

Project Completion Report Validation

Ibarra San Lorenzo Development Project and Buen Vivir in Rural Territories Programme

Republic of Ecuador

Date of validation by IOE: August 2019

I. Basic project data

			Approval-revised (US\$ m)**		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	Latin America and the Caribbean	Total project costs	68.48		63.83	
Country	Ecuador	IFAD loan and percentage of total	30.07	35%	23.85	37%
Loan number [project ID]	(PISL) L-I-849,L-E-5 [1100001354]; (PBVTR) L-I 789 & 804 [1100001588]	Borrower	12.86	33%	12.18	19%
Type of project (subsector)	Rural Development	Spanish Trust Fund	15.00	18%	12.55	20%
Financing type	Loan	GEF (PISL)	2.7	3%	2.7	4%
Lending terms*	Ordinary					
Date of approval	(PISL)15/09/2009 (PBVTR)15/09/2011					
Date of loan signature	(PISL)04/03/2011 (PBVTR)30/05/2012	Beneficiaries	7.85	9%	12.56	20%
Date of effectiveness	(PISL)04/03/2011 (PBVTR)30/05/2012	Other sources				
Loan amendments	(PISL) 2 (PBVTR) 1	Number of beneficiaries	26,500 (direct)		22,048 (direct)	
Loan closure extensions	(PISL) 1 (PBVTR) 2					
Country programme managers	Caroline Bidault (Current) Jesus Quintana (2013-2016)	Loan closing date	(PISL)31/03/2017 (PBVTR)31/12/2018		(PISL)31/12/2018 (PBVTR)30/06/2021	
Regional director(s)	Rossana Polastri)	Mid-term review			24/11/2015	
Project completion report reviewer	Jorge Carballo	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)			88.2%	
Project completion report quality control panel	Estibalitz Morras Fumiko Nakai	Date of the project completion report			January 2019	

Source: Project completion report 2018.

* Loans on ordinary terms have a rate of interest per annum equivalent to one hundred per cent (100 per cent) of the variable reference interest rate, and a maturity period of 15-18 years, including a grace period of three years.

**Due to the merge that took place during programme implementation, the approval amount shows the combined amounts for two projects, US\$48.63 million (revised figure) from the "Buen Vivir" in Rural Territories Programme (PBVTR, project ID 1588) and US\$19.85 million from the Ibarra San Lorenzo Development Project (PISL, project ID 1354).

II. Project outline

1. **Introduction.** The "Buen Vivir" in Rural Territories Programme (PBVTR) in Ecuador, originally approved for IFAD financing in September 2011, has served as an opportunity to improve food-insecurity, rural households that were largely depending on small-scale agriculture and related activities for their livelihoods and were consequently vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Most of these small-scale producers were facing challenges such as limited access to land, water, technical assistance, rural finance and markets.
2. The strategy proposed to confront this challenge was to implement a programme directed mainly at territorial level interventions to facilitate endogenous, territorial level initiatives centred on making agroecological production and other sustainable approaches viable for poor family-scale producers. Agro ecology was envisioned as the centrepiece of a new approach to multifunctional agriculture supported by the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG) in alliance with local governments, community and territorial based organizations, local financial institutions, commercial cooperatives and other actors in multiple initiatives.
3. During its implementation, PBVTR "absorbed" another ongoing IFAD-financed project, the Ibarra San Lorenzo Development Project (PISL). The IFAD financing for PISL had been approved in 2009 by the Executive Board (two years before the approval of PBVTR). In 2012, the Project Management Units (PMUs) for PBVTR and PISL were merged. The PISL 2014 mid-term review identified some issues that were affecting project implementation such as: changes in regulations regarding the operationalization of decentralized autonomous governments (GADs) and the implementation of PBVTR activities which were receiving more attention from the MAG. For this reason, by request of the MAG, the PISL financing agreement was amended and its objectives, goals, target group and components were aligned with those of the PBVTR. Since then, the expanded PBVTR has been implemented as one programme merging two distinctive projects.
4. The Project Completion Report (PCR) for an expanded PBVTR being validated provides an analysis considering both interventions (PISL and original PBVTR). Even though the results¹ were most of the time presented separately under different sub-sections according to their respective project/programme (with the exception of relevance) the PCR provides a single rating for each criteria. This PCR will provide a global analysis based on the combined results achieved by both interventions and their targets. At the same time, it should be noted that PBVTR is still ongoing, since the programme (associated with loan-849) has been extended for three years till December 2021 with additional financing. The PISL part is considered completed and its financing (L-789 and L-604) has been closed.
5. **Programme area.** The Programme area covered 46 rural municipalities and 151 rural *parish governments* in nine provinces (Chimborazo, Esmeraldas, Guayas, Imbabura, Loja, Los Ríos, Manabí, Santa Elena and Tungurahua). The target area has a combined population of about 760,000 or roughly 16 per cent of the country's rural population. It is inhabited mainly by small-scale producers and, in some areas, indigenous and afro-Ecuadorian communities, and is characterized by high levels of poverty and extreme poverty.²
6. The territories included a wide variety of ecosystems that were fragile or threatened, ranging from the moorlands of Tungurahua and Chimborazo to the semi-arid regions of Santa Elena and Manabí; critically important wetlands in Los Ríos; areas suffering high rates of deforestation in Esmeraldas; and degraded landscapes in Loja. These areas are important for national food production,

¹ *Inter alia* outputs, outcomes.

² PBVTR Project Design Report 2011.

biodiversity (including agrobiodiversity) and the watersheds that supply major cities.

7. **Programme goal, objectives and components.** The main goal of the programme was to improve the living standards of the targeted group in the programme area by: i) strengthening capacities for territorial development of social organizations and GADs; and ii) the consolidation of strategic economic initiatives related to food sovereignty.
8. The programme has four components:
 - *Component I: Strengthening capacities for territorial development.* The main objective of this component was to strengthen the institutional and organizational capacities in the territories targeted by the programme by co-financing capacity development initiatives for producer organizations on areas such as social inclusion, access to rural services, market access, knowledge sharing and application of environmental standards. In the case of GADs, the programme prioritized rural parish governments, communities and the effective coordination of territorial initiatives with provincial governments.
 - *Component II: Territorial initiatives investment fund.* The main objective of this component was to increase the income and food security of agroecological producers through the implementation of an investment fund for territorial initiatives, co-financed with non-reimbursable initiatives (sub-projects) of productive and commercial nature, natural resource management and socio-productive infrastructure.
 - *Component III: Participatory monitoring and evaluation system.* The main objective of this component was to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation capacity by encouraging the participation of beneficiaries in the planning and decision-making processes of the program and applying a participatory monitoring and evaluation system.
 - *Component IV: Programme management.* The objective of this component is to ensure that the PBVTR complies with national government and IFAD standards for an effective and an efficient programme implementation. The component covers three main government levels: central, regional and provincial.
9. **Target group.** The target group includes food-insecure, poor rural households living in nine different territories with a combined population of 760,000 (roughly 16 per cent of the country's rural population).³ These small-scale producers and, in some areas, indigenous and afro-Ecuadorian communities, are dependent to some degree on small-scale agriculture, either as producers on their own land; as day labourers; or both. Most families depend on multiple activities for their subsistence, including small-scale commerce, temporary work in nearby towns and cities and in the flower industry (*floriculas*) of the central highlands. Young men and women who encounter few opportunities in their local communities are especially likely to migrate.
10. **Financing.** At design, the original PBVTR had a total budget of US\$62.98 million financed as follows: an IFAD loan of SDR 10.75 million equivalent to US\$17.29 million (27.5 per cent of total cost), a Spanish trust fund loan of EUR 10.71 million equivalent to US\$15.0 million (23.8 per cent of total cost) and a domestic contribution (central government, GADs, beneficiaries and financial institutions) of US\$30.69 million (48.7 per cent of total cost). During implementation, the government counterpart was reduced due to the lack of confirmation of financial institutions funds. This reduction brought down the total budget to US\$48.62 million.

³ 2011 president report-PBVTR.

11. After the realignment of PISL components in May 2015, the adjustment in the total PBVTR budget and the merging of the PISL with the PBVTR, the programme had a total budget of US\$68.48 million (including the US\$19.85 million from the PISL). At completion, the total programme cost was US\$63.8 million (see table 1) financed as follows: three IFAD loans amounting to a total of US\$12.18 million (37.29 per cent of total cost), a Government contribution of US\$10.41 million (38.84 per cent of total cost), beneficiary contribution of US\$19.7 million (international financing [STF]) of US\$12.55 million (19.58 per cent of total cost) and a Global Environment Facility (GEF) grant of US\$2.75 million (4.29 per cent of total cost) (part of the PISL project).
12. Table 2 shows the total programme costs by component. It is important to mention that the appraisal cost includes the costs for both projects. Some differences may be due to the absence of funds from financial institutions, as mentioned before.

Table 1
Programme costs

Financier	Planned - PISL (in 000' US\$)	Planned (revised) - PBVTR (in 000' US\$)*	Percentage of planned costs (PISL & PBVTR)	Actual (PISL & PBVTR) (in 000' US\$)	Percentage of actual cost	Disbursement rate (%)
IFAD (L-849)	-	17,290	25.2%	15,250	23.9%	88%
IFAD (L-789)	8,650	-	12.6%	6,410	10.0%	74%
IFAD (L-804)	4,130	-	6.0%	2,190	3.4%	53%
Government	2,450	10,410	18.8%	12,180	19.1%	95%
Spanish Trust Fund	-	15,000	21.9%	12,550	19.7%	84%
GEF	2,700	-	3.9%	2,700	4.2%	100%
Beneficiaries	1,920	5,930	11.5%	12,560	19.7	160%
Total	19,850	48,630	100%	63,830	100%	

Source: PBVTR/PISL Project Completion Report 2019.

*This column shows the revised budget figures for PBVTR after the funds from local financial institutions did not materialize.

Table 2
Component costs

Component	Planned (PISL & PBVTR) (in 000' US\$)	Percentage of planned costs	Actual (in 000' US\$) (PISL & PBVTR)	Percentage of actual cost	Disbursement rate (%)
I. Strengthening capacities for territorial development	7,923	11.6%	2,471	3.9%	31%
II. Territorial initiatives investment fund	49,308	72.0%	51,315	80.4%	104%
III. Participatory monitoring and evaluation system	1,824	2.7%	230	0.4%	13%
IV. Programme management	9,425	13.8%	9,814	15.4%	104%
Total	68,480		63,830		

Source: PBVTR/PISL Project Completion Report 2019.

13. **Programme implementation.** The MAG was the implementing agency and a PMU for PBVTR was established within the Vice-Ministry for Rural Development. The PMU was composed by a central office located within the MAG in Quito and eight Territorial Liaison Offices (TLO) in the project areas. Each TLO had an operation unit that facilitated the communication between local organizations, other local actors and central, provincial and parish governments. In order to review, assess and approve sub-projects, a local steering committee was created. It was composed by producer organizations and local institutions representatives, which were appointed by the TLO units together with the GADs.
14. In order to execute sub-projects under component II, the committee decided to transfer socio-productive initiative funds directly to the PBVTR beneficiaries, as well as complementary transfers, through banking instruments. These processes were conducted without institutional intermediaries through a contract between the programme and the producer organizations as a part of the empowerment and co-responsibility strategy implemented by the PBVTR.
15. **Significant changes/developments during implementation:**
 - A. *Merging of PISL with the PBVTR:* in 2011, the government decided to move the PISL under the same executing agency of the PBVTR (MAG). Later in 2015, through an amendment of the programme agreement, the PISL aligned with the PBVTR objectives, components and indicators in the logical framework.
 - B. *Changes in the logical framework after mid-term review:* The target number of beneficiaries was reduced from 25,000 to 20,000 households under the original PBVTR and from 9,000 to 6,500 households under the ex-PISL. In other words, the revised target was 26,500 households in total, reduced from 34,000.
16. **Intervention logic.** The primary focus of the programme was given to long-term initiatives that would strengthen community-based territorial-level capacities to manage land, water and other natural resources that are strategic in the respective territories. The programme aimed to invest in business plans (60 per cent financed by the programme and 40 per cent financed by the organization) to be implemented by second-tier organizations, community-based groups, and public private partnerships in order to create employment, diversify the rural economy and generate income for agroecological producers and other target groups, including young women and men.
17. The means to achieve the objective of strengthening self-management capacities and sustainable livelihoods for poor rural families were through non-reimbursable transfers, endogenous initiatives for natural resource management, productive infrastructure, and other nation-wide strategies. The "organizational strengthening" approach of PBVTR focused on inter-community ventures, associations and other second and third level entities with the capacity or the potential to influence at the territorial level in order to facilitate social inclusion, services, commercialization knowledge sharing, good environmental practices and other objectives.
18. Through the sub-projects (business plans) under component II, the programme planned to provide three types of support: physical assets, technical assistance for agricultural products perceived as highly profitable and working capital. The sub-projects under this component were divided into five categories: agriculture (e.g. rice and lupin beans) and agroforestry (e.g. coffee and cocoa), dairy, fruit farming (e.g. berries, oranges and papaya) and irrigation. The main reason behind the support to these specific areas was to improve the livelihood of rural families by applying agroecological practices through crop diversification.

19. **Delivery of outputs.** The overview of the output delivery is presented in Annex III, which combines outputs⁴ from both interventions. The table in the annex shows that the achievement rates for most of the targets were 75 per cent or higher. However, this PCRV considers that most targets were slightly overambitious. In the case of component I most of the targets were almost achieved or overachieved, however, the delivery of activities such as the territorial management trainings to community members only reached 58 per cent of target.
20. For outputs under component II, the indicator on "families implementing agroecological productive plans" was the only one close to reach its target with 98 per cent. The rest of the output indicators were achieved by a range between 75 to 84 per cent of target, with the exception of "market, processing or storage facilities constructed or rehabilitated", which was only achieved by 35 per cent. This was mainly due to the low construction/rehabilitation of processing and storage facilities.

III. Review of findings

A. Core criteria

Relevance

21. **Relevance of objectives.** The objectives of the PBVTR proved to be relevant and aligned with national policies for poverty reduction and the 2002 and 2014 IFAD Country Strategic Opportunities Programmes (COSOP). The design of the PBVTR comes as a response to the request from the Ministry of Agriculture to target specific geographic areas (central highlands and coast) of the country that were reporting high poverty rates. The programme became a cornerstone of the National Strategy for Food and Nutritional Sovereignty (2009) which was part of the overall 2009-2013 National Plan for Buen Vivir⁵. By becoming part of this strategy, the programme was focused on food sovereignty, the stability and commitment to sustainable practices of family scale producers which also depended on economic alternatives and employment opportunities for the whole community, especially young women and men who were most prone to out-migrate.⁶
22. The programme was aligned with the strategic objectives of the 2004 COSOP which had a rural development approach focused on territorial development highlighted as a key component for policy dialogue. The programme was aligned to the eight "major areas of intervention": (i) support for ethnic native communities and ethnic minorities; (ii) the elimination of inequalities between men and women in rural areas; (iii) the protection and strengthening of social capital; (iv) the development of appropriate technologies for small farmers and entrepreneurs; (v) the provision of innovative rural finance services; (vi) the development of microenterprises and the expansion of the rural labour market; (vii) facilitation of access to land and property rights; and (viii) technical assistance and financing of agricultural and non-agricultural initiatives.
23. The programme continued to be relevant to the specific objectives of the 2014 COSOP which aim to: i) improve access to assets and resources to support the diversification of the rural Ecuadorian economy, promoting, among other things, associative ventures and investments that generate employment and income for poor rural families in Ecuador; and ii) increase the capacities of poor rural producers and potential entrepreneurs to participate in the formulation of productive policies that are inclusive and favourable to the poor and beneficial for them.

⁴ The outputs were described separately by project/programme in the main text of the PCR and in the logical framework presented in Annex 4 of this report.

⁵ The national plan was updated for the period 2013-2017.

⁶ PBVTR project design 2011.

24. **Relevance of design.** The programme design is considered relevant to the main issues associated with rural poverty in Ecuador. The design makes a proper analysis of the national context by tackling important issues such as: dependence on the production of extensive and short cycle monocultures, excessive use of agrochemicals, extreme fragmentation of agricultural plots, deforestation, deterioration of soil and water resources, low production and productivity, low technological level, gender inequality, environmental deterioration and weak organizational and associative structure. Additionally, the programme's logical framework provided a plausible number of indicators accompanied by assumptions and targets disaggregated by gender and ethnic groups.
25. On the other hand, there were some aspects that needed to be reinforced in the design such as: i) the programme design did not provide a clear analysis and strategy for crucial aspects such as commercialization and access to markets for independent and organized small producers; ii) the territorial development approach was limited due to the target area and the limited knowledge on how these territories could create economic synergies; iii) slightly over ambitious targets in the logical framework, mainly for indicators related to transformation and commercialization due to the limitations previously mentioned; and iv) the design does not include a clear exit strategy.
26. The programme's targeting approach was consistent with IFAD's policies based on a combination of the following: (i) direct targeting used to ensure inclusion of very poor families who were less likely to be members of community-based organizations; and (ii) a number of existing initiatives and second-tier organizations that were aligned with the programme's main objectives that would provide a pathway to participation in the programme for other poor rural groups.
27. One of the main modifications to the programme design was the merging of PISL and PBVTR. Initially, the design of the PISL was mainly focused on a territorial development approach, which was not aligned with the reality⁷ of the intervention area. The wide variation of components⁸ and activities did not allow the project to implement a territorial development approach, which was based on a "socio-economic corridor" concept. The merge with PBVTR and the realignment with its components, activities and objectives are considered relevant for the consistency of both programmes with new national policies and priorities, as well as for the achievement of more results, especially in terms of productivity.
28. **Overall**, the programme objectives proved to be aligned with the national strategies and priorities, as well as to the IFAD 2004 and 2014 COSOPs which targets key issues in terms of rural poverty reduction in the rural areas of Ecuador. The PBVTR design was considered relevant and includes key elements for the inclusive development of producer organizations in the targeted areas. However, the design missed the opportunity to make a proper analysis of crucial aspects such as commercialization, access to markets and the implementation of an exit strategy. This PCRV agrees with the Programme Management Department (PMD) and rates the programme's relevance as **satisfactory (5)**.

Effectiveness

29. This section presents the effectiveness of each component of the programme, in relation to the outcomes of the revised programme design and the delivery of outputs presented in section II. The programme benefited a total of 22,048 rural families (83 per cent of target) of which 7,736 were women headed households (35 per cent of total beneficiaries and 70 per cent of target). It is important to mention

⁷ Main issues: the existence of a socio-economic linkage between rural and urban areas; complementary activities between rural production and urban services; and articulation of local and regional markets.

⁸ (i) capacity-building, citizens' rights and institutional strengthening; (ii) management of natural and environmental resources; (iii) development of business ventures and value chains; and (iv) recovery of ancestral knowledge and reaffirmation of cultural identities.

that the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system failed to report on the number of indigenous people and youth who benefited from the programme, although at design they both had specific targets of 25 per cent of total (for each one). The analysis of this section benefits from the country visits conducted this year in the context of the 2019 Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation (CSPE) in Ecuador.

30. **Component I: Strengthening capacities for territorial development.** The main objective of this component was to strengthen the capacities of rural families in organizations to: (i) influence participatory and monitoring processes at the territorial level; and (ii) access to services that would support them in the agroecological production, transformation and commercialization. In this context, the programme was able to strengthen the participatory capacities of 111 organizations (111 per cent of target) and improved the capacities of agroecological production, transformation and commercialization of 175 organizations (152 per cent of target) which included 5,932 families (141 per cent of target).
31. While it is fair to say that the programme overachieved its targets at the outcome level for component I, it is important to further analyse the quality of this result. Based on the visits conducted in June 2019 for the Ecuador CSPE, it was noticed that the capacity improvement of the organizations and its members in terms of agroecological production (including diversification of cultures) and transformation was significant. However, in the case of commercialization, many organizations had limited capacity and knowledge, which also were affected by limited market information.
32. **Component II: Territorial initiatives investment fund.** The main objective of component II was to improve the income and food security of agroecological producers through the implementation of sub-projects for services (technical and financial) and infrastructure to support production, transformation commercialization and access to market. At completion, there were 17,113 organized rural families (88 per cent of target) in 220 organizations⁹ that formulated and implemented community "sub-projects". Dairy initiatives were the most implemented type of sub-project, followed by agriculture and agroforestry. In addition, 1,610 producers (40 per cent of target) implementing agroecological practices obtained certifications for good agricultural practices and sanitary certifications that allowed them to access formal local or regional markets. However, there was no evidence that certifications facilitated the access to international markets, as it was intended at design.
33. Similar to component I, the level of achievement for the delivery and implementation of "sub-projects" is considered satisfactory for the access to technical services and infrastructure to support production and transformation. The sub-projects promoted agroecological practices and promoted extensively the diversification of crops. On the other hand, limited results were found in terms of access to financial services, commercialization and access to markets.
34. **Component III: Participatory monitoring and evaluation system.** The aim of this component was to promote the participation of programme beneficiaries in the planning and decision-making processes through the implementation of a participatory monitoring and evaluation system. The programme implemented seven M&E systems (100 per cent of target), each in every TLO. The programme also produced 10 systematizations of experiences (100 per cent of target) which served as a learning tool for the formulation and implementation of other territorial initiatives being implemented by the PBVTR. However, it was not clear the degree and quality of participation from the organizations and its members in M&E

⁹ There was no target for this outcome.

processes. In addition, there was no evidence of a clear strategy to coordinate the data monitored by the organizations with the M&E systems of the TLOs.

35. **Overall**, the PBVTR was able to achieve satisfactory results at the outcome level. The programme was able to strengthen the participatory capacity of rural families as well as their agroecological and transformations capacities. Through the implementation of "sub-projects" under component two the programme was able to help producer organization to access to infrastructure to support production, transformation and in some cases commercialization. On the other hand, the programme had limited results in terms of commercialization and access to markets which could jeopardize the results achieved (see section on sustainability). This PCRV rates the programme's effectiveness as **moderately satisfactory (4)**, one point lower than PMD.

Efficiency

36. The PISL was approved by the Executive Board on 15 September 2009 and became effective on 04 March 2011, experiencing an effectiveness lag of 17.8 months. The PISL generated its first disbursement 13 months after its approval. The lengthy start-up implementation of the PISL was the results of different changes in government priorities and at the institutional level, which consequently led to the merging of both projects. The financing for the original PBVTR was approved by the IFAD Executive Board on 15 September 2011 and became effective on 30 May 2012, experiencing an effectiveness lag of 8.6 months. This compares favourably with the regional average for the Latin America and the Caribbean, which has an effectiveness lag of 13 months. The programme had also a speedy implementation start-up by disbursing only seven months after the programme became effective, which compared to the regional average of 9.1 months, can be considered satisfactory. The programme was completed¹⁰ on 31 December 2019 for a total implementation period of 7.6 years.
37. The PBVTR presents a positive disbursement rate throughout the programme life cycle. During the first two years of implementation, the programme achieved a disbursement of 10 per cent of the total funds, which represented a 50 per cent of the expected disbursement during the first two years. During the third and fourth year of implementation, after the formulation, approval and implementation of a considerable amount sub-projects, the disbursement rate improved and by the end of the fourth year the programme had already disbursed 64 per cent of the total funds (9 per cent more than the expected disbursement rate). On the other hand, as of December 2018, the programme disbursed only 88 per cent of the total available funds (PBVTR and PISL combined), despite the 15-month extension, as a result of low disbursements during the last two years of implementation. In fact, some funds from the IFAD loans approved originally for PISL remained unutilized prior to their closing: the disbursement rate was 86 per cent for the original loan (L-789) and 62 per cent for the additional financing (L-804). On the other hand, the GEF funds approved for PISL, as well as the IFAD loan and the Spanish Trust Fund loan approved for PBVTR recorded the disbursement rate of 100 per cent.
38. One of the factors for improved disbursement performance could be the decentralized approach which consisted in having implementation teams in each TLO. This approach resulted in a better understanding and knowledge of the territories which gave the opportunity to provide demand-driven support to the communities participating in the programme. However, some administrative and procurement processes were delayed due to the centralized public procurement which in some cases affected the programme implementation pace.
39. The programme management cost was US\$9.81 million (15.4 per cent of total cost) compared to US\$9.42 million (13.8 per cent of total cost) budgeted. Although

¹⁰ In December 2018 IFAD approved an additional financing of US\$ 10 million and an extension of three years for the PBVTR.

higher than planned, it can be said that the programme maintained this cost within the IFAD standards which generally ranged between 8–24 per cent of the total programme cost, depending on the type of intervention.

40. At completion, the cost per benefited family was US\$2,907 (12 per cent higher than expected at design). One of the reasons for this increase is due to the increase of cash transactions from the programme to producer organizations which changed from US\$2,000 to US\$4,000 per family. This data has to be taken with caution given that around 80 per cent of the total programme funds were channelled through the "*territorial initiatives invest fund*" (component II). Therefore, most of these funds were directly invested on infrastructure. However, it is important to take into consideration that, compared to similar projects in Latin American and the Caribbean where the cost per family benefited ranged from US\$1,200 to US\$1,800, it could be concluded that this cost was significantly high.
41. The PCR presents economic and financial analyses separately for the original PBVTR and PISL. The completion report calculated an Economic Internal Rate of Return (EIRR) for the PBVTR (original PBVTR) of 25.4 per cent in relation to the 29.3 per cent expected at design, indicating that programme is economically viable. In order to calculate the incremental benefits, the analysis used as a reference the data from ex-ante and ex-posts household survey. The production costs for the most representative agricultural activities took as a reference information from the production cost analysed for 21 initiatives supported by the programme. On the other hand, the EIRR calculated for PISL at completion was 23.0 per cent in relation to the 29.3 per cent expected at design. Considering the implementation challenges faced by the PISL and lower EIRR than expected, the initiatives supported with IFAD loans 789 and 804 under PISL are still considered economically viable.
42. Additionally, IFAD has recently approved¹¹ a programme extension of three years accompanied with an additional financing of US\$10 million due to the satisfactory disbursement and implementation performance achieved by the programme.
43. **Overall**, administrative processes for the start-up of PBVTR were efficiently managed. PISL, on the other hand, had a slow start-up caused by changes in the Government and institutional context. The PBVTR (after the merge) significantly improved disbursement processes and maintained a good disbursement rate during the third, fourth and fifth year of implementation. However, this pace decreased during the last years allowing the programme to disburse only 88 per cent of total funds due to low disbursement of PISL funds. The programme management cost was higher than expected at design, although it remained within the IFAD standards. The cost per family benefited was higher than expected at design and similar project in the region. The results of the internal rate of return proved that the programme is economically viable. This PCRV rates the programme efficiency as **satisfactory (5)**, one point higher than PMD.

Rural poverty impact

44. The analysis for this section is based on the data collected by the baseline survey (2013) and the end-line survey (2018) conducted for the PBVTR and presented in the PCR. The end-line survey was conducted with a treatment group of 376 families from 119 organizations who benefited from the programme sub-projects. However, it is important to take the results presented under this section with caution due to limitations such as lack of control groups and the partial coverage of impact domains in the end-survey analysis. The assessment in this section is also informed by the field visits conducted during the main CSPE mission.
45. **Household income and assets.** According to the end-line survey, the results show that the percentage of families having a monthly income of less than US\$200

¹¹ December 2018.

from agricultural activities was reduced from 56.8 per cent to 36.1 per cent of the total treatment group. Consequently, families having a monthly income between US\$201-400 were increased from 37.5 per cent to 48.6 per cent of the total treatment group. The results also show a 16.9 per cent increase of families accessing potable water in relation to the baseline. However, it is important to mention that the CSPE mission visited some organizations that are generating low profit margins due to limited access to markets. In these organizations, small-scale producers did not perceive much change in household income.

46. Some producer organizations that were visited by the main CSPE mission showed that, through the implementation of sub-projects and the transition to agro-ecological diversification, they experienced an increase in their income. In some cases, organizations that were renting land for the implementation of infrastructure plans were able to buy that land by using the profits generated from the economic activities of the organization. There were other families that did not experience significant increases due to the pre-mature stages of their organizations.
47. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** This impact domain was not qualitatively analyzed by the end-line survey report. However, it can be said that the programme achieved a considerable human and social capital impact through the capacity strengthening of smallholder farmers. Technical capacity related to agricultural and transformation seems to be the most impactful one, while commercialization and business management capacities remain areas that require further attention.
48. The direct transfer of funds from the project to the organizations and the co-financing percentages established (60 per cent from programme funds and 40 per cent from organization funds) for the implementation cost of sub-projects has significantly empowered organizations. This has also promoted and achieved co-responsibility and efficiency to implement sub-projects. However, this PCRV and the CSPE mission identified issues regarding the inclusiveness and equity in producers' participation in the decision-making processes within their respective organizations. In terms of women empowerment (see section gender equity and women empowerment), the impact has been limited. Despite an increase in their participation in agricultural production activities, most women benefited by the programme continued to be constrained by their lack of business-oriented mentality and capacity.
49. **Food security and agricultural productivity.** The introduction and/or extension of the production of native crops, which can be harvested throughout the whole year, has reinforced nutritional and food security. Agroecological diversification has also positively impacted the food security of rural families, especially child nutrition. Families benefited by the programme mentioned that their nutritional diet has improved because of a better access to fruits and vegetables that they are now producing. Additionally, the production surplus is used as a source of income to have access to other products to supplement their nutritional diet.
50. The programme implemented specific activities to improve productivity. In the case of dairy production organizations, the PBVTR provided technical assistance to improve pastures and applying climate-resilience practices. These small-scale producers reported that after these programme interventions, cows went from producing 3 litres per day to produce up to 12 litres per day. However, this information has to be taken with caution given that there is no quantitative evidence that this happened in all cases where small-scale producers received this type of support. Another factor mentioned by small producers that improved productivity was the implementation of irrigation systems. However, this could not be verified quantitatively through the end-line survey report.
51. **Institutions and policies.** The programme impact in terms of institutions and policies has been limited. Regarding the impact on institutions one of the few

examples that can be mentioned is the increased self-management capacity of the organizations as a result of the financial resources and services provided by local government and the Ministry of Agriculture. There was no evidence of activities having a direct impact on local, sectoral or national policies.

52. **Overall**, the programme did not have proper impact assessment and the quality and limitations of the end-line survey report generates attribution issues. However, it can be said, through the data available and the field visits, that the PBVTR was able to generate an important level of impact in terms of household income and assets; and food security and agricultural productivity. In the case of human and social capital and empowerment, despite achieving important changes, there are still crucial areas such as commercialization capacity and women empowerment that requires further attention to enhance impact. There was no major impact in terms of institution and policies. This PCRV rates rural poverty impact as **moderately satisfactory (4)**, one point lower than PMD.

Sustainability of benefits

53. In general terms, the sustainability of benefits achieved by small-scale producers is positive. First, small-scale producers have shown significant improvement in their capacity to diversify their crops under agroforestry systems accompanied by sustainable irrigation systems. The transition to agro ecology and agro forestry systems promoted by the programme has resulted in sustainable livelihoods. These types of production systems have significantly improved their income sources as well as the diversification of their food basket. The diversification of production has also opened opportunities in local markets and fairs where producers have spaces to commercialize their products.
54. On the other hand, this PCRV identified some issues that could jeopardize the sustainability of the business plans implemented by the programme. Many of these business plans were driven by the fact that, through the programme, there was a clear opportunity to grow and have access to important infrastructure. However, the programme did not pay enough attention to the wider goal of these initiatives which includes an equal involvement of all small producers in organizations in order to agree on a common vision and mission before implementing these sub-projects.
55. Furthermore, through the field visits, the evaluation team identified organizations that showed limited knowledge on how to properly manage their socio-economic initiatives. This includes a limited understanding of administrative and legal requirements, and compliance with health and safety regulations. All these aspects became significant barriers for many producer organizations to access local and international markets. The limited knowledge regarding commercialization and markets presents also a threat to the sustainability of these initiatives.
56. Through the agroecological diversification approach, the programme has successfully promoted sustainable production systems. This became the result of the knowledge acquired through the capacity strengthening activities promoted by the programme. On the other hand, the sustainability of the business initiatives financed by the PBVTR could be at risk. It is important for the organizations to have a full involvement of their members in the decision-making and administrative processes and to have the necessary capacity to effectively manage these investments. Finally, the limited knowledge in areas such as commercialization and access to markets could damage the development process of these initiatives by limiting their growth. This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates the programme's sustainability as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

B. Other performance criteria

Innovation

57. One of the actions that can be classified as innovative was the appointment of focal points by the Ministry of Agriculture within the government parishes. These focal

points were capable to establish a direct communication line with the parish authorities to enhance the territorial development approach and were also working as promoters or extension agents representing the MAG. It was the first time an IFAD project implemented this type of approach, which brought positive results in terms of programme's effectiveness and efficiency. The close communication between the programme and the decentralized governments has been recognized by all main stakeholders as innovative. Additionally, the adoption of agroforestry systems has also proven to be an innovative way to significantly reduce tillage, which was high due to the cultivation of basic grains.

58. One of the innovative activities that were planned at design was to support initiatives to systematize and share traditional knowledge related to ethno-agroecology and identify 'biocultural' systems proper to the indigenous communities of the Sierra. Unfortunately, this was not evidenced throughout the project.
59. The presence of the PBVTR activities has become the source of technical innovations for some organizations. For example, an organization that benefited from agroecological diversification activities by growing citrus products, is using the mandarins and oranges that do not qualify for the local market to produce a powder (after a drying process) that would be used to sweeten food and candies. This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates the programme's innovation as **satisfactory (5)**.

Scaling up

60. Limited evidence was found, through desk reviews and/or field visits, regarding scaling-up. For example, there are programmes being implemented by relevant ministries such as "Hombro a Hombro¹²". This programme has supported similar mechanisms implemented by the PBVTR such as the agricultural diversification.
61. On the other hand, the scaling up of the PBVTR has been affected by the following reasons: (i) the programme has not established synergies with other programmes/projects that are working in the same areas of intervention (e.g. two projects are implemented by FAO/GEF in the Chimborazo province, that supports the conservation of agrobiodiversity and agricultural transformation); (ii) limited commercialization capacity which in most of business plans is limiting their growth and, consequently, their opportunities for scaling up; and (iii) there was a lack of a clear scaling up strategy in the programme design.
62. **Overall**, the scaling up of the programme has achieved limited results through some national programmes that support similar areas of intervention by using mechanisms implemented by the PBVTR. However, there is space for improvement in terms of the communication between similar initiatives in the same areas of intervention and a clear strategy on how scaling up is intended to be achieved. This PCRV rates scaling up as **moderately satisfactory (4)**, one point lower than PMD.

Gender equality and women's empowerment

63. The gender strategy of the PBVTR aimed to ensure the equal access, by men and women, to the programme services, which would contribute to improve their participation at the community level and in the economic-productive activities. At design, the programme established a target of 50 per cent of women participating and receiving services from the programme. As mentioned in the effectiveness section, at completion, 35 per cent of the total beneficiaries were women (70 per cent of target).

¹² The "Hombro a Hombro" project aims to reduce rural poverty and promote the economic inclusion of the Popular and Solidarity Economy actors and the recipients of the Human Development Bond, through productive development in the provinces of the Central highlands: Cotopaxi, Tungurahua, Chimborazo, Bolívar and Cañar.

64. The programme shows positive results when it comes to women participation and their role in family farming. For example, women were the majority participating in activities related to livestock (improvement of pastures and livestock). This activity has been highly recognized and appreciated by men in their communities where these activities were not given enough importance. Nowadays, these families have benefited from the improved role of women which has increase productivity and consequently their household income. Additionally, many women were also economically empowered by managing themselves the economic activity and benefits related to livestock. Their husbands would work in other activities such as agriculture and construction.
65. There has been an important ownership of their respective socio-economic initiatives from organizations, especially from women, who have made significant monetary and non-monetary contributions for the development of their business plans. However, it was noticed that in many occasions, women were not given a business-oriented role, but the role of primary production supplier. This approach limits the empowerment of women and their involvement in decision-making processes for the organization.
66. At design, the gender strategy intended to report on number and percentage of women in managerial position of groups, organizations and government entities that were receiving funds from the programme. However, these indicators were not monitored by the M&E systems or programme teams. The evaluation mission in Ecuador visited some organizations that were led by women. Some of these women had very limited knowledge related to management and commercialization which had consequences reflected in the limited economic development of their associations.
67. **Overall**, the programme design included a gender strategy which included a target of 50 per cent participation of women and aimed to involve them in the economic-productive activities promoted by the programme. While this was partially achieved and their participation and role improved at the production level, there is still space to improve their business and managerial capacities so they can have more important role within their organizations and be pro-active role in the decision-making process. This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates gender equality and women's empowerment as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

Environment and natural resources management

68. The environment and natural resources management has improved considerably due to the importance given by the programme approach. Agricultural diversification combined with agroforestry systems and agroecological practices are reshaping the way small farmers are working the lands and taking care of natural resources. Producers in the areas of intervention used to be highly dependent of agrochemicals and non-organic fertilizer. Through the project, agroecological practices such as the preparation and application of organic fertilizers have been adopted increasingly. Agroforestry, apart from being a mean for diversification, it has been beneficial in terms of pest, disease and weed management.
69. Environment and natural resource management activities were also supported by a GEF grant of US\$2.7 million. This grant was mainly supporting capacity strengthening and support to business plans working with cocoa as a long-term income generator. The grant supported diversification by intercropping short cycle crops (e.g. maize, beans and peanuts) and medium-life cycle crops (fruits). This practice would become short and medium-term income generator as well as a bio stimulant for the main crop.
70. However, the Terminal Evaluation Report of the PISL-GEF rated its effectiveness as "moderately unsatisfactory". The project had limited results in promoting the good environmental practices such as sustainable soil management. While it is true that programme and the support of the GEF started a transition process where

producers were more aware of implementing good practices to improve natural resource management, some producers were not still clear of this concept. For example, the evaluation mission found that some producers were using organic fertilizer/pesticides; however, they would use chemical products in other crops nearby from time to time contaminating crops that were being considered as "organic".

71. The programme also faced some challenges regarding waste management. For example, in the case of some organizations implementing sub-projects related to dairy production and processing. It was found that, while some of these organizations were giving back the whey to producers in order for them to feed their animals (e.g. pigs); the remaining whey was sometimes thrown into the rivers. The community reported that the degradation of the soil and vegetation can be noticed in the areas where these practices are taking place.
72. This PCRV rates environment and natural resources management as **moderately satisfactory (4)**, one point lower than PMD.

Adaptation to climate change

73. Even though the programme design only makes few references to the effects of climate change and does not provide an actual strategy or action plan on this issue, the programme has supported adaptation to climate change through agricultural diversification and the introduction of technologies that reduce water dependency through drip irrigation systems and rainwater harvesting.
74. In the case where agroecological diversification is being implemented (e.g. national cocoa, golden berry and native pastures) there is evidence of drought resistance and less dependency on agrochemicals. These crops have shown potential to be adopted in other areas where the programme worked, where climate risk is considered high. However, the programme missed the opportunity to focus its activities in areas where there are more climate change risks and to promote integral farms that include renewable energy such as biogas to reduce the need to cut forest for firewood; and the support to local management of solid waste.
75. This PCRV rates adaptation to climate change as **moderately satisfactory (4)**. PMD did not provide a rating for this criterion.

C. Overall programme achievement

76. Through the strengthening of production and technical capacities and the implementation of sub-projects to support socio-productive initiatives, the programme has achieved significant results by increasing the agricultural production and productivity of organized rural families. The improved capacities of producer organization members became the pillars to develop business plans through which organizations had access to important inputs, infrastructure and technical assistance that supported the economic growth of their agribusinesses.
77. The transition to agro-ecological diversification of crops in family farms improved the food security and nutrition. In addition, in many cases, this transition became an economic activity where the surplus produced is being sold in local market. With additional sources of income, families are able to supplement the food basket to improve, specially, child nutrition. In some cases, it has even become an important source of income to support the education of children and to buy family assets. On the other hand, the programme had limited results in terms of commercialization and access to markets, which could impact the sustainability of results achieved.
78. The programme gave special attention to environment and natural resource management by promoting agro ecology, agro forestry, and the elimination of monocrops by implanting farm diversification. The results are currently tangible by many small-scale producers who have experienced improvements in the quality of their lands and have reduced the use of chemical products. However, the

programme could have done more to strengthen the technical knowledge of producers on organic production and waste management.

79. Based on the foregoing, this PCRV rates the overall programme achievement as **moderately satisfactory (4)**, one point lower than PMD.

D. Performance of partners

80. **IFAD.** IFAD is considered a key partner to fight rural poverty in Ecuador. Its flexibility to merge PBVTR and PISL and to conduct pertinent changes to the logical framework was highly appreciated by the government and allowed the implementing agency to conduct a smooth transition and to improve programme effectiveness and efficiency. With the implementation of the PBVTR, IFAD played an important role in the rural and agricultural development of the central highlands and cost areas of Ecuador, where the need to improve the agricultural capacity and productivity of smallholder farmers was evident and necessary.
81. IFAD also played a proactive role at the strategic level by accompanying the programme through a total of 21 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. Additionally, IFAD provided permanent support in the country by hiring two national consultants that provided technical and fiduciary support.¹³
82. On the other hand, IFAD could have paid more attention to issues that could affect the sustainability of the programme results such as the lack of an exit strategy and the limited support and knowledge in areas like commercialization and access to markets. This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates IFAD's performance as **satisfactory (5)**.
83. **Government.** The Ministry of Finance (as the main IFAD counterpart) and MAG (as the overall entity responsible for implementation) mostly complied with the financial agreements. Even though domestic counterpart was affected by the lack of estimated funds from local financial institutions and disbursed only 44 per cent of the total amount at design, the agreed counterpart funds from the central government and decentralized autonomous governments were fully disbursed and exceeded in some cases.
84. The decentralized approach adopted through the territorial implementation units adopted by the programme was key to the effective development of the programme. One of the achievements by some TLOs was to involve Parishes, provincial governments and MAG local offices by participating and co-financing sub-projects supported by the programme, which have also created spaces for dialogue between producer organizations and local government entities.
85. On the other hand, there was a significant space for improvements in areas such as M&E. The programme teams were able to implement M&E systems in each one of the territorial liaison offices, however, these systems were not effectively reporting in some indicators that were agreed at design (e.g. youth participation). This PCRV agrees with PMD and rates the government's performance as **satisfactory (5)**.

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

Scope

86. All sections requested in the terms of reference are covered in the report. The PCR presented relevant and detailed annexes that included important data to

¹³ At completion, only the fiduciary consultant was still active.

understand the different topics and contexts, specially, details to understand the merge of PISL with PBVTR. All standard criteria were discussed adequately in the PCR. However, the PCR did not make a proper differentiation between outputs and outcomes. This creates confusion in the analysis presented between the programme activities and results achieved. The scope of the PCR is rated as **satisfactory (5)**.

Quality

87. 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 impacted the programme. Some tables presenting financial information are inconsistent. Moreover, for the section on rural poverty impact, some domains are not very well substantiated with qualitative data and some information presented is at the outcome level, making it difficult to conclude the actual impact generated by the project's interventions. Additionally, some sections (e.g. gender and environment and natural resource management) could have benefitted from a deeper analysis. The quality of the PCR is rated as **moderately satisfactory (4)**.

Lessons

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

Candour

89. The PCR was most of the time relatively candid in describing the issues encountered by the programme and highlighting the positive and negative sides. However, it sometimes gives a rather optimistic understanding of the issues, but usually rates coherently the evaluation criteria. The candour of the PCR is rated as **satisfactory (5)**.

V. Lessons learned

90. The following lessons learned expand the analysis on two main issues gathered from the PCR (commercialization and access to markets and women empowerment) and add a new lesson learned (sustainability of the socio-economic initiatives) drawn from the findings of the PCR and the CSPE main mission in Ecuador.
91. **Commercialization and access to markets.** The programme design was oriented to improve the technical and production capacities of organized small-scale producers and to support their organizations through productive infrastructure. However, the commercialization capacities and access to markets remain a key challenge for the development of many producer organizations. Despite the increase in production yields, many organizations are still constrained to sell their organic products through local intermediaries at lower prices than other competitive markets. It is important that future programmes in the country make a proper analysis of the markets and provide a market-oriented strategy that would fit the purpose of different organizations.
92. **Women empowerment.** The participation of women in capacity strengthening and the implementation of sub-projects activities was noticeable. Many women shared stories where they were just playing the role of "housewife", but through the programme, they start productive activities through which they could contribute to household income. On the other hand, it is important for these type of programmes that there is a clear strategy where women are actively supported so they can play a dynamic role within their organizations and to become part of decision-making by having access to management roles.

93. **Sustainability of the socio-economic initiatives.** The PBVTR has achieved significant results in developing economically active producer organizations with the support of agricultural inputs, capacity and infrastructure. Nonetheless, many organizations still lack an inclusive and business-oriented mentality. It is important that they have the capacity to continue developing their businesses without depending on other programmes to support them. It is important that future interventions include exit strategies that take into consideration the development of capacities at all levels (administration, management .etc.) to potentiate the organizations' growth.

Definition and rating of the evaluation criteria used by IOE

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

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

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

Rating comparison^a

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Programme Management Department (PMD) rating</i>	<i>IOE Project Completion Report Validation (PCR) rating</i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (PCR-PMD)</i>
Rural poverty impact	5	4	-1
Project performance			
Relevance	5	5	0
Effectiveness	5	4	-1
Efficiency	4	5	+1
Sustainability of benefits	4	4	0
Project performance^b	4.50	4.50	0
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	4	4	0
Innovation	5	5	0
Scaling up	5	4	-1
Environment and natural resources management	5	4	-1
Adaptation to climate change	n/a	4	-
Overall project achievement^c	5	4	-1
Performance of partners^d			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	5	5	0
Average net disconnect			-3/11=-0.27

^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	-	5	-
Lessons	-	5	-
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)	-	4	-
Scope	-	5	-
Overall rating of the project completion report	-	5	-

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 1- Strengthening capacities for territorial development			
Families and their organizations formulating and implementing Buen Vivir community plans	7	10	143%
Community members receiving territorial management trainings	500	285	58%
Promoters trained in territorial management	20	79	395%
Organizations of rural families with strengthening plans for service provision (Administration-Projects)	50	42	84%
Organizations of rural families, youth and women formulate and execute proposals in production management	5,000	7,119	142%
Technical service providers trained and supporting producers	50	174	348%
Component II. Territorial initiatives investment fund			
Families in organizations formulating and implementing agroecological productive projects	10,500	10,300	98%
Families in organizations formulating and implementing productive infrastructure projects (transformation, infrastructure, commercialization)	7,500	5,662	75%
Farmland under water-related infrastructure constructed/rehabilitated (Hectares)	4,000	3,168	79%
Market, processing or storage facilities constructed or rehabilitated	235	83	35%
People supported with accompaniment of sustainable productive, business, transformation and commercialization practices.	16,000	13,395	84%
Component III. Participatory monitoring and evaluation system			
Organizations receive training for participative M&E and Knowledge management.	80	69	86%
Project teams at territorial level implementing M&E systems	7	7	100%
Knowledge management products	10	10	100%
Organizations participating in M&E processes		130	

Abbreviations and Acronyms

COSOP	Country Strategies and Opportunity Paper
CSPE	Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation
EIRR	Economic Internal Rate of Return
GAD	Decentralized autonomous governments
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MAG	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
PBVTR	The "Buen Vivir" in Rural Territories Programme
PCR	Project Completion Report
PCRv	Project Completion Report Validation
PISL	Ibarra San Lorenzo Development Project
PMD	Programme Management Department
PMU	Project Management Unit
TLO	Territorial Liaison Offices

Bibliography

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) 2004. Country Strategic Opportunities Programme. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2011. President's Report- PBVTR. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2011. Design Report – PBVTR. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2011. Financing Agreement – PBVTR. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2012-2018. Supervision missions - PBVTR. Rome, Italy.

_____. 2014. Country Strategic Opportunities Programme. Rome, Italy.

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

_____. 2019. Project Completion Report – PBVTR and PISL. Rome, Italy.

IFAD-GEF 2010. Grant design - PISL. Rome, Italy.

_____.2015. Grant Mid-Term Review – PISL. Rome. Italy.

_____.2017. Grant Project Completion Report – PISL. Rome, Italy.

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