Independent Office of Evaluation

IFAD
Investing in rural people

Project Completion Report Validation

Supporting Small-scale Traditional Rainfed Producers in Sinnar State
Republic of the Sudan
Date of validation by IOE: November 2019

I. Basic project data

				Approval (US$ m)		*Actual (US$ m)*	
Region	Near East, North Africa and Europe Division		Total project costs		21.17		23.89
Country	Republic of the Sudan		IFAD grant and percentage of total	13.54	64%	12.95	54.2%
Grant number	G-I-DSF-8072-SD		Recipient	4.72	22%	4.42	18.5%
Type of project (subsector)	Agricultural development		Cofinancier 1				
Financing type	IFAD-initiated and exclusively financed		Cofinancier 2				
Financing terms*	Grant under debt sustainability framework (DSF)		Cofinancier 3				
Date of approval	15 December 2010		Cofinancier 4				
Date of financing signature	28 March 2011		Beneficiaries	2.91	13.7%	3.47	14.5%
Date of effectiveness	26 April 2011		Other sources (ABSUMI)	3.97[1]**		3.35	14.%
Loan amendments			Number of beneficiaries	20 000 household		Direct: 110 064 [2] Indirect: 82 548	
Loan closure extensions			Project completion date	30 June 2018		30 June 2018	
Country programme managers	Tarek Ahmed (Jul 2017-present), Mohamed Abdelgadir (Jun 2016-Jul 2017), Hani Abdelkader Elsadani Salem (Jan 2013-May 2016), Mohamed Abdelgadir (2012-2013), Rasha Omar (2004-2012		Financing closing date	31 December 2018		31 December 2018	
Regional director(s)	Khalida Bouzar		Mid-term review			10 May 2015	
Project completion report reviewer	Diane Abi Khalil		IFAD financing disbursement at project completion (%)			97.30 (in the grant currency SDR[3])	
Project completion report quality control panel	Fumiko Nakai		Date of the project completion report			01 October 2018	

Source: President's report, Design report and Project completion report.

* Debt Sustainability Framework

[1] ABSUMI was added after mid-term review and is not calculated in the cost at appraisal.
[2] There is a discrepancy in the numbers across the report and different figures were reported (for instance page 16 – project outreach: 22,777 men and 10,898 women as direct beneficiaries and page vii: direct beneficiaries 110,064).
[3] Special Drawing Rights. The grant amount approved was SDR 8.85 million and SDR 8.635 million disbursed.

II. Project outline

1. **Introduction.** Following the approval in December 2010, the financing agreement for the project Supporting Small-scale Traditional Rainfed Producers in Sinnar (SUSTAIN) was signed on 28 March 2011 and became effective on 26 April 2011 for a period of seven years. Project completion report validation (PCRV) is normally prepared based on a desk review, but this specific PCRV has been informed by a field mission in the context of a country strategy and programme evaluation (CSPE) conducted in September and October 2019.

2. **Project area.** SUSTAIN operated in three localities in the Sinnar State – Dindir, Abu Hujar, and Dali-Mazmoum, and covering 100 villages. The project was a response to the alarming levels of land degradation in these areas, further aggravated by the uncontrolled expansion of mechanized schemes and the lack of enforcement of environmental conservation rules in these schemes.

3. **Project goal, objectives and components.** The project goal, as stated in the President's Report, was to reduce rural poverty and increase food security and income for about 20,000 households in the project area. The specific objective was to increase the productivity of staple and cash crops as well as that of the small ruminants.[4]

4. The project had three components:

   a. *Technology transfer* for livestock and rain-fed agriculture (estimated at 32 per cent of project total cost). This component was expected to address productivity constraints for crop production and livestock. Its main expected outcome was the adoption of conservation agriculture and nutritional packages by at least 60 per cent of participants. Key activities under this component included: (i) demonstrations of technical packages (minimum tillage, soil moisture management, crop rotation, tree boundary planting, and livestock nutrition packages; (ii) scaling up of the successful packages; (iii) home garden (*jubraka)* cultivation for women.

   b. *Market access and post-harvest management* (estimated at 9.8 per cent of project total cost) was expected to tackle issues related to physical market accessibility and post-harvest handling techniques. Key activities included: (i) construction of multi-purposes crossing; (ii) improvement of traditional grain storage facilities; (iii) introduction of solar drying techniques of vegetables and fruits and improvement of local oil seed presses.

   c. *Capacity-building and institutional strengthening* (estimated at 58 per cent of project total cost) aimed at: building the capacity of producers to adopt environment-friendly production techniques; the promulgation of laws favouring sustainable use of land and water resources; and the establishment of an efficient project management set-up. Its main outcomes was the improvement of social cohesion of the communities. Key activities included: mobilisation and formation of villages development communities (VDCs) and common interest groups (CIGs); the establishment of a community environment conservation fund; and the development of an enabling environment for sustainable management and land and water.

5. **Target group.** The project targeted three groups: (i) smallholders who cultivated less than four hectares [about 9.5 feddans] and owned five small ruminants or

[4] The President's report also included three main policy and institutional objectives: (i) improving the quality of extension services thanks to capacity-building for staff and introducing new procedures for smallholder access to improved technological packages; (ii) tailored insurance services to meet smallholders' needs, thus helping them overcome their risk aversion; and (iii) creating an operational policy on land use and resource management thanks to the formulation of the land use and the investment map as well as the promulgation of the bill on sustainable management of natural resources. These objectives were not explicitly mentioned as objectives in the design or the PCR. They rather corresponded to the components, particularly component 3.

less; (ii) settled pastoralists in the three localities with limited access to water and fodder; and (iii) destitute women who have been displaced ten years ago by the civil strife in southern Sudan. SUSTAIN was expected to benefit 20,000 households, including 19,000 smallholder households, 800 settled pastoralist households and 200 households headed by women.

6. **Financing.** The project cost was estimated at US$21.17 million, financed by IFAD through a DSF grant of US$13.54 million. The planned contribution of the government amounted to US$4.72 million and the one of the beneficiaries to US$2.91 million. In 2013, following the partnership with the Agricultural Bank of Sudan Microfinance Initiative (ABSUMI), a component "*Rural finance*" was added with an estimated cost of US$3.97 million,[5] increasing the total project budget to US$23.89 million. At completion, the overall disbursement rate was 95 per cent and that of IFAD grant 97 per cent (in SDR).

Table 1
Project costs by financier

Funding Sources	*Planned expenditure at appraisal*	*Revised budget*	*Actual expenditure*	*% disbursed out of revised budget*
IFAD (grant)	13.54	13.54	12.95	95.6*
Government	4.72	4.72	4.42	94
Beneficiaries	2.9	2.9	3.47	120
ABSUMI		3.97	3.35	84
Total	21.17	25.14	23.89	95

Source: Design report and PCR.
* In US$ terms. In the grant currency (SDR), the disbursement rate was 97.3 per cent.

Table 2
Project costs by component

Component	*Allocation at appraisal*	*Revised budget*	*Actual expenditure*	*% of total actual expenditure*	*% disbursed out of revised budget*
Technology transfer	6.79	6.79	4.74	19.8	70
Market access and post-harvest management	2.08	2.08	1.98	8.3	95
Capacity building and institutions strengthening	12.30	12.30	11.8	49.4	96
Rural finance		3.98	5.35	22.4	134
Total	21.17	25.14	23.89	100	95

Source: Design report and PCR.

7. **Project implementation.** The project implementation was steered by a board of directors representing the key decision-making entities including: the State Minister of Agriculture Animal Wealth and Irrigation (MAAWI) and heads of technical departments in MAAWI, representatives from the State Ministry of Physical Planning and Public Utilities, as well as the Federal Ministry of Finance and

[5] It is understood that the financing was partly from an IFAD grant funded project, 'Scaling-up the Agricultural Bank of Sudan Microfinance Initiative" and partly from the Government of Sudan and the Central Bank of Sudan particularly for on-lending (based on the 2014 supervision mission report). The IFAD grant was approximately US$925,000 and was to support the establishment of six new ABSUMI units in collaboration with on-going IFAD-financed investment projects at the time.

Economic Planning, and the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, and the project manager of SUSTAIN. An inter-ministerial committee, chaired by the Federal Minister of Agriculture, was in charge of reviewing and approving policy recommendations emanating from the Board of directors and related to natural resources management (NRM). A central coordination unit for the IFAD co-financed projects, based in Khartoum, provided assistance to the project management unit (PMU)[6] in the recruitment of project staff and the procurement. The PMU was based in Sinja in the Sinnar state assisted at the localities level by five multi-disciplinary extension teams with the following specialization: (a) team leader cumulating monitoring and evaluation (M&E) responsibilities; (b) crop production; (c) range management/forest management; (d) livestock production; (e) community development and capacity building; and (f) accountant clerk.

8. The project was to be implemented over seven years in three interrelated phases:

- The pre-implementation or preparatory phase during the first year following the inception of the project.
- The demonstration phase for the actual implementation of the suggested activities (between 2012 and 2016).
- The scaling up phase for consolidation, adoption and replication of the second phase.

9. **Developments during programme implementation.** Changes in the implementation of the project that occurred after the Mid-term Review (MTR) are as follows:

(i) An agreement was signed with the State of Sinnar to pay top-ops on salaries for the extension teams.[7]

(ii) The activities under the Community Environmental Conservation Fund was shifted to the ABSUMI units and the remaining fund resources were reallocated to the rehabilitation of infrastructures (schools, health center, water supply etc.).

(iii) The activity aiming at the rehabilitation of natural open and community rangeland of 6,000 feddans was dropped as this area was privatised.

(iv) The MTR reallocated IFAD proceeds to cover for the increased cost categories such as construction of *wadi* crossing, vehicles, equipment, etc.

10. **Intervention logic.** In order to achieve its objective, SUSTAIN introduced technical packages that are environmentally friendly and supported their adoption and scaling up through field demonstrations and capacity building. Improvement of post-harvest management and access to market aimed at diversifying and increasing the incomes of target groups. The emphasis of policy dialogue on land use issues was expected to improve the environmental and economic sustainability of the project through a sustainable use of natural resources. Strengthening the capacities of the institutions and communities was vital to effectively implement the activities and sustain the project benefits.

11. **Delivery of outputs.** The project performance in terms of outputs delivery and physical targets was satisfactory. Outputs under component one, *Technology transfer,* exceeded the initial targets varying between 65 and 180 per cent. Component 2, *Market access,* reached its target except for the routine maintenance of the crossing, that was partially met (50 per cent). Component 3, *Capacity building and institutions strengthening,* achieved 95 per cent of its targets. Targets under component 4, *Rural finance,* were partially achieved, reaching 59 per cent

[6] Project management office in the design report and PMU in the PCR.
[7] The MTR suggested partial financing for such teams in 2016 – 50 per cent by IFAD and 50 per cent by the government; in 2017 – 25 per cent by IFAD and 75 per cent by the government, and in 2018 the government would cover 100 per cent of the top-ops.

for the targeted villages, 52 per cent for group formation and 57 per cent for group membership. A list of outputs delivered by the project against initial targets can be found in Annex III.

12. The PCR presents different and inconsistent figures for the number of beneficiaries. While the main text indicates that the number of beneficiaries directly reached by the project was 22,777 men and 10,898 women (thus a total of 33,675 persons) and that this was 138 per cent of the initial target, it also cautions on the possibility of a double counting thus making the figure inaccurate. The PCR (page vii) indicates a very different number, 110,064 for direct beneficiaries (and 82,548 for indirect beneficiaries).

III. Review of findings

A. Core criteria

Relevance

13. SUSTAIN was aligned with government strategies, namely with the Agricultural Revival Programme, which had the overall objective of increasing food security and income for poor rural people. At the Sinnar State level, the main instruments for improving agricultural productivity included rehabilitation and improvement of irrigation systems, the introduction and promotion of conservation agriculture, and water harvesting.[8] The project was also fully in line with IFAD policies (in terms of targeting, improved access to land and tenure security, and the private-sector development), and with the 2009 and 2013 country strategic opportunities programme for Sudan, that focused on increased access to agricultural services, to markets and microfinance and on enhancement of productivity.

14. **Project design.** In general, the interventions were relevant to the needs of the target population and addressed constraints that smallholders faced in the area of coverage, such as limited access to technology, market and quality inputs. SUSTAIN introduced technical packages for agricultural growth,[9] in a context characterized by low productivity for crops and livestock, land degradation and drought. The infrastructures interventions were crucial given that the rural population become isolated in rainy season due to flooded areas and lack of adequate infrastructure. The project design combined the practical solutions with policy dialogue aimed at the promulgation of laws for sustainable use of land and water resources. The choice of crops was relevant, combining staple crops (sorghum and millet) essential for household consumption and cash crops (sesame and groundnut) for generating incomes. The inclusion of nutrition training during an early stage of the project was very relevant to address the issue of malnutrition in the project area.[10]

15. Despite these positive aspects, the design was ambitious in terms of scaling up conservation agriculture. SUSTAIN assumed that smallholder farmers will systematically scale up conservation agriculture following the demonstration. It overestimated their financial capacity and presumed that the private sector would provide them with timely services and that the insurance company would tailor services to their needs. This has proven optimistic; the rain-fed agriculture is a risky business for these partners, given the likelihood of drought in a context characterized with climate instability.[11]

[8] Design report, page 5 (more than 90 per cent of the funds allocated for Sinnar Development Plan were for sustainable development and poverty alleviation).
[9] Technical packages included minimum tillage, soil and water conservation and livestock nutrition packages.
[10] The training programme covered topics such as the importance of nutrition, complementary meals for child and pregnant women. Supervision report 2012.
[11] Rainfed farming is seen by insurance companies as too risky and expensive to manage, and private companies in general do not find it cost-effective in providing inputs/services to smallholders. Despite the introduction of ABSUMI after the MTR, the financing of seasonal production costs for the smallholder farmers remained limited.

16. **Relevance of targeting.** The project focuses on localities in rural areas that are poor and vulnerable to a high variability of rainfall, which in turn affects agricultural income and food security.[12] Socio-economic criteria and a self-targeting by the participating communities guided the selection of the target groups. The gender mainstreaming strategy relied on: (i) tailoring activities to the needs of women to diversify their incomes and alleviate their workload; (ii) gender training of the project staff and the target groups; and (iii) a participation quota of 30 per cent to ensure the participation of women to the supported activities. The design of the project did not address youth. This group was only included during the last two years of implementation, when the last supervision reports recommended their inclusion and their training as spray service providers.

17. **In summary** SUSTAIN was in line with the priorities of the Government in agricultural development/revival and with IFAD strategies. Its design is relevant to the context and to the target population, including women. The supported activities are pertinent to achieve the objective. Nonetheless, assumptions related to conservation agriculture were ambitious. The PCRV rating for relevance is *satisfactory* (5), in line with the PCR.

Effectiveness

18. The assessment of effectiveness in the following paragraphs is structured around the major expected outcomes of the project as addressed by the PCR.

19. **Outcome 1: Adoption of technical packages including minimum tillage, soil moisture management, improved seeds, crop rotation, tree boundary planting and livestock nutritional packages.** The project supported a series of activities for the transfer of technology including demonstration of technical packages and their adoption and scaling up, the introduction of crop rotation, and better access to inputs and equipment through a private-public partnership.[13] The reported adoption rate of the technical packages promoted by the project was 66 per cent. The training of para-vet at the community level enabled project beneficiaries to benefit from veterinary services, whereby 236,427 small ruminants (sheep and goats) were treated, and benefiting 28,624 owners (45 per cent women). The establishment of *jubraka* through improved land and water management techniques have enabled the target group, in particular women, to secure home food needs, and to sell the surplus on the market.

20. While transfer technology on soil and water conservation and nutritional packages to address productivity constraints for crops and livestock performed well, the results for scaling up of conservation agriculture technology *by smallholder farmers* were modest. According to the PCR, scaling up by 4,091 smallholder farmers covered 58,098 feddans compared to scaling up by 94 large farmers covering 94,573 feddans.[14] Also within the category of "smallholder farmers", according to the PCR, a majority (54 per cent) operated on land holding larger than the indicative threshold for targeting (i.e. nine feddans), despite enthusiasm and interest by smaller farmers in the technical packages. Two explanations emerged from the reviewed documents: (i) farmers operating on smaller land areas have limited financial resources to adopt the new technologies, as confirmed during the PCR workshop; and (ii) the service providers are more interested in large farmers, as observed in the 2016 supervision mission report and precisely "the average area service providers chiselled per farmer client is close to 50 fed, considerably above the 5-10 fed of project target group households and indicates that a large number

[12] About 29 per cent of the population in Sinnar is food insecure and 44 per cent of the state population is classified as poor. Design report, working paper 1, pages 6-7.
[13] The linkage with service providers experienced a slow start but the project was later successful in linking smallholder farmers with 24 service providers. PCR page 8.
[14] PCR, page 9.

of the new adopters of conservation agriculture are larger farmers". Discussions during the CSPE mission reinforced the above emerging findings.

21. In general, reasons behind this low level of performance in scaling up were related to the limited access to extension services,[15] to financial resources,[16] to machinery and crop insurance.[17]

22. **Outcome 2: Access to market improved.** The construction of 32 multipurpose crossings improved access to markets during the rainy season. Crossing construction benefiting 207 villages (of which 130 beyond the project coverage) has reportedly decreased the travel time by about 40-50 per cent and the cost of transportation by 34 per cent. However, observations during the CSPE mission revealed weaknesses in the quality of the construction of some visited crossings. The improvement of traditional grain storage facilities (benefitting 1,284 stores; 308 per cent of target) reduced crop loss to an average of 2 per cent compared to 15 per cent at pre-project stage. The introduction of post-harvest techniques (food dryer), targeting essentially women, improved the conservation of perishable crops, and consequently food consumption and nutrition. It also contributed to creating income-generating activities. While the PCR lacks quantitative data to reinforce this outcome, the focus group discussions during the CSPE mission (September-October 2019) revealed the same qualitative findings.

23. **Outcome 3: The social cohesion of the participating communities improved.** The establishment and training of 99 VDCs and 496 CIGs has improved the social cohesion of the communities. The VDCs have become an interface between the supported communities and the project. The CIGs have been involved in implementing and managing the supported activities (e.g. conservation agriculture, animal nutrition, forestry and range, post-harvest).

24. The project initiated a series of activities to enable policy on land use including awareness-raising campaign on NRM, different exchange visits and fora and a learning route to Kenya and Tanzania on land tenure security and NRM. The outcomes of these outputs at the various level (federal, state and locality) are not documented. A land use and investment map was prepared by the project, yet the State Law to support a sustainable management of land and water was not promulgated because of the late delivery of the land map.[18]

25. **Outcome 4: Access to finance improved.** While this was not formally or explicitly introduced in the logical framework, the inclusion of component *Rural finance* was expected to lead to this outcome. SUSTAIN contributed to the economic improvement of the targeted household by facilitating their access to financial services. Linkages with ABSUMI enabled the beneficiaries, particularly women, to start small business and to improve the livelihood of the entire family (e.g. improving/purchasing household assets, building houses, clothes, paying school tuition fees). Nevertheless, the PCR and discussions from the CSPE mission revealed two major concerns with the ABSUMI performance: (i) limited financing of agricultural production and a strong focus on livestock (81 per cent of its portfolio),

[15] The Government of Sinnar did not fulfil the agreement of financing this activity agreed in the MTR, resulting in delays in salary top-up for extension teams. Limited capacity and skills by the project extension staff delayed the linkages between beneficiaries and service providers and hindered the promotion of scaling-up conservation agriculture by smallholder farmers (supervision report 2016).
[16] ABSUMI coverage for seasonal agricultural operation was limited. The late start of micro finance branches and delay in creation of necessary partnerships between service providers and the financing institutions were another limitation (supervision report 2016).
[17] Rain fed smallholder farming is seen by insurance companies as too risky and expensive to manage. PCR page 22.
[18] A Land Use and Investment Map would determine land potential, capacities and capabilities and design alternative land use plan, which addresses environmental, economic and social objectives of the state. The findings generated by the Land Use and Investment Map would be translated into improved policies, considering the recommended sustainable land-use options and scenarios, with the formulation and promulgation of land use and natural resources management bills.

given the risk of investing in rain-fed agriculture; and (ii) tight schedule of instalment.

26. **Factors that affected the effectiveness**. Despite the positive factors, the effectiveness was constrained by: (i) the delay in covering the salaries top-up and allowance for local extension agents, limiting their mobility and outreach; (ii) the limited focus of ABSUMI on financing agriculture operations versus financing livestock; and (iii) the increase of production costs due to the high inflation rate (67 per cent in 2018).[19]

27. **Overall**, the expected outcomes of the project were partially achieved. The project performed well in terms of technology transfer and access to markets. Social cohesion of the communities has improved with the creation and the strengthening of VDCs and CIGs. The project was less successful in scaling up conservation agriculture and in developing an enabling environment for the sustainable management of water and land. The PCRV rating for effectiveness is *moderately satisfactory (4),* one rating below the PCR rating.

Efficiency

28. The project became effective only four months after its approval, which is positive since the average time in Sudan is usually eight months.[20] IFAD financing disbursement was 97.3 per cent.[21] The Government contributed 94 per cent of the planned amount. On the other hand, delays in paying the salaries of the extension teams affected the implementation of planned activities and in some cases hindered effective scaling-up of the demonstrated technologies at the level of smallholders during the 2017 agricultural season. In many cases, delivered outputs exceeded the initial targets notwithstanding the disbursement rates of related components that varied between 70 and 95 per cent. This could be explained by the devaluation of the local currency and the possibility of delivering more with the same project cost in US dollar terms.

29. The **project management** was subsumed under the component *Capacity building and institution.*[22] According to the costing at project design, 37 per cent of the budget (US$6.58 million) was allocated for the project management unit. This would seem high, but in fact, close to two thirds of the allocation was for renovation of offices and purchase of vehicles, without which the budget for project management would have been less than 15 per cent, thus, within the reasonable range. The PCR does not present detailed actual costs with a breakdown, but the proportion of project management cost may not have been substantially higher than the original plan given that the actual component cost is less than the budget (US$11.8 million compared to US$12.3 million) and the proportion of the *component cost* against the total cost reduced from 58 per cent to 49 per cent.

30. According to the PCR, **the economic internal rate of return** calculated at completion (16.38 per cent) is higher than the opportunity cost of capital (14.7 per cent) and the economic internal rate of return estimated at appraisal (15.6 per cent).[23] A review conducted in the context of CSPE noted that the analysis at completion appears robust and that there are also some environmental and social benefits that were not quantified and their inclusion could result in a higher return.

31. The PCRV rating for efficiency is *satisfactory (5)*, in line with the PCR rating.

[19] PCR, p. 23
[20] For projects approved between 1999 and 2017
[21] In the grand currency SDR. Special Drawing Rights. The grant amount approved was SDR 8.85 million and SDR 8.635 million disbursed.
[22] The component cost comprised three distinctive headings: (i) community orientation and training; (ii) development of an enabling environment; and (iii) project management unit.
[23] However, it is noted that the project design report presented different figures: 15 per cent in the main report and 16.11 per cent in the working paper.

Rural poverty impact

32. This section reviews the data presented in the PCR, which were drawn from the Results and Impact Management System (RIMS), from the results of the final impact assessment carried out in 2018 integrated into the PCR,[24] the final stakeholder workshop, and the PCR mission observations. The accuracy and the reliability of the data can be questioned and often the PCR referred to project documents without specifying which report. In some cases, RIMS presented incomplete data. Qualitative data collected during the CSPE mission suggest that IFAD supported activities have had overall positive effects on rural communities.

33. **Household income and assets.** The PCR and the household impact assessment study indicated an average increase in household income by 30 per cent. According to the financial analysis carried by the project, the production model contributed to an increase in the income of small producers.[25] Household asset ownership has improved by an average of 15 per cent; an average increase in the number of cattle, sheep, and goats by 194 per cent, 25 per cent, and 62 per cent respectively. A decrease in loss of sheep and goat respectively from 32 per cent and 31 per cent to about 2 per cent each was possible, thanks to the improvement in livestock nutritional packages. The pilot fattening programme contributed to 26 per cent increase in profit on sold fatten animals.[26] The increase in agriculture and animal production is likely to have contributed to an increase in income. Moreover, the PCR reported 40 per cent saving on travel cost, thanks to the crossings. The focus group discussions during the CSPE mission indicated IFAD supported activities contributed to increased household incomes- particularly *jubraka*, access to credit (mainly for livestock) and markets, livestock production and animal health services. The beneficiaries also reported an increase in asset (building/renovation of houses, improvement of furniture).

34. **Food security and agricultural productivity.** A decrease in chronic child malnutrition was registered (32 per cent compared to 35 per cent at baseline).[27] Activities promoted by the project including nutrition related activities (establishment of *jubraka,* and training on nutrition), diversification of production, improved storage and food processing have plausibly promoted food security and nutrition and reduced seasonal hunger, a finding conveyed consistently during the CSPE field visits.

35. The supported activities contributed to an increase in agricultural yields and production of main crops exceeding the targets. The average sorghum yield between 2012 and 2017 from the improved farming techniques was 119 per cent higher than the average yield from the traditional farming techniques for the same period and 110 per cent higher for sesame, which is a cash crop.[28] The financial and economic analysis estimated in increase in livestock productivity between 26 and 183 per cent, for sheep and goat respectively. The improvement in productivity in general can be attributed to the training of farmers, the adoption of technical packages, and nutrition and animal health services supported by the project.

[24] A random sample of 30 villages was selected from a total of 101 villages in the five Rural Administrative Units in which the project was operating and covering a sample of about 1,754 households, participants and non-participants selected randomly. The assessment included a control group, which it considered wealthier than target group. Moreover, the report highlighted that "It is not possible to use the “before and after approach” because of the difficulties to reach respondents of the baseline data or even to complement the “with and without” approach through recall techniques because of the time factor as about seven years elapsed since the project started." Nevertheless, it referred to the baseline in the comparison of the results.
[25] PCR page 57.
[26] PCR page 15.
[27] Impact assessment 2018, page 26.
[28] 591 kg/fed of sorghum with improved techniques compared to 269 kg/fed with traditional practices. 600 kg/fed of sesame with improved techniques compared to 290 kg/fed with traditional practices. The average cultivated area of sorghum (12 fed.) and sesame (7.4 fed) for the whole sample in season 2017-2018, are higher by 55 per cent, and 54 per cent, respectively, compared to baseline data in 2011-2012. PCR, page 16.

36. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** The project invested considerable efforts in capacity building and community development. Trainings (including business, adult literacy, gender awareness, nutrition classes, midwives and first aid, animal and agriculture production) were major elements in the project. They contributed to building local knowledge in different field and to improving productivities and increasing opportunities for income generating activities. The construction of crossings improved access to health facilities. Focus group discussions with the beneficiaries during the CSPE mission confirmed the relevance and impact of the trainings on the beneficiaries and the improved access to health services.

37. Capacitated VDCs became an interface between the beneficiaries and the project and built a social cohesion in the communities. They have been involved in the management of community infrastructures and natural resources, using organizational and managerial skills acquired through the project. According to the household impact assessment, the perception of respondents about the roles and performance of VDCs was mixed.[29] While the PCR indicates that the project targeted specifically youth and enabled them to take up various employment opportunities, the PCRV lacks the evidence to support these findings and their participation was not monitored by the project.[30]

38. **Institutions and policy.** The project worked closely with multidisciplinary extension teams under the State Ministry of Agriculture. Their participation in training programmes and in the implementation of the supported activities are likely to have enhanced their capacities.[31] Extension team members met by the CSPE team were all highly motivated and committed to achieve results and the beneficiaries praised their work.

39. SUSTAIN was not successful in inducing changes at the policy level. Despite the preparation of the land use and investment map, the expected State law for the sustainable NRM was not drafted *(see Effectiveness)*.

40. Overall, SUSTAIN contributed to the increase in the productivity of staple and cash crops and of small ruminants. The project had a positive impact on income and assets, human and social capital. The capacity enhancement of beneficiaries and extension teams played an important role in achieving these results. The impact was less significant on policies. The PCR rating for rural poverty impact is *satisfactory (5),* in line with the PCR rating.

Sustainability of benefits

41. The 2017 supervision report of SUSTAIN observed that part of the SUSTAIN activities will continue under the ongoing IFAD-financed project "Integrated Agriculture and Marketing Development Project (IAMDP)".[32] Most, if not all, members of the SUSTAIN PMU and multi-disciplinary teams have been retained to work with IAMDP.

42. Otherwise, SUSTAIN benefited from the engagement of targeted communities and in some cases their participation to the various activities exceeded the targets. While technical packages promoted by the project contributed to increased

[29] The household impact study reported mixed results: (i) some respondents highlighted achievements as provision of electricity and digging well, services to farmers and animal raisers, maintenance of schools and mosques and sources of drinking water and their pumps;[29] (ii) 30 per cent of respondents were not aware of the role of VDCs; and (iii) participants to groups discussions agreed that VDCs and other social groups and societies contributed considerably in increasing cohesion between people in the villages.
[30] Supervision reports 2016 and 2017.
[31] Topics covered included improved agriculture, animal nutrition, water conservation, seeds propagation and multiplication, farmers' schools, groundnut harvesting, micro doze applications, data collection, sampling methods and nursery techniques, partnership building with private sector, participatory approach and community mobilisation, farming as a business.
[32] The project has started in 2018 and covers Sinnar, North, South, and West Kordofan. Its objective includes improving market linkage for smallholder farmers and facilitating a private sector led supply chain for services and inputs.

productivity, modalities crucial for their scaling up were not addressed adequately by SUSTAIN and would be strengthened by IAMDP as observed by the supervision reports. The institutional sustainability relies on the community organizations established and strengthened by the project. The PCR did not specifically assess their level of autonomy but revealed that they were engaged in linking smallholder farmers with private service without the support of the project.

43. In conclusion, SUSTAIN has a potential of social and institutional sustainability. The technical sustainability depends on the implementation of IAMDP. The PCRV rating for sustainability is *moderately satisfactory (4)* in line with the PCR rating.

B. Other performance criteria

Innovation and scaling up

44. **Innovation.** SUSTAIN introduced various technological agricultural innovations through demonstrations that helped increase the productivity. The chisel ploughing technique has been an important innovative aspect, well appreciated and adopted by the farmers who had access to adequate financial resources, as observed by the CSPE mission. The project introduced a new business model based on partnerships between farmers and the private sector (such as mechanised service providers, small-scale retailers of agrochemicals). SUSTAIN has also promoted alternative energy and post-harvest management activities (gas stove and food dryer)[33] benefitting essentially women and achieving positive results. The PCRV rating for innovation is *satisfactory (5)*, in line with the PCR rating.

45. **Scaling up.** The State Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Resources and Irrigation has expanded the demonstration phase of SUSTAIN to additional villages in Sinnar state[34] and has initiated the Integrated Agricultural Solutions Programme based on the successful interventions of SUSTAIN in terms of capacity building and promotion of technical packages.[35] Discussions with beneficiaries during the CSPE suggest that there is a wider adoption of the technical packages promoted by the project by non-beneficiaries, based on the experience of the actual beneficiaries. In addition, although it does not fully comply with IFAD definition,[36] scaling up is ongoing by another IFAD-financed project in Sudan – IAMDP - and mainly in terms of the 4Ps model (public-private-producer partnership).

46. The PCRV rating for scaling up is *satisfactory (5),* in line with the PCR rating

Gender equality and women's empowerment

47. SUSTAIN made considerable efforts to empower women and strengthen their position in the community. The PCR shows that women represented 53 per cent of the participants in scaling up conservation agriculture, 93 per cent in literacy training, 100 per cent for gas stove distribution, and 100 per cent in the development of *jubraka*. Moreover, women represented 30 per cent of the members in the VDCs and hereafter were involved in the planning of the community development and in the decision-making process. Discussions during the CSPE field visits indicated that the presence of trained women in the extension teams and the attendance of both men and women in gender awareness campaign have been fundamental factors in facilitating the participation of women to the various interventions. Discussions with men during the CSPE mission conveyed a strong sense of acceptance of women's empowerment and of the consequent benefit brought for the entire household.

48. The project increased women's access to assets, services and resources. Key productive activities (such as home garden *jubraka*, post-harvest management

[33] During the FGD in the CSPE mission, beneficiaries considered the introduction of two items by the project as an innovation.
[34] Supervision report, 2017.
[35] CSPE mission – interview with the State Ministry of Agriculture in Sinnar, September 2019.
[36] IFAD's operational framework for scaling up results, December 2015.

techniques, livestock, microfinance) coupled with capacity-building enabled women to have a significant role in the family. It contributed to improved food security and nutrition and income increase for the entire household. Interventions such as the promotion of gas stove benefitting to 6,144 women (123 per cent of the initial target) have decreased their workload by reducing the time spent for firewood collection (63 per cent)[37] and the time for cooking that was much appreciated by the beneficiaries, as conveyed in the discussions during the CSPE field visits. Various project activities and outputs, such as improved rural roads, first aid and midwives trainings facilitated women's access to health structures and markets and to safe birth delivery services and enhanced childcare, as testified during the CSPE mission field visit.

49. Overall, the project achieved significant results in terms of women's empowerment (economic and social), in particular through capacity building, infrastructure investments, homes gardens, community organizations and participation to rural organisations. The PCRV rating for Gender equality and women's empowerment is *satisfactory (5)*, in line with the PCR rating.

Environment and natural resources management

50. Natural resources management was at the core of SUSTAIN. The project has introduced environment friendly technical packages: chisel ploughing, crop rotation, fodder production that limited the impact on rangeland, capacity-building of producers to adopt the promoted techniques, the introduction of gas stoves reducing the reliance on firewood.

51. Knowledge management activities were undertaken in terms of awareness on the challenges of NRM through the "learning route to Kenya and Tanzania", inter-state visits and organizations of fora. The project prepared a land and investment map that would be used to address environmental, economic and social objectives of the state but did not yet feed into relevant State law by project completion.

52. The PCRV rating for environment and natural resources management is *satisfactory (5),* same as the PCR rating.

Adaptation to climate change

53. The project enhanced the resilience of farmers to climate change through the promotion of technical packages that addressed issues such as the reconstitution of the soil fertility, resistance to drought, and improved productivity of farming and herding. It is likely that the technical packages and precisely the introduction of soil and water conservation techniques provided some yield stability and enhanced production under drought conditions.[38]

54. The PCRV rating for Adaptation to climate change is *satisfactory (5),* same as the PCR rating.

C. Overall project achievement

55. The objective of SUSTAIN to increase the productivity of staple and cash crops as well as small ruminants has been largely achieved.

56. In general, the project was aligned with the Government and IFAD strategies, and responded to the needs of the targeted groups. Demonstration and adoption of technical packages contributed to increased agriculture and animal productivity. Impact on rural poverty was positive. Key productive activities combined with relevant training allowed increase in income, in assets and plausibly in food security. The project paid great attention to gender issues. It was successful in engaging women in community development and in empowering them socially and economically. Access to finance was limited by the interest of ABSUMI to invest in

[37] PCR, page 15.
[38] PCR, environmental assessment.

livestock and less in rain fed agriculture, limiting the scaling-up of conservation agriculture.

57. The PCRV rates the overall programme achievement as *satisfactory (5),* in line with the PCR rating.

D. Performance of partners

58. **IFAD.** IFAD carried out regular supervision and follow-up missions, in addition to the MTR mission. Weaknesses in the project were highlighted and the adequate adjustments were provided for better implementation. The IFAD in-country office provided regular support and prompt decision-making, as noted by the PCR. It played an important role in terms of knowledge sharing and supporting the participation to a learning route to Kenya and Tanzania on "land tenure security and natural resources management". The PCRV rating for the IFAD performance is *satisfactory (5),* the same rating of the PCR.

59. **Government.** Government participated to the supervision missions through the steering committee. It provided 94 per cent of its financing despite the devaluation of the currency. It was nevertheless slow in paying the salary top-up and allowances for the extension teams. This affected the implementation of planned activities negatively and in some cases hindered effective scaling-up of the demonstrated technologies particularly, during the 2017 agricultural season. It also limited the coordination between local extension agents and ABSUMI credit officers at the field level, resulting in a low level of credit financing of conservation agriculture loans.[39]

60. Supervision mission reports observed weak financial management and recommended repeatedly a better control over the expenditures, the accounting data and the monitoring of budget. The Ministry of Physical Planning and Public Utilities at the State level was in charge of conducting regular maintenance of the crossings but the PCR reported that maintenance was only conducted on four crossings. The reviewed reports voiced concerns about the quality of some crossings due to weaknesses in their design and construction and water erosion.[40] Delays in the recruitment of a senior M&E consultant to assist the PMU were also reported in supervision missions. The PCRV rating for the Government performance is *moderately satisfactory (4)*, in line with the PCR rating.

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

Scope

61. The PCR covered all sections and annexes as per the guidelines for Project Completion Review (2014). The section of *efficiency* is not addressed with sufficient details excluding an assessment of the quality of project management, procurement and quality of M&E, nor on the quality of financial management. A Bibliography list would have been helpful as the PCR often referred in its statements to "project documents" without any specific reference. The PCRV rating for Scope is rated *moderately satisfactory (4)*

Quality

62. The PCR process was inclusive of a variety of actors. A stakeholders' workshop was held during which the findings of the mission were endorsed and concerns of beneficiaries were voiced. Evidence provided in some areas were limited and not comprehensive enough to reach conclusion (e.g. income, gender and youth). There were some inconsistencies in the figures reported (for instance, the number of beneficiaries) and it is not always clear the PCR relied on which specific report to support its findings. The data from the endline impact assessment was included in

[39] Supervision report 2017.
[40] The PCR did not specify how many crossings needed maintenance or rehabilitation, but the CSPE mission during the field missions observed some weaknesses in the construction of some visited crossings.

the PCR but the quality and reliability of data were questionable, while the data in RIMS were incomplete. The PCRV rating for Quality is *moderately unsatisfactory (3).*

Lessons

63. The PCR generated a number of lessons that are relevant and congruent with the main conclusions, although some of them were rather conclusions than lessons. The PCRV rating for Lessons is *satisfactory (5).*

Candour

64. The PCR reported positive and negative results. It clearly explained the weaknesses and shortcomings in the implementation phase. The PCRV agreed with most of the ratings. The PCRV rating for Candour is *satisfactory (5).*

65. **Overall** the PCR quality is rated as *moderately satisfactory (4).*

V. Lessons learned

66. Useful lessons drawn from the PCR are as follows:

The presence of effective extension teams and services providers at the community level is key for the effective adoption of conservation agriculture and its scaling up.

Where rain fed agriculture is seen as a risk by insurance companies, an alternative to crop insurance should be assessed.

The attendance of both men and women in gender awareness campaign could be a fundamental factor in facilitating the participation of women to the supported activities.

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. *Four impact domains* • Household income and net assets: Household income provides a means of assessing the flow of economic benefits accruing to an individual or group, whereas assets relate to a stock of accumulated items of economic value. The analysis must include an assessment of trends in equality over time. • Human and social capital and empowerment: Human and social capital and empowerment include an assessment of the changes that have occurred in the empowerment of individuals, the quality of grass-roots organizations and institutions, the poor's individual and collective capacity, and in particular, the extent to which specific groups such as youth are included or excluded from the development process. • Food security and agricultural productivity: Changes in food security relate to availability, stability, affordability and access to food and stability of access, whereas changes in agricultural productivity are measured in terms of yields; nutrition relates to the nutritional value of food and child malnutrition. • Institutions and policies: The criterion relating to institutions and policies is designed to assess changes in the quality and performance of institutions, policies and the regulatory framework that influence the lives of the poor.	X	Yes No No No 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

Criteria	*Definition* *	*Mandatory*	*To be rated*
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]

Criteria	*Programme Management Department (PMD) rating*	*IOE Project Completion Report Validation (PCRV) rating*	*Net rating disconnect (PCRV-PMD)*
Rural poverty impact	5	5	0
Project performance			
Relevance	5	5	0
Effectiveness	5	4	-1
Efficiency	5	5	0
Sustainability of benefits	4	4	0
Project performance[b]	**4.75**	**4.5**	**-0.25**
Other performance criteria			
Gender equality and women's empowerment	5	5	0
Innovation	5	5	0
Scaling up	5	5	0
Environment and natural resources management	5	5	0
Adaptation to climate change	5	5	0
Overall project achievement[c]	**5**	**5**	**0**
Performance of partners[d]			
IFAD	5	5	0
Government	4	4	0
Average net disconnect			**-1/12=-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

	PMD rating	*IOE PCRV rating*	*Net disconnect*
Candour		5	
Lessons		5	
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)		3	
Scope		4	
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.

List of outputs

Component I: Technology transfer:	Units	Target appraisal/MTR amended	Cumulative achievement	% Achieved
Agriculture:				
Procurement of cash and food crop seeds	Contract	6	6	100%
Procurement of fodder and range seeds	Contract	6	6	100%
Fodder and range seeds delivered to RAU	Contract	6	6	100%
Rehabilitation of nurseries	Nursery	1	1	100%
Provision of equipment for water ponds and inlets (plastic sheets)	Sets	360	934	259%
Area semi-intensive conservation agriculture Demonstrations	Feddans	28000	30630.8	109%
Number of beneficiaries -Demonstration phase	Number	5600	6817	122%
Area semi-intensive conservation agriculture up scaling	Feddans	72975	153100.5	210%
Number of beneficiaries -Scaling up semi-intensive	person	6300	4240	67%
Jubraka demonstration	Feddans	180	615.52	342%
Number of beneficiaries -Jubraka improvement	person	360	1409	391%
Demonstration on household nurseries	Farmers	3240	3804	117%
Supply of improved seeds supervised by ARC	ton	247.5	195.8	79%
Applied research by ARC	Season	3	3	100%
ARC technical backstopping (researchers)	Person/season	6	8	133%
Technical back up (technicians)	Person/season	15	20	133%
Development of manual on water harvesting	Manual	1	0.5	50%
Radio program and TV spots	Episodes	96	214	223%
Field days agriculture	Villages	100	125	125%
Exchange visits agriculture	persons	980	1390	142%
Workshops at RAUs -agriculture	RAU	35	30	86%
Framers" training:				
Farmers Business Training	persons	590	4498	762%
Training of women farmers on improved Jubrakas	Trainees	1800	1409	78%
Training of farmers on conservation agriculture	Trainees	5600	5412	97%
Training of farmers on procurement of machinery services	Trainees	5600	6904	123%
Training of agricultural service providers staff	Trainees	100	174	174%
Animal nutrition				
Provision of choppers	Number	40	26	65%
Provision of Scale balance	Number	30	10	33%
Chicken vaccination campaign	village	100	102	102%
Feed for chicken (community contribution)	Sacks (90kg)	1080	1675.6	155%
Distribution of chicken	Number	5400	15093	280%
Chicken pans	Number	360	641	178%
Training				

Component I: Technology transfer:	**Units**	**Target appraisal/MTR amended**	**Cumulative achievement**	**% Achieved**
Training of extension engineers on improved nutrition for livestock	Trainees	40	41	103%
Training of extension engineers and veterinarians on animal health	Trainees	30	33	110%
Training of farmer trainers on improved animal nutrition and use of choppers	Trainees	100	156	156%
On the job training of farmers on animal nutrition	Trainees	5600	7306	130%
Training of paravets on animal health	Trainees	100	121	121%
On the job training of farmers on animal health	Trainees	5600	4900	88%
Field days animal nutrition	Villages	60	110	183%
Exchange visits animal nutrition	persons	980	1477	151%
Workshops at RAUs- animal nutrition	RAU	35	30	86%
Range improvement and forest enrichment				
Enrichment of reserved forests nearby villages with fodder trees and nutritive grass species	Feddan	2000	1618	81%
Component II: Market access and post-harvest management	**Units**	**Target appraisal/MTR amended**	Cumulative achievement	% Achieved
Construction of crossings -Dinder	Number	24	23	96%
Construction of crossings -Mazmoum	Number	9	9	100%
Training of communities on crossings maintenance	Trainees	150	163	109%
Women trained in food processing and technology	women	2500	3407	136%
Routine crossing maintenance	LS	1	0.5	50%
Grain Storage Facilites and Transformation Techniques				
Procurement of simplified sun dryers	Units	200	205	103%
Training on solar energy dehydration for vegetables & sun drying of vegetables	Trainees	700	1124	161%
Improvement of Oil Pressing	Study	1	1	100%
Improvement of Existing Stores	Units	350	1077	308%
Training on storage management	Trainees	700	932	133%
Training of trainers of extension agents on storage IPM extensions agents	Trainees	100	104	104%
Component III: Capacity building and institutions strengthening	**Units**	**Target appraisal/MTR amended**	Cumulative achievement	% Achieved
Village selected and phased (animation and mobilization)	village	100	101	101%
Village development committee established	VDC	100	99	99%
Village development committee registered	VDC	100	89	89%
Training on adult literacy	Person	3000	3527	118%
Training on mother child and environmental health (First aid)	Person	2000	2267	113%
Male VDC members trained	member	840	1446	172%

Annex III

Component I: Technology transfer:	**Units**	**Target appraisal/MTR amended**	**Cumulative achievement**	**% Achieved**
Female VDC members trained 30%	member	360	810	225%
Gas Stove Distribution	households	5000	6144	123%
Number of field extension units rehabilitated/ constructed	Units	5	5	100%
Training of extension teams on computer and soft ware	person	50	43	86%
Training of extension teams on participatory approach	Person	30	30	100%
Training of trainers on capacity building of community organization	Person	40	38	95%
Training of PMU and extension teams on financial soft ware	Person	20	16	80%
Training on monitoring and evaluation	Person	100	72	72%
Training of interest groups	person	10300	8838	86%
Training on gender (TOT)	person	160	143	89%
Training on gender	person	10000	5539	55%
Training on safety operation and maintenance of gas stoves	Person	5000	9539	191%
Supporting MAARI in the drafting of the bills on land use NRM	bills	5	0	0%
Financial system backup	Contract	4	4	100%
Construction of PMU Office and Guesthouse	buildings	1	1	100%
Construction of stores at RAUs	buildings	6	6	100%
Thematic studies (Scholarship for MAAWI staff to document projects impact)	Study	6	8	133%
Annual impact assessment	Study	5	5	100%
NRM Awareness campaign	Campaign	27	11	41%
Land use and investment plan formulated	plan	1	1	100%
Establishment of ABSUMI units	unit	3	3	100%
Board of Directors Meetings	meeting	28	19	68%
State Coordination Meetings	meeting	14	8	57%
Locality Coordination Committees' Meetings	meeting	42	19	45%
Rural Finance	**Units**	**Target appraisal/MTR amended**	Cumulative achievement	% Achieved
Establishment of ABSUMI unit	Unit	3	3	100%
Number of villages covered	Village	155	92	59%
Women savings and credit groups formed	Group	1150	599	52%
Savings mobilized	SDG	NA	3744388	
Micro loans provided	Number	NA	8814	
Households receiving loans	Number	18580	8814	47%

Source. PCR appendix 8

Bibliography

IFAD. 2010. Loan agreement.

_____. 2010. President's report.

_____. 2010. Design report.

_____. 2012-2016. Supervision reports.

_____. 2012-2016. RIMS reports.

_____. 2015. Mid-term review report.

_____. 2018. SUSTAIN Impact assessment report.

_____. IOE. 2019. Country strategy and programme evaluation field mission.

Acronyms

ABSUMI	Agriculture bank of Sudan microfinance initiative
CIG	Common Interest Groups
CSPE	Country strategy and programme evaluation
IAMDP	Integrated Agriculture and Marketing Development Project
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MAAWI	State Minister of Agriculture Animal Wealth and Irrigation
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MTR	Midterm review
NRM	Natural resources management
PCR	Project completion report
PCRV	Project completion report validation
PMU	Project management unit
RIMS	Results and Impact Management System
SUSTAIN	Supporting Small-scale Traditional Rainfed Producers in Sinnar State
VDC	Village development committee