

Project Completion Report Validation

Support to Agricultural Development Project (PADAT)

Republic of Togo

Date of validation by IOE: November 2019

I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m) ¹		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	Western and Central Africa	Total project costs	82		35	
Country	Republic of Togo	IFAD grant and percentage of total	13.5	17%	12.3	35%
Grant number	(i) DSF-8069-TG (ii) COFIN-GAF-8069-TG (GAFSP)	Borrower	11.5	14%	3.3	10%
Type of project (subsector)	Rural development	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program	19.9	24%	16.5	48%
Financing type	IFAD-initiated and co-financed	West African Development Bank	15	18%	0	0%
Financing terms	Grant	Bank for Investment and Development of the Economic Community of West African States	14.8	18%	0	0%
Date of approval	15/12/2010	Global Environment Facility	5.3	6%	2.3	7%
Date of grant signature	(i) (ii) 22/12/2010	Beneficiaries	1.8	2%	0.3	1%
Date of effectiveness	(i) (ii) 22/12/2010	Other sources				
Grant amendments	(i) (ii) 1 on 23 March 2015 (reallocation of funds)	Number of beneficiaries	107,500 direct 475,000 indirect		136,033 direct 535,095 indirect	
Loan closure extensions	NA	Project completion date	31/12/2016		31/12/2016	
Country programme managers	Abdoul Barry; E. Kasalu-Coffin; V. Galastro; A. Touré; M. Tounessi	Grant closing date	30/06/2017		30/06/2017	
Regional director(s)	L. Martin (current); I. De Willebois; M. Béavougui	Mid-term review			26 March – 18 April 2014	
Project completion report reviewer	Valeria Galletti	IFAD grant disbursement at project completion (%)			91%	
Project completion report quality control panel	Fumiko Nakai Fabrizio Felloni	Date of the project completion report			15/07/2017	

Source: President's Report (2010), Project Status Reports (PSR), Project completion report (PCR), grant agreements, IFAD Operational Results Management System (ORMS).

¹ Project costs in the table include the financing from the Global Environment Facility that was integrated in the project in 2013.

II. Project outline

1. **Introduction.** The Support to Agricultural Development Project (PADAT)² was a project in the Republic of Togo aiming to improve smallholders' food security and incomes by promoting pro-poor rural economic growth and integrated value chains.
2. PADAT was designed after a 15-year suspension of international development cooperation in the country³ and in the aftermath of political and food crisis worsened by climatic events such as droughts and floods. The project was approved by IFAD's Executive Board on 15 December 2010. The financing agreement became effective on 22 December 2010 with 31 December 2016 and 30 June 2017 as completion and closing dates respectively.
3. **Project area.** The project was designed to be implemented in all the national territory through a sequenced and phased approach, focusing on the three poorest regions of Togo (Centrale, Kara and Savanes) in years 1-3 and then expanding to the remaining two regions (Maritime and Plateaux).⁴
4. **Project goal, objectives and components.** According to the 2010 President's Report, the project's overall goal was to help improve the food security and incomes of rural families. Its specific objectives were to: (i) boost the productivity and outputs of three staple food crops (cassava, maize and rice); and (ii) improve the processing and marketing of agricultural outputs. The project had three components at design: (a) support to production and productivity; (b) value addition; and (c) project coordination and management.
5. *Component 1 – Support to production and productivity* aimed to support smallholders to improve production and productivity through: (i) the provision of technical support and infrastructure (e.g. the distribution of inputs, the promotion of animal traction and mechanized farming techniques, the provision of advisory services, integrated soil fertility management (ISFM), irrigation); and (ii) capacity-building of farmers and producers' organizations (POs).
6. *Component 2 – Value addition* aimed to increase producers' incomes by: (i) facilitating access to processing and market equipment and infrastructure (e.g. storage and processing facilities, roads); and (ii) providing market assistance (e.g. through bulking of produce, market information systems).
7. *Component 3 – Project coordination and management* aimed to ensure project coordination, administrative and financial management and monitoring and evaluation.
8. Following the mobilization of financing from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in 2013 (see more below), an additional intervention was integrated in the project to reduce the impact of climate change on vulnerable groups and on natural resources essential to support agricultural production and increase food security. *The component 4 – Adapting Agriculture Production in Togo (ADAPT)* particularly focused on: (i) mainstreaming climate change adaptation tools in agricultural production systems (e.g. through thematic studies, capacity building, the dissemination of weather and climate information); (ii) supporting vulnerable farming systems to adapt to climate impacts through improved cultivation methods, the introduction of new drought resistant varieties and the promotion of diversification; (iii) information, education and communication activities.
9. **Target group.** PADAT mainly targeted smallholder farmers operating in the three selected value chains as follows: (i) farmers unable to meet family food

² From the French: *Projet d'Appui au Développement Agricole au Togo*.

³ Source: 2010 President's Report.

⁴ The first phase was expected to focus on the quick-start operation (input distribution) to respond to the immediate needs of the most vulnerable producers. At the end of the third year, the project would draw the necessary lessons in order to consolidate achievements in view of a possible introduction of the sector approach.

requirements, let alone produce a marketable surplus from the farming of 0.5-1.0 ha of land; and (ii) farmers with 1 to 3 ha of land able to produce a modest surplus for sale. According to the PCR, the project was expected to reach 107,500 direct beneficiaries. Of these, about 75,000 were to be reached through 3,000 POs. The number of expected indirect beneficiaries was 475,000. Nonetheless, inconsistencies were found in project related documents in relation to direct and indirect beneficiaries.⁵

10. **Financing.** The total cost⁶ of PADAT at approval was US\$75.2 million, of which US\$13.5 million⁷ was expected to be financed by IFAD through a grant under the Debt Sustainability Framework. Additional sources of financing included the following: (i) the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP, US\$19.8 million grant); (ii) the West African Development Bank (BOAD,⁸ US\$15 million loan); (iii) the Bank for Investment and Development of the Economic Community of West African States (EBID, US\$14,8 million loan); (iv) the Government (US\$10.7 million); and (v) beneficiaries (US\$1.38 million). In 2013, additional grant financing of US\$5.3 million from the GEF Least Developed Countries Fund was mobilized⁹ bringing the total costs of the project to US\$81.7 million.¹⁰ Nonetheless, no disbursement was made under BOAD and EBID financing as of project completion. The planned and actual project costs by financier are provided in table below.

Table 1
Project costs by financier*

Source of Funding	Type of financing	Estimated amount (US\$ m) ¹¹	Estimated amount (% of total)	Actual expenditure (US\$ m) ¹²	Expenditure (% of total)	Disbursements (% of estimated amount)
IFAD	Grant	13.5	17	12.3	35	91 ¹³
GAFSP	Grant	19.9	24	16.5	48	83
GEF	Grant	5.3	6	2.3	7	43
BOAD	Loan	15	18	0	0	0
EBID	Loan	14.8	18	0	0	0
Government		11.5	14	3.3	10	29
Beneficiaries		1.8	2	0.3	1	17
Total		82	100	35	100	42

Source: ORMS, PCR.

* Any inconsistencies in percentages are due to rounding up.

⁵ The PCR and other project documents (e.g. design report, mid-term review report) refer to these figures for expected direct and indirect beneficiaries. Nonetheless, the same design report, as well as the President's Report and the grant agreement also indicate some different figures, i.e. that the project target group comprised 222,000 farmers under group (i) and 160,000 under group (ii). Also for the number of planned indirect beneficiaries, two figures were found even in the same report (e.g. design report), 368,000 and 475,000.

⁶ Source: ORMS, 2010 President's Report.

⁷ The budget in the financing agreement was expressed in Special Drawing Rights (SDR) and amounted to SDR8.65 million.

⁸ From the French: *Banque Ouest-africaine de Développement*.

⁹ The proposal was endorsed by the GEF on 30 July 2013. The GEF Trustee letter of commitment received by IFAD in September 2013, was approved by IFAD on 10 October 2013. The grant 2000000362 between IFAD and the Government of Togo to integrate the GEF financing into PADAT became effective on 11 December 2013. The project completion and closing dates were aligned to those of PADAT.

¹⁰ According to ORMS, additional financing from the Government and beneficiaries was also mobilized in 2013: US\$0,42 million from beneficiaries and US\$0,8 million from the Government, bringing their total contribution to US\$1,8 million and US\$11,5 million respectively.

¹¹ Source: ORMS for all figures.

¹² Sources: ORMS for IFAD, GAFSP and GEF related expenditures as of 10 September 2019; PCR for Government and beneficiaries' related expenditures as of 31 December 2016.

¹³ The percentage calculated on figures expressed in SDR is 93 per cent (SDR8.65 million budget vs SDR8.07 million expenditures). The difference with the percentage presented in the table is due to the different currency/exchange rate.

11. The table below presents project budget and expenditures by component as reported in the summary table of the PCR and does not include the contribution of BOAD and EBID. This explains why the total budget in table 2 differs from table 1. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that the PCR contains several inconsistencies in the presentation of project costs and expenditures.¹⁴

Table 2
Project costs by component (as of 30 June 2017)

<i>Components</i>	<i>Planned (US\$ m)</i>	<i>Planned amount (% of total)</i>	<i>Actual amount (US\$m)</i>	<i>Actual (% of total)</i>
Support to production and productivity	18.6	36	13.7	39
Value addition	21.8	42	8.4	24
Project coordination	5	10	8.9	25
ADAPT	6.5	13	2.1	6
Initial Advance	NA	NA	2.5	7
Total	52	100	35	100

Source: PCR.

* Any inconsistencies in percentages are due to rounding up.

12. **Project implementation.** The project was designed to be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MAEP)¹⁵ and guided by the steering bodies of the National Programme for Agricultural Investment and Food Security (PNIASA).¹⁶ Day-to-day implementation was to be coordinated by a project support unit integrated by national experts and international technical assistance. Responsibility for field activities was expected to be outsourced to qualified service providers.
13. **Changes and development during implementation.** Significant changes occurred during implementation and following the 2014 mid-term review (MTR).
- According to the PCR, the agreements between the Government and BOAD and EBID were signed late (on 7 February 2014 and 15 July 2014 respectively) and no disbursement was made as of project completion. PADAT was thus implemented without the contributions of the two institutions, that represented 40 per cent of the budget at design¹⁷ and were intended to finance infrastructures in Centrale, Kara and Savanes. Based on the above, GAFSP funds were used to finance infrastructures in the five regions;¹⁸
 - Based on project performance and lack of financing from BOAD and EBID, some targets were reduced at MTR while the need for enhanced capacity building was emphasized. Main revisions made include the following: (i) the reduction of lowland areas to be developed through infrastructures (from 8,000 ha to 4,276 ha); (ii) the increase of the number of producers to be trained in farming and animal traction (from 50 to 200);

¹⁴ In particular, inconsistencies were found in terms of project costs, expenditures and related percentages in the different sections and annexes of the PCR.

¹⁵ From the French: *Ministre de l'Agriculture, de l'Élevage et de la Pêche*.

¹⁶ From the French: *Programme national d'investissement agricole et de sécurité alimentaire*.

¹⁷ The percentage is calculated against the project budget at design (without the GEF contribution and the additional Government and beneficiaries contributions mobilized in 2013). The percentage against overall budget is 36 per cent.

¹⁸ Source: IFAD, Report from the Mid-Term Review, 2014.

- A reallocation of funds by categories under IFAD and GAFSP grants was made in March 2015 upon request of the Government of Togo and based on the recommendations from the MTR;¹⁹
 - GEF financing was integrated in the project in 2013. According to the PCR, several activities planned at design were cancelled (e.g. sectoral/thematic studies that had already been conducted)²⁰ or reduced due to cash-flow issues.
14. **Intervention logic.** The project was designed to improve smallholders' food security and incomes through complementary interventions articulated around three technical components. In particular, component 1 was expected to boost the production of staple food crops, while activities under component 2 would improve their processing and marketing, enhancing self-reliance among small farmers. The support to and consolidation of POs was expected to empower producers and influence decision-making within value chains. Women empowerment was also expected to be enhanced through women's participation in capacity building and economic activities. Finally, by disseminating knowledge on climate change, integrating adaptation tools and supporting economic diversification, the ADAPT component would contribute to improve crop yields resilience to climate change and to mitigate the impact of climate change on food production and food security.
 15. **Delivery of outputs.** According to the PCR, the delivery of outputs by the project was mixed. In particular, a relatively good level of achievements was recorded under component 1, principally in relation to input distribution, training and capacity building. Activities under component 2 and 4 were only partially implemented.

III. Review of findings

A. Core criteria

Relevance

16. **Relevance vis-à-vis IFAD and Government policies and strategies.** The project's objectives were aligned with the Government and IFAD strategies.
17. In particular, the project was in line with IFAD's 2007-2010 strategic framework as contributing to its strategic objectives²¹ and it continued to be coherent with subsequent IFAD frameworks (2011-2015 and 2016-2025). According to the 2010 President's Report, the design of PADAT was based on the note on strategic opportunities for Togo prepared in July 2009, waiving the usual requirement of a country strategic opportunities programme.²²
18. PADAT was fully aligned with the Comprehensive Strategy Paper for Poverty Reduction²³ of Togo in which agriculture is considered key to reduce poverty, improve food security and the country's economy and sustainable growth. The project directly supported the Government's efforts to implement the 2010-2015 PNIASA with its focus on the promotion of diversified value chains, farmers' capacity building as well as the right to food. Also, it was coherent with the 2008-2010 Strategy for the Relaunch of Agricultural Production.²⁴ The objectives of the ADAPT component to address climate variability were further aligned with: (i) the

¹⁹ IFAD proceeds under categories II (transport and equipment) and V (service provision) and unallocated funds were allocated particularly to categories I (civil and rural works), III (studies, training and workshops), IV (international technical assistance), VII (salaries) and VIII (operating and maintenance costs). GAFSP proceeds under categories I were particularly allocated to categories II (transport and equipment), III and V.

²⁰ While the design of the ADAPT component was undertaken in 2010, the GEF financing was integrated in the project in 2013 only. Based on the above, some studies planned at design had already been conducted when ADAPT implementation started.

²¹ Source: 2010 President's Report.

²² According to IFAD's Reviewers' Recommendations Note (2010), a decision was taken by IFAD to directly support the PNIASA taking into account the need to urgently address the situation of Togo.

²³ *Document complet de stratégie de réduction de la pauvreté.*

²⁴ *Stratégie de Relance de la production Agricole.*

2011-2015 National Investment Programme For Environment and Natural Resources,²⁵ that complemented PNIASA in relation to climate change and environment related issues;²⁶ and (ii) the National Action Programme for Adaptation to Climate Change.²⁷

19. **Relevance of design.** The project structure along the three components and the supported activities reflected the needs of the beneficiaries and were relevant to meet project objectives. In particular, the objectives of components 1 and 2 addressed major structural constraints to rural and agricultural development among small-scale producers in Togo such as the limited access to inputs and equipment, the lack of infrastructures to support production and marketing and the weak capacities of actors. The ADAPT component complemented the intervention to address climate variability negatively affecting production and food security.
20. The targeting strategy proposed was relevant and in line with the IFAD Policy on Targeting by focusing on: (i) the most vulnerable groups among small-scale producers, as well as women and young people; (ii) crops that played an important role in household food security;²⁸ and (iii) community-based targeting through POs; and (iv) self-targeting.
21. Nonetheless, the design showed some weaknesses. In particular, the project revealed weak capacities and performance of some of the selected service providers (see the section on effectiveness) and the implementing agency (see section D). This might indicate a weak assessment of their strengths and weaknesses at design. The final evaluation report of ADAPT²⁹ indicates that the ADAPT component was too ambitious and complex (e.g. with multiple activities and intervention sectors and a limited timeframe) resulting in challenging implementation and development of synergies with the other components. According to the PCR, the decision to align ADAPT implementation period (2013-2016) with the one of PADAT was particularly ineffective and didn't take into account the delays that were already affecting the implementation of the other project components (particularly related to procurement issues).
22. In summary, the project was aligned with both national and IFAD's priorities and the main areas of intervention were relevant to the poor. However, stakeholders' capacities were not properly assessed at design and the design of the ADAPT component was too ambitious. These design issues affected implementation and the achievement of results. Based on the above, project relevance is rated *moderately unsatisfactory (3)* by the PCR, in line with the PCR.

Effectiveness

23. **Objective 1 – To boost the productivity and outputs of three staple food crops.** The initial objective of the component was to improve cassava, rice and maize productivity through five main operations.
24. *Quick start operation.* According to the PCR, in the period 2011-2013 the project provided 53,500 small rice and maize producers (of which 50 per cent women) with input kits (including fertilizers and improved seeds) against a target at design of 50,000. The PCR refers that field surveys conducted by the Directorate of Statistics, Information and Documentation (DSID)³⁰ in 2017, revealed that 74.2 per cent of beneficiaries were able to replenish their kits buying the needed inputs. Supported producers saw their yields increase and were able to produce about 65,000 tons of cereals. According to the PCR, the success of the operation was

²⁵ *Programme National d'Investissements pour Environnement et les Ressources Naturelles au Togo.*

²⁶ Source: ADAPT Project Document, 2013.

²⁷ *Plan d'Action National d'Adaptation aux Changements Climatiques.* Source: PCR.

²⁸ Source: IFAD, PADAT, Reviewers' Recommendations Note (RRN), 2010.

²⁹ ADAPT was subjected to a separate final evaluation in accordance with the procedures for GEF-funded projects.

³⁰ From the French: *Direction des Statistiques, Information et Documentation.*

particularly attributable to the motivation of targeted beneficiaries as well as the quality of support provided.

25. *Small scale infrastructure.* PADAT initially aimed to develop an area of 8,000 ha with water and soil conservation/irrigation systems. The target was lowered at MTR to 4,276 ha, of which 2,056 ha under GAFSP financing. At project completion only 62 ha had been developed (or 3 per cent of the target at MTR). According to the PCR this was mainly due to lengthy procurement procedures, the limited capacities of service providers and time needed to implement works.
26. *Animal traction and mechanized farming.* PADAT successfully supported pilot initiatives to promote animal traction. In particular, animal traction kits were distributed to 78 farmers enabling them to increase cultivated areas from 339 ha in 2015 to 610 ha in 2016. PADAT further distributed 10 tillers to POs. Nonetheless, half of them broke down after the first rice farming season and machines operators and repairmen/mechanics did not have the skills to handle and maintain them.
27. *ISFM.* PADAT enabled to set up 613 farmers' fields schools (FFS) against a target of 650 to promote ISFM techniques among producers. Support provided by the Institute for Technical Support and Advice (ICAT),³¹ the regional branches of the national PO CTOP³² and NGOs trained 1,200 lead farmers (against a target of 1,452) and to promote ISFM techniques among 14,362 farmers (against a target of 6,500). According to the PCR, surveys conducted by the DSID in 2017 indicate that the adoption rate of the ISFM techniques reached 95.4 per cent during the 2016-2017 farming season.
28. *Capacity building to stakeholders.* PADAT supported different categories of actors through capacity building. In particular: (i) it delivered training to 2,912 POs at the grassroots (against a target of 3,005) and supported them to organize in SCOOPs.³³ Nonetheless, according to the 2016 supervision mission report, only a limited number of them was able to formally obtain the statute of SCOOPs fitting the criteria set by OHADA.³⁴ Further, not all of them were able to link with umbrella organizations/unions to facilitate marketing and their level of development was not uniform; (ii) The CTOP was supported to improve the quality of services provided to their members through the establishment of regional branches (CROPPAs)³⁵ and activities aiming to promote its visibility; (iii) PADAT provided the Chamber of Agriculture with equipment and supported the renovation of their offices. Further, it provided training to ICAT and NGOs operating in the sector; (iv) 99 young entrepreneurs were supported to develop business plans and received an amount of XOF100,000 (US\$168 approximately)³⁶ each to kick start income generating activities. Nonetheless, the amount was insufficient and not all of them were able to co-finance their activities and continue/expand their businesses; (vi) 24 repairmen/mechanics were trained to repair and maintain equipment distributed.
29. **Objective 2 – To improve the processing and marketing of outputs.** The component aimed to improve the income of producers, particularly women who played a key role in downstream production, through a set of interventions specifically aimed at: (i) reducing post-harvest losses and improving the quality of products; (ii) improving labor productivity and reducing workload related to post-harvest and processing; and (iii) facilitating the marketing of products.
30. *Access to processing equipment.* The project supported the acquisition and distribution of 1,300 processing equipment (e.g. maize shellers, rice threshers). While the number of equipment distributed was as planned at design, some of

³¹ From the French: *Institut de Conseil et d'Appui Technique.*

³² From the French: *Coordination Togolaise des Organisations Paysannes et de Producteurs Agricoles.*

³³ Simplified Cooperative Societies / *Société Coopérative Simplifiée.*

³⁴ Organisation pour l'Harmonisation en Afrique du Droit des Affaires.

³⁵ From the French: *Coordination Régionale des Organisations Paysannes et de Producteurs.*

³⁶ Exchange rate US\$-XOF at 15 October 2019: XOF1=0,00167877US\$ used for all figures in the document.

them were of poor quality.³⁷ At the same time, it is worth noticing that with the support of local repairmen/mechanics it was possible to repair some of the machines or adapt them to the needs of producers. As a result, the quantity of cassava, maize and rice processed increased by 27.1, 1 and 8 per cent respectively against a target of 10 per cent each.

31. *Storage and market infrastructure.* The construction of the planned 351 storage and market infrastructure started in 2015 but only 254 infrastructures were finalized. According to the PCR, this underachievement was due to several combined factors including: lengthy procurement procedures; weak contract management; and the weak capacities of some enterprises. According to the PCR, 230 infrastructure management committees were set up within POs/SCOOPS. Of these, 127 were trained in stock management, stores maintenance and management. Nonetheless, training was not always effectively provided (e.g. in some cases delivered one year before the infrastructures were available for use or late). Some committees were not trained at all.
32. *Collective marketing.* INADES-Formation³⁸ supported 66 SCOOPS to promote grouped sales and set up aggregation centers. Grouped sales in 2015/2016 enabled them to market 6,069 tons of cereals against 5,198 tons in 2014/2015. During the last year of project implementation four structures for warehouse receipt systems were in use.
33. *Market information system.* One of the members of the CTOP, *the Centrale des Producteurs de Céréales*, was supported to develop a market information system covering over 40 markets. Prices were disseminated through the radio and a website.
34. *Rural roads.* The expected rehabilitation/construction of roads did not materialize due to the lack of financing from BOAD and EBID.
35. **Component 4 – To adapt agricultural production to climate change.** The component was structured around three main axes of intervention aiming to reduce the effects of climate change on agricultural production and ultimately on food security.
36. *The integration of climate change adaptation tools into agricultural production systems.* PADAT planned to conduct several sectoral and thematic studies. As mentioned in chapter II, part of these were abandoned or not realized. At project completion, a study on improved seeds within supported value chains was conducted as well as a study on good practices in relation to climate change adaptation. PADAT also supported setting up nine meteorological stations and a center for meteorological data management. Nonetheless, these were not fully operational at project completion. Planned training on climate change for policy makers didn't take place.
37. *Adaptation of vulnerable agricultural production systems to current and future climate impacts.* A large number of activities were planned, most of them with limited implementation progress, as summarized below.
 - Improved cassava, maize and rice varieties were identified with delays, preventing the project from disseminating improved seeds as expected. Conversely, ADAPT successfully promoted Soil Fertility, Water and Pests Integrated Management through fungi (GIFERC)³⁹ through FFS. In particular, three types of fungi with relevant adaptation qualities were promoted⁴⁰ for the

³⁷ According to the PCR, part of the equipment distributed by the project was imported and broke down after the first agricultural season. Some of the equipment's components were not suitable or not resistant.

³⁸ INADES-Formation is a network of associations under Ivorian law, with its headquarters in Abidjan. It is present in 10 countries in Africa including Togo.

³⁹ From the French: *Gestion Intégrée de la Fertilité, de l'Eau et des Ravageurs par les Champignons*.

⁴⁰ These include: saprophytic fungi, accelerating the decomposition of organic matter; symbiotic fungi, increasing the capacity of the plant to extract water and nutrients from the soil; entomopathogenic fungi, combating insects.

production of the Micotry powder, used to coat seeds before sowing and the Microplus liquid fertilizer. According to the PCR, analyses were ongoing to determine the potential negative impacts of these products on human health and environment;

- According to the 2016 IFAD supervision missions report, planned water and soil conservation and stream bank stabilization activities were not conducted due to the limited project duration;
 - The distribution of livestock to vulnerable households for income diversification was launched in December 2016 only, i.e. six months prior to PADAT completion. This activity was taken over by the Government;
 - Ten water reservoirs were set up for aquaculture/fishing purposes. Nonetheless, the PCR indicates that their viability and quality was uncertain. Committees of fishermen and fish farmers were set up, but they were not trained or equipped;
 - Low pressure drip micro-irrigation pilot activities were conducted with the support of the NGO CADI-Afrique.⁴¹ Irrigation kits were distributed to 100 POs reaching 2,542 vegetables producers. According to the PCR, the assessment of producers was very positive and the benefits of micro-irrigation recognized particularly in terms of the reduction of workload for watering and weeding;
 - A mapping was conducted on passage corridors for transhumance in order to improve the management of pastoral areas. The installation of 4,300 posts (against 2,000 planned) for the delineation of corridors was still in progress at project completion. In addition, 15 livestock water points were installed;
 - ADAPT supported the reforestation of 937 ha (against 1000 ha planned) by the Government through its Office for the Development and Exploitation of Forests (ODEF)⁴² and by the communities with the support of NGOs;
 - Apiculture was promoted with the installation of 382 modern hives and the provision of training benefitting 202 producers (against 300 planned).
38. *Information, education and communication.* INADES-Formation conducted awareness raising activities and training on climate change impacts and adaptation reaching 1,500 POs members against a target of 2,863. According to the PCR, the participatory approach promoted by INADES proved to be successful. Conversely, the planned development of modules and technical manuals on the adaptation of agricultural production systems to climate change, and training for Government services and NGOs were not realized.
39. **Outreach.** Despite the limited project performance and expenditures (see the Efficiency section), the project reportedly reached 136,033 direct beneficiaries against 107,500 planned. Of these, 48 per cent were women. Special attention was also given to youth.⁴³ Indirect beneficiaries were estimated at 535,095 against a target of 475,000. According to the PCR, the total number of beneficiaries (direct and indirect) reached 671,128 or 18 per cent of the rural population of Togo.⁴⁴ However, as it was the case for expected beneficiaries referred to in the design report (see footnote 4), it is not clear how beneficiaries were defined or calculated.
40. **Summary.** Overall, project objectives were partially achieved. Under component 1, several targets were met. This is particularly true for the quick start operation, agricultural advisory services provided to producers and the support to POs. The delays in conducting activities under component 2 and the lack of BOAD and EBID financing had a negative impact on project performance and did not allow PADAT

⁴¹ Cercle D'actions Pour Un Développement Intégré En Afrique.

⁴² Office of de Développement et d'Exploitation des Forêts.

⁴³ E.g. youth represented 47 per cent of beneficiaries of the quick start operation.

⁴⁴ The source referred to in the PCR is the 2012 National Census on Agriculture (total rural population: 3.8 million).

to make the best use of IFAD and GAFSP funding and to achieve results as expected. The final evaluation report of ADAPT further indicates that the results of the ADAPT intervention were overall disappointing. Although many activities were initiated, they were mostly unfinished at project completion.

41. Effectiveness of PADAT is considered both in the PCR and PCRV as *moderately unsatisfactory (3)*.

Efficiency

42. PADAT performance was well below expectations due to non-availability of planned co-financing. In addition, the project suffered implementation delays since the beginning (with one-year delay in the effective start) and was further affected by weak financial management, lengthy procurement procedures and a limited mobilization of resources from the Government (see more in section D). PADAT was classified as a project at risk since 2014 up to the completion.⁴⁵
43. According to the available financial information on the status of cumulative expenditures, the overall financial execution stood at 68 per cent of the estimated project cost excluding BOAD and EBID co-financing. Expenditures related to project management under component 3 exceeded the planned allocations. The actual component 3 cost was in fact US\$8.9 million (or 25 per cent of project expenditures) against an original allocation amounting to US\$5 million (or 10 per cent of project budget). According to the PCR, this was largely due to the costs of international technical assistance recruited to set-up the project support unit,⁴⁶ not integrated in the project budget at design.
44. The PCR indicates that the cost per beneficiary household reduced due to the lower unit cost for infrastructure, but it is not possible to understand how these figures were calculated in light of the data on project costs and number of beneficiaries.⁴⁷ Also, while most certainly the cost per beneficiary would have reduced due to a combination of the significantly lower project cost and the higher outreach compared to the design, the analysis would be incomplete without looking at the benefits generated. In fact, without the implementation of planned infrastructure works that were to be funded by BOAD and EBID as well as given the implementation issues and delays, benefits generated would also have been significantly reduced. Notwithstanding, the PCR estimated the economic rate of return at 20.1 per cent against 16.7 per cent at design with a benefit/cost ratio at 1.81. It is difficult for the PCRV to examine the reliability of figures and analysis presented in the PCR.
45. In view of delays in disbursement and implementation processes also affected by fiduciary issues, as well as the high project management cost, efficiency is rated *moderately unsatisfactory (3)* in both the PCR and the PCRV.

Rural poverty impact

46. The assessment of project impact in the PCR was based on information from several sources (e.g. the Results and Impact Management⁴⁸ Survey, DSID evaluation, data collected in the field as part of the discussions with the beneficiaries and implementing partners, the conclusions of the stakeholders' workshop). Some constraints to impact analysis are highlighted by the PCR and particularly relate to the limited duration of the ADAPT component (with many activities not realized or expected to have effects in the medium and long term). In

⁴⁵ Source: IFAD, Decision Memo – Budget Reallocation, 2015.

⁴⁶ The project hired the French firm SOFRECO (*Société Française de Réalisation, d'Études et de Conseil*) to set up the project support unit and develop project management tools.

⁴⁷ According to the PCR, the costs per beneficiary household was XOF24,964 or US\$42 against XOF29,847 or US\$50.1 at design. Based on the actual cost US\$35 million and the reported number of beneficiaries (136,033 direct and 535,095 indirect) the cost per beneficiary would be US\$52. Assuming the average household size was 5, the cost per household would be US\$260.

⁴⁸ In French : *Système de gestion des résultats et de l'impact (SYGRI)*.

addition, some thematic studies that might have contributed to the impact analysis were not available.⁴⁹

47. **Households' income and asset.** According to the PCR, PADAT facilitated households' access to market facilities, inputs and advisory services resulting in increased production and added value. As a result, supported households saw their revenues increase by 16 and 9 per cent from the marketing of maize and rice products respectively (against a target of 40 per cent). Their annual income from maize and rice production reached XOF11,2106 (or US\$188) and XOF126,737 (or US\$213) respectively. Nonetheless, baseline data to compare this information with was not available.⁵⁰ The project also contributed to the creation of employment (3,210 part-time and 2,778 full-time). In the opinion of the beneficiaries at the stakeholders' workshop, household assets also improved, particularly in terms of housing and equipment.
48. **Food security and agricultural productivity.** According to the PCR, ISFM, the quick start operation and advisory services promoted resulted in increased yields (38 per cent for maize, 11 per cent for rainfed rice and 50 per cent for lowland rice). The comparison of DSID data with national data showed that the increase of productivity in project areas was higher compared to national rates. The average production per farmer in the period 2011-2016 increased by 114 per cent for maize and by 59 per cent for rice. According to the PCR, the increase in revenues of supported households and the improved availability of cereal stocks resulting from the construction of storage facilities had a positive impact in terms of food security and nutrition. The rate of households affected by the lean season decreased from 84 per cent in 2012 to 62 per cent in 2016 and improvements were also registered in the nutritional status of children with a decrease of chronic malnutrition from 37.9 per cent to 24.6 per cent over the same period. According to the PCR, representatives of beneficiaries who participated in the regional stakeholders workshops in Kara and Notsè, reported that the improvements in the health status of children were among the major impacts of the project.
49. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** The project provided capacity building to producers, POs and NGOs resulting in increased skills and knowledge of stakeholders in rural areas. According to the PCR, activities promoted by PADAT in terms of the support to POs particularly resulted in improved social cohesion in rural areas and solidarity among supported POs. Members of POs saw their social status improve significantly and were perceived as local leaders. At the same time, the level of development and maturity of these organizations was mixed and part of them were still young and fragile.
50. **Institutions and policies.** According to the PCR, the experiences and lessons learned from the implementation of PADAT significantly contributed to the development of the national agricultural policy document (2016-2030) geared towards accelerating growth, competitiveness, transformation, modernization and openness to markets. While several partnerships and contracts were signed with different public and private stakeholders as well as consultancy and construction firms, their performance was uneven.
51. **Rural poverty impact.** Based on the above, poverty impact is rated moderately satisfactory (4) in both the PCR and PCR.V.

Sustainability of benefits

52. **Social sustainability.** The project enabled adequate beneficiary participation (men and women) during project implementation and improved social cohesion in rural areas through partnership with POs. Some of these organizations became

⁴⁹ E.g. assessment of pilot activities to support animal traction and mechanized farming; capacity building to POs; reduction of post-harvest losses as a result of the use of transformation equipment.

⁵⁰ For other activities, the generated annual income per household was on average: XOF317,000 (or US\$532) for beekeeping; XOF182,950 (or US\$307) for cassava processing; XOF234,750 (or US\$394) for animal-drawn cultivation.

crucial actors in the institutional, social and economic landscape. However, targeted actions to strengthen their capacities were still needed to ensure sustainability particularly in terms of governance, resources mobilization and financial management.

53. **Economic and financial sustainability.** According to the PCR, the dynamics generated by the project (e.g. in terms of support to POs, improved production techniques, storage and processing) and the increasing demand for cassava, maize and rice products were expected to ensure the sustainability of the economic and financial achievements of PADAT. Nonetheless, risks were identified relating to the sustainable access to inputs, the quality and management of storage and processing infrastructures and equipment, and the capacity of cooperatives to link with umbrella organizations to facilitate access to markets. Also, the financial sustainability of the market information system and meteorological stations established by PADAT might be endangered by the lack of strategies to cover their recurrent costs.
54. **Technical sustainability.** Training and advisory services provided by PADAT enabled producers to improve their knowledge of production techniques and apply them during three crop seasons. The training of 1,200 lead farmers was further expected to contribute to the sustainability of project intervention. At the same time, the low quality of certain equipment coupled with the weak capacities of operators to handle and maintain them presents risks (although mitigated by the ownership of some POs and the availability of repairmen/mechanics). Relevant challenges were also observed in the weak management of market infrastructures representing a risk for their sustainable use and maintenance.
55. **Institutional sustainability.** PADAT supported different actors including decentralized services of MAEP and public institutions (e.g. ICAT, ODEF) to improve the services delivered to the rural poor. While the PCR indicates that the successful engagement of ICAT in the project will contribute to a sustainable management of resources invested by PADAT, improvements in the capacity of MAEP staff as a result of project support do not clearly emerge from the PCR.
56. **Environmental sustainability.** The 2016 PSR indicates that results achieved in terms of climate change and environment were insufficient (see section B). Nonetheless, as highlighted in the PCR, PADAT contributed to raise awareness on climate change and its effects. Also, promoted techniques and approaches addressing climate change issues and adaptation were welcomed by target groups and started to be replicated.
57. Overall, although elements for the sustainability of project interventions were introduced through capacity building, the mobilization of farmers and production techniques promoted, significant risks were observed and associated with the quality of equipment, the maintenance and management of infrastructures, support services required by producers, the capacities of POs. Further, it seems the project did not elaborate an exit strategy. Based on the above, sustainability is rated *moderately unsatisfactory (3)* both in the PCR and PCR.V.

B. Other performance criteria

Innovation and scaling up

58. **Innovation.** The PCR lists several innovations as promoted by PADAT. Nonetheless, the majority of them are not explained/detailed and not referred to in other sections of the document or in other project related documents (e.g. the partnership between POs and input sellers with POs renting storage infrastructure to input sellers resulting in the generation of income and in the reduction of the costs for the transportation of input needed by POs; the set-up of supply chains for national and sub-regional markets; the acquisition by POs of up to 33 per cent capital share of *Entreprise de Services et Organisations de Producteurs / Service*

Companies and Farmer Organizations to facilitate access to inputs and market). There are also other approaches and activities that are presented in the PCR as innovative, but it is not clear how they can be considered as innovations (e.g. the use of the tool Tom2Monitoring for project technical monitoring in complementarity with Tom2Pro for financial management and accounting).

59. In addition, the 2016 supervision mission report indicates that the project was not innovative in terms of the support to POs and it rather promoted classic approaches. Conversely, it highlights that beneficiaries were innovative in adapting and addressing issues confronted in terms of equipment (adapting machines to needs). The PCR does not refer to this aspect in relation to innovation.
60. Based on the above, innovation is considered *moderately unsatisfactory (3)* in the PCR, one point lower than the PCR.
61. **Scaling up.** The PCR rated the “potential” for scaling up moderately satisfactory. This rating, however, is not adequately supported by the narrative, which is very limited and only refers to the need to pursue innovations promoted and to the key factors on which it depends. Nonetheless, complementary information was collected in the ADAPT final evaluation report and in other sections of the document. Based on it, the following few elements relevant for scaling up were identified in relation to ADAPT: (i) the production of GIFERC products started to be replicated within other initiatives in the country such as the multi-donor Project for Integrated Disaster and Land Management;⁵¹ (ii) NGOs that supported the implementation of beekeeping pilot initiatives were contacted by the MAEP to set up a national network of beekeeping professionals as part of an African Union supported initiative; and (iii) the protection of forestry lands initiated by the project with the support of ODEF was continued by the Food and Agriculture Organization.
62. Based on the above, the criterion is considered *moderately satisfactory (4)* in both the PCR and PCR.

Gender equality and women’s empowerment

63. Gender inclusion in PADAT can be appreciated from both quantitative and qualitative points of view. In terms of outreach, women represented 48 per cent of total direct beneficiaries, 50 per cent of the beneficiaries of the quick start operation, and 40 per cent of lead farmers trained. Also, women accounted for 30 per cent of the membership of SCOOPs.
64. The following main achievements in terms of women empowerment were highlighted in the PCR: (i) the reduction of women financial dependence on husbands resulting from income generated through project activities; (ii) the improved status and decision making of women in the household and within communities; (iii) the reduction of women workload in processing activities thanks to improved technologies; and (iv) improved access to land as a result of awareness raising activities promoted with an increase of areas planted by women from 0.53 ha in 2011 to 0.98 in 2016. Conversely, according to the ADAPT final evaluation report, while women were a priority target of the component, no specific arrangements were put in place to ensure their participation.
65. Overall, women accounted for a significant number of beneficiaries and the project contributed to improve their social and economic status. Based on the above, this criterion is rated *moderately satisfactory (4)* in the PCR as in the PCR.

Environment and natural resources management

66. According to the PCR, environmental impact was not specifically assessed by the project. The ADAPT final evaluation report further indicates it was too soon to fully

⁵¹ *Projet de Gestion Intégrée des Catastrophes et des Terres.*

measure the impacts of the intervention due to its limited implementation period, with many activities just finalized or unfinished at project completion.

67. However, some positive aspects could also be highlighted. In particular, the PCR indicates that: (i) ADAPT supported interventions with immediate impact on natural resources (e.g. reforestation); (ii) the promotion of modern beekeeping proved relevant as it prevented producers from destroying hives for harvesting honey, fighting against bush fires and encouraging the preservation of forests; (iii) the project contributed to reducing the use of fertilizers and chemical pesticides thanks to training on ISFM and the promotion of GIFERC products. The use of these organic products enabled to improve the soil structure and its water retention capacity.
68. Moreover, only a limited number of infrastructures were developed beyond warehouses (whose impact was limited to 62 ha of lowlands) and water reservoirs.
69. Taking into account the limited achievements of ADAPT and the lack of an impact assessment on environment, this criterion is rated *moderately unsatisfactory (3)* both in the PCR and PCR.V.

Adaptation to climate change

70. As mentioned above, results achieved through the implementation of the ADAPT component were disappointing. However, the PCR indicates that actions promoted enabled to raise awareness on climate change and adaptation measures among project partners and beneficiaries, and changes were observed in behaviors and practices. Other activities might have a positive impact in the future. For example, the meteorological stations set up by ADAPT might contribute to improve the accuracy of climate information and forecast and strengthen the preparedness for climatic events. The identification of cassava, maize and rice varieties with improved adaptation qualities, might help secure harvests and increase the resilience of production systems. The availability of small water reservoirs and the improved soil structure through the use of GIFERC products, would further enable to better address drought episodes.
71. Overall, the 2016 PSR indicates that results achieved in terms of climate change and environment were insufficient particularly taking into account that a specific component was integrated in the project. Based on the above, this criterion is rated *moderately unsatisfactory (3)* both in the PCR and the PCR.V.

C. Overall project achievement

72. Although the project had some positive impact on livelihoods and contributed to increased productivity, food security and incomes, results achieved were below expectations. This is particularly true for expected results under components 2 and 4. Also, project performance was hindered by a weak management by MAEP, lengthy procurement procedures and a low level of mobilization of counterparts financing. Expenditures stand at 68 per cent of the planned budget, with 25 per cent of expenditures used for project management. The overall performance of PADAT is considered *moderately unsatisfactory (3)*, in line with the PCR.

D. Performance of partners

73. **IFAD.** According to the PCR, PADAT benefited from direct supervision by IFAD with the organization of 14 supervision and support missions and an MTR (2014). Missions mobilized expertise covering the different thematic areas of the project and enabled to address implementation issues faced. IFAD also provided support for financial management and monitoring and evaluation. Also, the Fund was flexible in adapting to the context revising the procedures for disbursement and increasing the thresholds for withdrawal application for GAFSP.
74. Nonetheless, the PCR indicates that: (i) delays were experienced by IFAD to process documents; (ii) weak attention was given to the transition that followed

the termination of the contract with SOFRECO; (iii) the decision to align the completion date of ADAPT with the one of PADAT compromised the achievement of the objectives of the component; and (iv) the high turnover of country programme managers (four in six years) affected the quality of IFAD's support.

75. Based on the above, and taking into account the identified weaknesses in terms of project design, the performance of IFAD is rated *moderately unsatisfactory* (3) both in the PCR and PCR.V.
76. **Government.** According to the PCR, the provisions of the financing agreement were overall respected. The Government participated in supervision missions and the steering of the project was regularly conducted. Notwithstanding positive aspects, some weaknesses were also identified including the following:
- The performance of the project was hindered by the instability of the project support unit. The unit was set up with the support of international technical assistance provided by SOFRECO that was overall considered poor.⁵² In the period when SOFRECO was phasing out (2015), delays were observed in the recruitment of national staff to team up with SOFRECO during the transition and then to replace them. According to the PCR, the recruitment process was initiated in April 2016 only and was still not concluded at project completion. Further, lack of transparency in the recruitment process was reported. A weak management of human resources (e.g. unclear attribution of roles and responsibilities; different salaries for the same staff categories) and a high turnover of staff were also observed;
 - Financial management was weak, particularly in relation to: (i) internal control; (ii) weak accounting and the absence of financial statements; (iii) procurement. Ineffective and lengthy procurement procedures particularly affected the implementation of the project.
 - Contractual frameworks were established with service providers. Nonetheless, there was no systematic assessment of their performance resulting in an inefficient use of resources.
 - The Government showed a limited capacity to mobilize counterpart funding.
77. Based on the above, the performance of the Government is rated moderately unsatisfactory (3) both in the PCR and PCR.V.

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

78. **Scope.** The scope of the PCR is generally in line with the PCR Guidelines and is considered satisfactory (5).
79. **Quality.** While an effort was made in the PCR to be exhaustive and detailed, some sections of the document are not developed in a clear manner. This is particularly relevant for the Annex 7 and the section on project costs: financial tables and data presented in the PCR (tables and narrative) are not consistent. As a result, overall project expenditures by financier, components and categories in US\$ are not clear in the report. The section on innovation and scaling up is also weak and the PCR doesn't describe the characteristics of the innovations mentioned, how these were tested and what were the results or benefits.
80. In some cases, statements and rating are not substantiated with evidence or ratings are not consistent with the narrative (e.g. innovation and scaling up). Also, some contradictions were found across the document (e.g. in relation to the replenishment of quick start kits). The analysis of the project impact in terms of improved capacities of MAEP and its deconcentrated services is also limited.

⁵² Source: 2014 PSR, PCR.

Furthermore, some acronyms were not spelled out making reading sometimes cumbersome.

81. The rating of the quality of the PCR is *moderately unsatisfactory (3)*.
82. **Lessons.** The PCR presents several lessons which are generally relevant. Nonetheless, in some cases these are not based on explicit findings or in depth analysis made in the document. The rating is a *moderately satisfactory (4)*.
83. **Candour.** The narrative tone of the PCR is objective and the report states positive as well as less positive results. In particular, the PCR assessed IFAD's performance moderately unsatisfactory, which is uncommon in PCRs. The rating is *satisfactory (5)*.
84. **Overall PCR quality** is rated as *moderately satisfactory (4)*.

V. Lessons learned

85. The main lessons and recommendations gleaned from the PCR and its validation include the following:
 - One of the main constraints that affected implementation was that the financing of BOAD and EBID could not be mobilized as expected undermining the achievement of project objectives. The synchronization of financing might have had a significant impact particularly in terms of improved production and marketing. For future projects, IFAD and the Government should ensure project contributions are formalized and mobilized as planned.
 - The project was affected by weak financial management and lengthy and ineffective procurement procedures. To avoid implementation delays and challenges that can affect project efficiency and effectiveness, financial management and procurement capacity need strengthening.
 - The project institutional set-up with international technical assistance proved to be inefficient. This approach should be considered carefully in the future and, if needed, the support of technical assistance should be occasional and mobilized based on needs.
 - Some project approaches proved effective and should be promoted. In particular: (i) the involvement and capacity building of different stakeholders as key to lay the basis for the provision of proximity agricultural services in rural areas and for the transfer of knowledge and skills for improved sustainability; (ii) the support to FFS resulting in a good adoption rate for techniques promoted; and (iii) the combination of the quick start operation with warehouse receipt system/warrantage to improve the resilience of vulnerable groups in a context of fluctuating market prices.
 - The quick start operation was effective to support more vulnerable groups to improve access to inputs and get out of poverty. Nonetheless, the objective to reconstitute kits was not totally achieved. A risk of progressive erosion might question the effectiveness of this approach. Further support is needed to enable quick start beneficiaries to systematically link with cooperatives and POs, and facilitate the development of partnerships between POs and market stakeholders.
 - The promotion of locally made equipment selected by beneficiaries is a model to be encouraged in order to have equipment best adapted to the real needs of producers.

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 and scaling up, as well as environment and natural resources management, and adaptation to climate change.	X	Yes
Performance of partners			
• IFAD	This criterion assesses the contribution of partners to project design, execution, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation. The performance of each partner will be assessed on an individual basis with a view to the partner's expected role and responsibility in the project life cycle.	X	Yes
• Government		X	Yes

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

Rating comparison^a

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Programme Management Department (PMD) rating</i>	<i>IOE Project Completion Report Validation (PCR) rating</i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (PCR-PMD)</i>
Rural poverty impact	4	4	0
Project performance			
Relevance	3	3	0
Effectiveness	3	3	0
Efficiency	3	3	0
Sustainability of benefits	3	3	0
Project performance^b	3	3	0
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	4	4	0
Innovation	4	3	-1
Scaling up	4	4	0
Environment and natural resources management	3	3	0
Adaptation to climate change	3	3	0
Overall project achievement^c	3	3	0
Performance of partners^d			
IFAD	3	3	0
Government	3	3	0
Average net disconnect			-0.08

^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 and 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		4	
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)		3	
Scope		5	
Overall rating of the project completion report		4	

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

ADAPT	Adapting Agriculture Production in Togo
BOAD	West African Development Bank
CTOP	<i>Coordination Togolaise des Organisations Paysannes et de Producteurs Agricoles</i>
DSID	Directorate of Statistics, Information and Documentation
EBID	Bank for Investment and Development of the Economic Community of West African States
FFS	Farmers Field School
GAFSP	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIFERC	Soil Fertility, Water and Pests Integrated Management through fungi
ICAT	Institute for Technical Support and Advice
ISFM	Integrated soil fertility management
MAEP	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non-governmental organization
ODEF	Office for the Development and Exploitation of Forests
ORMS	Operational Results Management System
PADAT	Support to Agricultural Development Project
PCR	Project completion report
PCRV	Project completion report validation
PNIASA	National Programme for Agricultural Investment and Food Security
PO	Farmers and producers' organization
PSR	Project status report
SCOOP	Simplified Cooperative Societies

Bibliography

Government of Togo. *Document complet de stratégie de réduction de la pauvreté* (2009-2011).

_____. *Programme national d'investissement agricole et de sécurité alimentaire* (2010-2015).

_____. *Stratégie de Relance de la production Agricole* (2008-2010).

_____. *Programme National d'Investissements pour Environnement et les Ressources Naturelles au Togo* (2011-2015).

_____. 2009. *Plan d'Action National d'Adaptation aux Changements Climatiques*.

_____. 2012. PADAT progress report.

_____. 2012. National Census on Agriculture.

_____. 2012. *Enquête SYGRI/RIMS de Reference dans les Zones d'intervention du PADAT*.

IFAD. IFAD Strategic Frameworks 2007-2010; 2011-2015; 2016-2025.

_____. 2010. President's report, Proposed grants to the Togolese Republic for PADAT.

_____. 2010. PADAT Design Report.

_____. Aide Memoires from supervision missions and management letters (2012-2016)

_____. 2013. ADAPT Project Document.

_____. 2014. Report from the Mid-Term Review.

_____. 2015. ADAPT Final Evaluation Report.

_____. Project Status Reports

In addition, IFAD internal MEMOs, quality enhancement/assurance related documents, communications and documents available in the Electronic Records Management System (ERMS) and xdesk (IFAD Intranet) were consulted.