 2009-2015 and 2016-2021 Country strategic opportunities programmes⁸ as well as with the government’s priorities to support agricultural and livestock development, and to reduce rural poverty and malnutrition.⁹</p> <p>3. The internal logic among components was overall coherent and adequate to meet the intervention’s outcomes and relied on strong linkages particularly between components 1 and 2.¹⁰ However, as acknowledged by the PCR, the linkages among activities and outputs as outlined in the logframe presented several weaknesses.¹¹ The adjustments made at mid-term and throughout project implementation show the responsiveness and flexibility of the project to retain relevance (i.e. including improvements in the logic within the logframe, introduction of new indicators, consolidation of activities under component 1 and introduction of climate change adaptation activities through additional financing).</p> <p>4. Based on the above, the PCR rates the relevance of PAIVA-B as <i>satisfactory (rating 5)</i>, in line with the PCR rating.</p>	
Effectiveness	
<p>5. The PCR assessed the results under component 1 as satisfactory. With regard to management and protection of productive capital and land tenure, achievement rates were all above 73 per cent and, in some cases, exceeded the targets (i.e. approx. 3,700 hectares of bare ridges reforested versus 3,300 targeted and nearly 24,000 land tenure certificates issued against the target of 20,000). Positive achievement rates above 70 per cent are reported at output level in terms of intensification of the value of agricultural production (i.e. certified seeds provided and livestock distributed, number of farmer field schools supported). The lowest rates refer to the hectares of restored watersheds (2,409 ha versus 3,292 ha targeted) and the number of livestock distributed within the community solidarity chains (4,176 versus 6,000 targeted). This was due to reported inadequate planning and related mismatches between availability of funds and commencement of activities in the field. Despite the above results at output level, some challenges are reported at outcome level with reference to the quality of irrigation infrastructure and the low adoption rate of certified seeds (50 per cent) due to users’ affordability constraints. Finally, the various degrees of achievement reported for the land tenure activities in terms of land certificates issued (23,911 against a target of 20,000), low land conflicts reduction (only 3.6 per cent against 30 per cent targeted) and limited use of land title deeds as collateral with financial institutions (only 5.6 per cent against the target of 50 per cent), negatively affect the effectiveness assessment of this intervention.</p> <p>6. The results reported under component 2 were mixed, with differing levels of success across the various subcomponents. As reported in the PCR, the objective of supporting and protecting productive capital was undermined by an initial poor market study. While access to market was generally facilitated by PAIVA-B through a combination of soft (capacity building activities in favour of producers’ associations) and hard (infrastructure for rice and milk production and collection, as well as rural roads) interventions, it is worth noting that activities in the four additional provinces appeared to be concentrated in the last two years of project</p>	4

⁸ Focusing on promoting rural poor access to new economic opportunities, strengthening farmers’ organizations, improving resilience to climate change, capacity building, inclusion of more disadvantaged groups in development activities, rural development, and rural poverty reduction.

⁹ More precisely, it was in line with: (i) the National Agriculture Strategy for 2008-2015; (ii) the National Agricultural Investment Plan for 2012-2017; (iii) the National Programme for Food security for 2008-105; and (iv) the Multisector Plan for Food Security and Nutrition for 2014-2017.

¹⁰ However, as reported in the effectiveness section, delays were reported in undertaking key investment activities and execution of the annual work plan and budgeting did not always follow the plans.

¹¹ Such as: (i) limited importance paid to the third objective which was not explicitly linked to the operational components and lacked a dedicated indicator in the logframe; and (ii) weak targeting mechanisms focusing on the most vulnerable groups and the landless, including lack of appropriate indicators in the logframe.

PCR finding	PCR Rating
<p>life. This was due to initial delays at project level which negatively affected the overall implementation and the related outcomes (i.e. in the milk value chain only 30 per cent of overall production is reported to be commercialized through milk collection centres).¹² With regard to the financing of agricultural investments, results appear satisfactory both in terms of new financial products developed (four out of five targeted) and overall loan outstanding (actual BIF2,666 million versus BIF1,312 million targeted).</p> <p>7. Results under component 3 related to the capacity building of local stakeholders (communities, NGOs and local producers' groups) are not all consistently reported in the PCR, presumably due to the reported weaknesses in the M&E system. All available outputs, however, exceed targets set at appraisal and show positive outcomes in terms of ownership of new techniques introduced and capacities built within local producers' organizations.</p> <p>8. Finally, this PCRV agrees with the MTR assessment that the project implementation strategy used a watershed management approach within which project activities were integrated in a satisfactory manner, maximizing PAIVA-B's impact at local level.¹³ Nevertheless, some drawbacks were also experienced such as the lack of geographic continuity among targeted municipalities.¹⁴</p> <p>9. Based on the information available in the PCR, satisfactory levels of accomplishments are reported for most of the activities under the first and third components although the implementation of certain interventions was delayed. Achievements under the second component were mixed, particularly in those provinces targeted during the last years of project's life. Based on the above, the effectiveness is rated <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> by the PCRV, in agreement with PCR rating.</p>	
Efficiency	
<p>10. Upon completion, the disbursement rates of IFAD's financing were satisfactory with 100 per cent of the initial DSF grant fund and 86 per cent of the additional financing. Utilization of cofinancing was generally satisfactory (100 per cent for EU and 90 per cent for the grant from Canada), with the exception of WFP's funding which was only 33 per cent. Reference is made in the PCR to WFP not disbursing as planned, but the underlying reasons are not explained. Government counterpart financing was utilized at 30 per cent and this is probably due to an overestimation made at appraisal. Assessment of beneficiaries' contribution was significant during the first phase (in-kind contribution) and lower during the second phase due to the low levels of financial contribution to the infrastructure development.</p> <p>11. Time from approval to entry into force was three months and time from entry into force to first disbursement of funds was five months which compares well with the current average for the Eastern and Southern Africa region (i.e. 11 months), notwithstanding the age of the project.¹⁵ Overall disbursement trends were not consistent throughout the project life and average execution of the annual workplan and budgeting was 62 per cent. This is an indication that the project's financial programming was not adequately reflected in the disbursement plan.</p> <p>12. Key indicators of the economic and financial analysis show an overall satisfactory performance. The ex post financial and economic analysis reports the economic rate of return at completion equal to 17 per cent. This is higher than the 12 per cent opportunity cost of capital, thus showing the project's viability. The discrepancy with design (i.e. economic rate of return estimated at 14 per cent for the initial financing and 20 per cent for the additional financing) could be explained by optimistic assumptions at appraisal, lower actual adoption rates as well as delays in undertaking some investments that in turn affected the computation of benefits. All</p>	4

¹² At mid-term, the budget execution of the component stood at US\$1,087 million equivalent to only 7.1 per cent.

¹³ Such complementarity refers to land rehabilitation, watershed development, strengthening of users' associations, distribution of livestock kits and development of boundaries using forage species.

¹⁴ It is reported that in some cases the civil works undertaken upstream contributed to flooding in the valleys, which were not part of the management plan.

¹⁵ Source: IFAD Oracle Business Intelligence.

PCR finding	PCR Rating
<p>financial models show strong profitability levels with internal rates of return generally higher than the borrowing interest rate of 24 per cent (i.e. internal rates of return vary from 55 per cent for rice production to 25 per cent for milk collection).</p> <p>13. With reference to the unit costs, these are generally in line with design estimates, and, in some cases, savings are reported which show efficient project management. The only exception was the unit cost of rural roads (which was 12 per cent higher than appraisal estimates) but the reasons for the increase are not explained. However, the increase in recurrent costs¹⁶ as percentage of total costs (13 per cent at completion versus 8 per cent at design) and the decrease in the percentage of investment costs (87 per cent at completion versus 92 per cent at design) suggests that resources were shifted from investments to finance project management costs.¹⁷ As noted already by the MTR and several supervision missions, the above increases were due to unplanned staff expenses to deal with increased workload and some inefficiencies at PMU level.¹⁸</p> <p>14. Based on the above, the PCR rates efficiency as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>, in agreement with the PCR rating.</p>	
Rural poverty impact	
<p>15. The assessment of the project's impact on rural poverty is based on the data collected by the completion mission, three Results and Impact Management System surveys as well as the project M&E system, which, as acknowledged by the PCR, presented some weaknesses.</p> <p>16. With reference to household incomes and assets, according to the endline survey data reported in the PCR, targeted households registered an average increase in incomes of BIF1,066,188 (or US\$564 equal to 4.5 times the baseline income and twice the income of the control group). While the increase is reported in all six provinces, better results (an eightfold increase) are described in those three provinces targeted since the initial phases of the project. Beneficiary households experienced significant improvements in assets ownership, also compared to the control group, indicating that these improvements may be attributed to the project.</p> <p>17. PAIVA-B contributed to human capital development of target beneficiaries through improved knowledge and skills in the domain of agricultural production and livestock rearing (i.e. watershed management, intercropping, production and marketing techniques, etc.), literacy training and basic repair as well as maintenance of infrastructure (410 people trained against the target of 238). In terms of social capital, the PCR narrative refers, <i>inter-alia</i>, to the support and creation of seven rice cooperatives (100 per cent achievement rate), and 34 associations of water use (100 per cent achievement rate), as well as the capacity building of targeted farmers' and producers' organizations.</p> <p>18. According to the PCR, PAIVA-B reported a satisfactory impact on food security of the target population. Several indicators are reported which show <i>inter-alia</i> the reduction of food insecurity (65 per cent at completion versus 75 per cent at appraisal) and chronic malnutrition (63 per cent at appraisal and 38 per cent at completion).¹⁹ Increases in agricultural productivity are reported for all targeted crops varying from 94 per cent for maize to 66 per cent for potatoes. It is worth noting that indicators reported in the log frame are limited to rice and milk productions, not all the others targeted by the project.</p> <p>19. Finally, as for institutions and policies, the PCR reported that PAIVA-B contributed to new regulations for milk and dairy products and better tracking of livestock. Unfortunately, how this was achieved is not described.</p>	5

¹⁶ Including salaries and project operating costs.

¹⁷ This is confirmed by the increase in the project management costs (i.e. 18 per cent at completion versus 12 per cent at design).

¹⁸ Additional staff required at PMU level that was not envisaged at design (procurement and financial staff to deal with EU financing) as well as some inefficiencies in hiring and allocating human resources.

¹⁹ Positive results with regard to improvements of beneficiaries' nutritional habits are also reported by producers during the final stakeholder workshop.

PCR finding	PCR Rating
20. Based on the above findings, this PCR rates rural poverty impact as <i>satisfactory (5)</i> , in agreement with the PCR rating.	
Sustainability of benefits	
<p>21. According to the PCR, the following factors contribute to a positive assessment of this criterion: (i) the development of an exit strategy covering most project interventions;²⁰ (ii) expected follow-up by PRODEFI and the Support Agricultural and Rural Financial Inclusion Project in Burundi; (iii) establishment of certain strong producers' organizations; and (iv) implication of local administration during project implementation. Nevertheless, two main aspects are expected to negatively affect the sustainability of the project's benefits, such as: (i) delays in carrying out civil works and related training provided to producers' organizations in those areas targeted towards the end of project's life; and (ii) limited resources of local administrations and central technical services to provide required follow-up at field level.</p> <p>22. According to the PCR, certain project results are more likely to be sustained than others depending on the geographical area of intervention. Overall, producers' organizations and institutions involved in the project's activities in the first provinces of interventions are more mature and more likely to be sustainable than those associations supported during the final years. Capacities built at local level and arrangements foreseen for the management of the infrastructure are reported to be robust. In addition, when the private sector was involved, sustainability prospects appear to be generally positive (i.e. rice and milk value chains). The sustainability of rural infrastructure is mixed since it relies on the capacities of personnel trained and the mechanisms foreseen and/or in place for regular maintenance. While these preconditions are in place in the first provinces of PAIVA-B intervention, several challenges are reported in the areas involved towards the end of the project life.</p> <p>23. Finally, sustainability of certain key project activities will be supported by the existing laws and regulations for cooperatives and animal husbandry. However, clear procedures with regard to the collection of fees deriving from the use of infrastructure or equipment provided to the producers' organizations are not foreseen by law.</p> <p>24. Based on the above, the PCR rates this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>, in agreement with the PCR rating.</p>	4
B. Other performance criteria	
Innovation	
<p>25. The PCR describes several innovations tested in the project area to modernize targeted agricultural production systems and launch new approaches for production and value addition. These include the establishment of milk collection centres together with the private sector, the organization of the local cooperatives around water associations and the transformation of the role of community development committees, which are all described in the PCR along with key successful factors and challenges experienced. Two technological innovations reported in the PCR (i.e. the cowshed built using cement, and system of rice intensification, SRI), were not truly innovative, but rather were just new to the project area. However, their adaptation to the local context has reported positive results and uptake by local producers.</p> <p>26. Particularly innovative was the introduction of the Household Mentoring approach and the Gender Action Learning System tested in the country together with Oxfam Novib. In addition, it is worth mentioning that PAIVA-B tested a participatory planning, management, evaluation and learning tool to allow close involvement by the community development committees throughout the project's life.</p>	5

²⁰ With the exception of those infrastructure built during the end of the project's life.

PCR finding	PCR Rating
27. For these reasons, this criterion is rated as <i>satisfactory (5)</i> , in agreement with the PCR.	
Scaling up	
<p>28. The adoption and replication by the government of the farmer field school approach and the community development committees are reported in the PCR. In addition, successful replication of certain innovative practices through producers' organizations is outlined in the report.</p> <p>29. The PCR recognizes that several approaches and practices promoted by PAIVA-B have the potential to be scaled up both by the Government of Burundi as well as the private sector. In this regard, clear criteria are outlined in the PCR as conditions for the successful replication at larger scale (including, inter-alia, the establishment of attractive public investment packages for the private sector, adequate communication campaigns, quality standards ensured for local production etc.). Whether these criteria are actually in place is not clearly presented and no clear evidence of actual scaling up has been provided in the PCR itself.</p> <p>30. The PCR reports the replication of certain practices and approaches (i.e. participatory, planning, monitoring, evaluation and learning; gender action learning system; SRI) in other IFAD-financed projects; however, the PCR notes that replication of practices in other IFAD-funded projects does not necessarily constitute scaling-up as per the IFAD definition.²¹</p> <p>31. Nonetheless, through discussion with PMD on the finalization of this PCR in May 2020, it has come to light that certain PAIVA-B practices (particularly in the milk and rice value chains) have been replicated and up-scaled with substantial co-financing by the OPEC Fund for International Development, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program and WFP under PRODEFI I and II and the National Programme for Food Security and Rural Development in Imbo and Moso.²² In this regard, the Government of Burundi has reportedly facilitated the scaling up of PAIVA-B innovations.</p> <p>32. Overall, while the PCR document itself focused mostly on the potential for scaling up and lacked concrete evidence of actual scaling-up having taken place, this PCR takes into account the additional evidence provided by PMD with regard to the up-scaling of PAIVA-B practices with substantial co-financing by development partners and rates this criterion as <i>satisfactory (5)</i>, in line with the PCR rating.</p>	5
Gender equality and women's empowerment	
<p>33. At appraisal, women, widows and heads of households, were included in the target group. However, a gender strategy was not developed at appraisal and the MTR did not provide specific guidelines on how to adequately target those groups or mainstream gender across the project components.</p> <p>34. Available figures reported in the PCR show the following outputs in terms of women's participation in project's activities: (i) 33 per cent of beneficiaries of the rice cooperatives; (ii) 49 per cent of maize cooperatives; (iii) 23 per cent of milk cooperatives; (iv) 60 per cent of farmer field school participants; and (v) 50 per cent of seed multiplier groups. At outcome level, the PCR reported women improved participation in decision-making processes at household, community and political levels. While limited information is provided in terms of women's representation and new roles within the community groups or at political level, it is worth noting that several activities have contributed to women's empowerment in the project area. These include, inter-alia, literacy campaigns (13,156 but no targets are provided),</p>	4

²¹ "Expanding, adapting and supporting successful policies, programmes and knowledge, so that they can leverage resources and partners to deliver larger results for a greater number of rural poor in a sustainable way" (IFAD operational framework for scaling up results, 2015). It further noted that "scaling up results does not mean transforming small IFAD projects into larger projects", but rather it is about "how successful local initiatives will sustainably leverage policy changes, additional resources and learning to bring the results to scale".

²² With particular reference to the National Programme for Food Security and Rural Development in Imbo and Moso funding, it included a US\$1 million grant from IFAD, US\$19.79 million from the OPEC Fund for International Development and US\$30.2 million from the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program.

PCR finding	PCR Rating
<p>new jobs created (3,351 women beneficiaries against 3,588 targeted), establishment of solidarity groups, sensibilization campaigns under the gender action learning system approach, as well as legal support provided to victims of domestic violence. With reference to the latter, training was also provided to 533 paralegals to provide future support to women in need. Marriage counseling was also provided through the activities funded by Canada, which contributed a greater acknowledgement of women's rights in the event of separation. However, it is reported that only 2,283 women (or 10 per cent) benefitted from land tenure support activities, which are considered very important in terms of women's empowerment. The reason for such low participation is not clearly explained in the PCR.</p> <p>35. Based on the above, the rating of the PCR is <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>, in agreement with PCR's.</p>	
Environment and natural resources management	
<p>36. The PCR assessment of this criterion highlights the reduction of environmentally damaging behaviours as an effect of increased beneficiaries' incomes.²³ However, considering that in certain areas income increases and sustainability prospects are lower than others, it could be argued that certain behaviours can still take place (i.e. cutting woods or over exploitation).</p> <p>37. It is reported that certain project activities had a limited negative environmental impact (i.e. civil works for watershed management, infrastructure for improved agricultural practices and rural roads to access the areas of interventions). The description of the environmental benefits deriving from PAIVA-B interventions could have been better articulated in the dedicated PCR section (ref. D.5) although relevant information is provided in the Annex V. Positive results are reported especially in terms of water management and hectares of marshland recovered (2,408 hectares or 73 per cent of appraisal target), hectares of watershed managed and recovered (27,017 hectares equal to 77 per cent of target) and anti-erosion systems put in place in all marsh lands rehabilitated. However, as highlighted by the MTR, choosing the marsh as a starting point for the development of the watershed management plan hampered the identification of critical slopes within the broad watershed area thus contributing to floods in certain valleys. The PCR also reported that some dams and water drainage canals were severely damaged by heavy rainfall with negative impacts on the surroundings. Overall, the risks associated with water pollution from fertilizers other agricultural products are considered limited by the PCR and significant results are reported in terms of water management, including groundwater table, and related use. Yet, some recommendations are made to allow adequate availability of water to all parcels especially during the dry season and avoid possible conflicts. Whether the recommended interventions on the size of the irrigation canals were put in place is not clear. Also, in the absence of piezometric monitoring data, and the high heterogeneity of the water resource in the six provinces of project intervention, it is difficult to assess the impact in the medium term.²⁴</p> <p>38. The reforestation of 3,743 hectares is reported at completion versus the target of 3,353. An additional 37,301,210 plants²⁵ and 24,000 plants of <i>Bambusa vulgaris</i> were planted to support riverbanks. Unfortunately, it is not possible to evaluate the achievement rate of this important intervention without an indication of the targets set. Also, reporting on a critical indicator foreseen in the log-frame "hectares under climate resilient management" is missing.</p> <p>39. Finally, as acknowledged by the PCR (Annex V) PAIVA-B did not conduct strict environmental monitoring during its implementation. Based on the above, the PCR</p>	4

²³ Including hunting, harvesting of wild forage and over exploitation of land in the protected areas in the Kibira National Park.

²⁴ For these reasons, it is recommended by the PCR to further monitor the water availability before new investments are undertaken, which would further increase the demand for water.

²⁵ Such as *Eucalyptus sp*, *de Grevillea sp*, *de Calliandra sp* et *de Prunus africana*.

PCR finding	PCR Rating
rates this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> , lower than the PCR (satisfactory, 5).	
Adaptation to Climate Change	
<p>40. A specific component for adaptation to climate change was not foreseen at design. Funds for mainstreaming adaptation to climate change were made available with IFAD's additional financing in 2015, particularly for activities under component 1. According to the PCR, PAIVA-B supported adaptation to climate change through the main following activities: (i) introduction of improved seed varieties; (ii) promotion of more sustainable water use during the dry season through management of natural water points; (iii) construction of dams and support to watershed management; and (iv) promotion of biogas and use of photovoltaic solar energy for milk storage. However, with reference to the adoption rate of improved seed varieties, it is reported that only 50 per cent of rice producers actually used the improved seeds, as they were too expensive. In addition, with regard to the biogas, it is noted that the bio-digesters were introduced towards the end of the project life and only benefitted three households with limited effects on the environment. The PCR noted that the above practices should have been better documented and evaluated, also in view of their potential for replication.</p> <p>41. For the above reasons, this criterion is rated <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> by the PCR, in agreement with PMD.</p>	4
C. Overall Project Achievement	
<p>42. PAIVA-B was conceived to be implemented in phases, with activities starting in two provinces at the end of 2009 to be then expanded to the other four provinces during the project's life. As a result, overall project achievements, and their sustainability, varied a lot across the project area.</p> <p>43. Overall, the production inputs delivered by the project contributed to increases in yields of all target crops, especially for rice, which benefitted also from the introduction of SRI. Agricultural and livestock-related equipment and infrastructure was developed at the local level with a view to sustaining the project's benefits after completion. Value chain development and access to markets was also facilitated through partnerships with the private sector (particularly for rice), the development of rural roads and the establishment of infrastructure facilities for storing agricultural products (i.e. milk collection centres). Capacities of local producers' organizations, cooperatives and more generally private sector partners, were also built through farmer field schools and several training activities.</p> <p>44. However, implementation delays and limited time devoted to the areas targeted during the second half of project activities, negatively affected the overall project performance. Producers' organizations were less mature in certain areas, training provided was less effective and watershed infrastructure and their maintenance systems were more problematic. Also, the poor quality of market studies commissioned at start-up, and weaknesses experienced with the project M&E system throughout implementation, did not allow PAIVA-B to provide adequate assistance and follow-up to local stakeholders in view of fully achieving all targeted outcomes. In addition, certain activities related to land tenure did not achieve the expected results, particularly in terms of reduction of land-related conflicts and use of land title deeds with financial institutions.</p> <p>45. Despite the above, however, PAIVA-B reported some positive results in all targeted provinces in terms of increased incomes and household assets, improved agricultural productivity and improved nutritional status and food security of its target groups when compared to the control group. For these reasons, this PCR rates overall project achievement as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>, in line with the PCR rating for this criterion.</p>	4

PCR finding	PCR Rating
D. Performance of Partners	
IFAD	
46. The PCR highlights that in addition to support provided by IFAD through 10 supervision and implementation support missions, technical expertise was mobilized through the project life to deal with specific issues (i.e. financial management for EU money). The PCR also points out the proactive role played by the IFAD country office since its establishment in 2012 and the benefits deriving from the field presence. However, while PCR criticizes the sudden departure of the IFAD country programme manager in 2017 and the various changes of country programme managers over the years, there was nonetheless consistent support provided to the project. The PCR rates this criterion as <i>satisfactory (5)</i> , in agreement with the PCR rating.	5
Government	
47. According to the PCR, Government of Burundi's performance was satisfactory in terms of the support provided by MINEAGRIE and provincial administrators throughout the implementation, their participation in supervision missions and ad-hoc field visits. However, a very low level of counterpart financing (i.e. 30 per cent of appraisal value) is recorded at completion. According to the PCR, this could be due to its overestimation at design, but it is worth noting that Government of Burundi financing has not been discussed or modified at mid-term. It is reported that efforts were made by the Government of Burundi to support the project in other ways (i.e. availability of office space, etc.) but they were not quantified in the PCR.	4
48. While the PCR assessment of government performance is overall satisfactory, the PCR draws attention to the implementation delays reported by several supervision missions, which were reportedly due to insufficient planning of certain activities. Furthermore, some inefficiencies in terms of staff management are also reported in the MTR.	
49. Based on the above, government performance is rated <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> by this PCR, lower than the PCR rating (5).	

IV. Assessment of PCR Quality

PCR finding	Rating
Scope	
50. The PCR contains all chapters, sections, and annexes as per the Guidelines for Project Completion Review (2015) although the table of content is missing. <i>This PCR rates the scope of the PCR as satisfactory (5).</i>	5
Quality	
51. The PCR process was inclusive of a variety of stakeholders, male and female, including government staff from MINAGRIE and other relevant ministries as well as their decentralized offices, representatives of IFAD-supported projects, implementing partners and beneficiaries. A stakeholder workshop was held in August 2019 to take stock of PAIVA-B achievements and for participants to voice their observations on the project's results. The workshop's findings are clearly organized and presented. A detailed list of all relevant stakeholders who participated in the workshop is provided but information on how they have been involved in the review process is missing, thus making it difficult to assess the level of inclusiveness. At field level, two stakeholder workshops took place (in July 2019 in Gitega and the following month in Kayanza) with participation of project's stakeholders from all provinces.	5
52. Challenges and changes experienced by the PAIVA-B monitoring and evaluation throughout the implementation are clearly explained in the report. This was also adequately taken into account in the PCR and qualitative and quantitative results	

PCR finding	Rating
<p>were therefore collected during the mission. More importantly, for the assessment of the rural poverty impact, the PCR consistently compares findings for project beneficiaries with the control group, which adds to the plausibility of the findings.</p> <p>53. Based on the above, the PCR rates the quality of the PCR as <i>satisfactory (5)</i>.</p>	
Lessons	
<p>54. Lessons presented in the PCR (ref. Section H) have been drawn from the review of the institutional arrangements set at project design as well as from the project implementation. Challenges experienced in the PAIVA-B phasing approach are documented and valid reflections are made which can be useful for future projects. The lessons appear reasonable and presented in a coherent manner and paved the way to multiple recommendations presented in the PCR (see Section I). The rating by the PCR is satisfactory (5).</p>	5
Candour	
<p>55. The PCR narrative is objective and reports both positive as well as less positive results. Ratings are generally in line with the narrative. Concerns were raised (i.e. effectiveness of activities carried out under component 2 and sustainability) and the assessment of the overall project appear balanced. This PCR rates the candour for the PCR as <i>satisfactory (5)</i>.</p>	5

V. Final Remarks

Issues for IOE follow up (if any)
56. 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
Rural poverty impact	Impact is defined as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions.	X	Yes
	<i>Four impact domains</i>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household income and net assets: Household income provides a means of assessing the flow of economic benefits accruing to an individual or group, whereas assets relate to a stock of accumulated items of economic value. The analysis must include an assessment of trends in equality over time. 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. 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. Institutions and policies: The criterion relating to institutions and policies is designed to assess changes in the quality and performance of institutions, policies and the regulatory framework that influence the lives of the poor. 		No
Project performance	Project performance is an average of the ratings for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of benefits.	X	Yes
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, institutional priorities and partner and donor policies. It also entails an assessment of project design and coherence in achieving its objectives. An assessment should also be made of whether objectives and design address inequality, for example, by assessing the relevance of targeting strategies adopted.	X	Yes
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.	X	Yes
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.	X	Yes
Sustainability of benefits	The likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. It also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.	X	Yes
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	The extent to which IFAD interventions have contributed to better gender equality and women's empowerment, for example, in terms of women's access to and ownership of assets, resources and services; participation in decision making; work load balance and impact on women's incomes, nutrition and livelihoods.	X	Yes
Innovation	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction.	X	Yes
Scaling up	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have been (or are likely to be) scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and others agencies.	X	Yes
Environment and natural resources management	The extent to which IFAD development interventions contribute to resilient livelihoods and ecosystems. The focus is on the use and management of the natural environment, including natural resources defined as raw materials used for socio-economic and cultural purposes, and ecosystems and biodiversity - with the goods and services they provide.	X	Yes
Adaptation to climate change	The contribution of the project to reducing the negative impacts of climate change through dedicated adaptation or risk reduction measures.	X	Yes

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

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

Rating comparison^a

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Programme Management Department (PMD) rating</i>	<i>IOE Project Completion Report Validation (PCRVR) rating</i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (PCRVR-PMD)</i>
Rural poverty impact	4	4	0
Project performance			
Relevance	5	5	0
Effectiveness	4	4	0
Efficiency	4	4	0
Sustainability of benefits	4	4	0
Project performance^b	4.25	4.25	0
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	4	4	0
Innovation	5	5	0
Scaling up	5	5	0
Environment and natural resources management	5	4	-1
Adaptation to climate change	4	4	0
Overall project achievement^c	4	4	0

Performance of partners^d			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	5	4	-1
Average net disconnect			-0.17

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

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

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

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

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

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

BIF	Burundi Franc
DSF	Debt Sustainability Framework
EU	European Union
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IOE	IFAD Independent Office of Evaluation
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MINEAGRIE	Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock
MTR	Mid-Term Review
PAIVA-B	Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project
PCR	Project Completion Report
PCRV	Project Completion Report Validation
PMU	Programme management unit
PRODEFI	Value Chain Development Programme
SDR	Special drawing rights
SRI	System of rice intensification
WFP	World Food Programme

Bibliography

- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2009. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *Design Report. Main Report, Annexes and Working Papers*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2009. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *President's Report on the Proposed grant to the Republic of Burundi*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2013. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *Thematic mid-term review report*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2014a. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *Mid-term review report*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2014b. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *Supervision report*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2015a. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *Supervision report*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2015b. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *President's Memorandum on proposed additional financing to the Republic of Burundi for the Agricultural Intensification and Value-Enhancing Support Project*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2016. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *Supervision report*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2017. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *Supervision report*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2018. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *Supervision report*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2019. Agricultural Intensification and Value-enhancing Support Project. *Supervision report*, Rome: IFAD.