

Project Completion Report Validation

Gwadar-Lasbela Livelihoods Support Project

Islamic Republic of Pakistan

Date of validation by IOE: December 2020

I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m)		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	Asia and the Pacific Division	Total project costs	38.27		26.55	
Country	Pakistan	IFAD loan and percentage of total	30	78.39%	25.54	96.20%
Loan number	1000004020 L-I-837	Saudi Development Fund	3	7.84%	0	0%
IFAD project ID	1100001515	Government	4.72	12.35%	0.86	3.27%
Type of project (subsector)	Community development- Fisheries infrastructure	Beneficiaries	0.54	1.42%	0.14	0.54%
Financing type	IFAD initiated and cofinanced with a supplementary fund grant					
Lending terms	Loan -Highly concessional ¹					
Date of approval	(loan) 11/05/2011 (grant) 11/06/2014					
Date of signature	(loan) 31/01/2013 (grant) 03/2015					
Date of effectiveness	(loan) 31/01/2013 (grant) 22/12/2015					
Loan amendments	2	Number of beneficiaries	20,000 household		53,395 household	
Loan closure extensions	3	Project completion date	31/03/2019		31/07/2020	
Country programme managers	Matteo Marchisio (2011 - 2014); Hubert Boirard (current)	Loan closing date	31/03/2019		31/10/2020	
Regional director(s)	Hoonae Kim; Nigel Brett	Mid-term review			03/05/2016	
Project completion report reviewer	Diane Abi Khalil	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)			97.5 ²	
Project completion report quality control panel	Eoghan Molloy; Fabrizio Felloni	Date of the project completion report			29/10/2020	

Source: IFAD's Operational Results Management System, Project Completion Report (PCR).

¹ Special loans on highly concessional terms are free of interest but bear a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75 per cent) per annum and have a maturity period of 40 years, including a grace period of 10 years.

² Based on XDR values.

II. Project outline³

Country & Project Name	Pakistan (Islamic Republic of Pakistan). Gwadar-Lasbela Livelihoods Support Project (GLLSP).
Project duration	Project duration: six years. Board approval: 11/05/2011; date of effectiveness: 31/01/2013; effectiveness lag: 20 months; Original completion date: 31/03/2019; actual completion date: 31/07/2020; Loan financial closure date: 31/10/2020; Extensions: three extensions (11/09/2018 – 31/03/2020 – 30/04/2020); Time from entry into force to first disbursement of funds: 11 months.
Project goal, objectives and components	<p>Goal: to contribute to the reduction of poverty among 20,000 poor households in Gwadar and Lasbela, by enhancing the access of the poor rural men and women to productive assets, skills, services and technologies.</p> <p>Objective: to increase the incomes and enhance the livelihoods of the poor rural/fishers households in the project area.</p> <p>Specific objectives: (i) organizing the rural poor men and women in target villages to be active partners in implementation of project activities and their own development; (ii) improving the access to poor men and women to productive assets, including skills, knowledge, capital, means of production and markets; (iii) assisting in addressing local development and services lags through provision of support for local productive infrastructure; (iv) improving production support infrastructure of fishers communities through improved landing sites and strategically located road network; and (v) empowering poor communities to become effective partners in development and accessing development resources and mainstream an accountable system for development delivery.</p> <p>Components: (i) community development; (ii) fisheries development; (iii): rural infrastructures.</p>
Project area and target group	The project was implemented in the province of Balochistan, precisely in two districts: (i) the district of Gwadar that offers coastal livelihoods development centred on fisheries; and (ii) the district of Lasbela that is centred on agriculture although suffers from water scarcity. The target group comprised small landowners, tenants, landless, small fishers (either owning small boats of less than 30 feet and working as hired hands or “khalasis”), and youth and women. The targeting was based on a geographical targeting and a poverty scorecard-based household targeting.
Project implementation	The overall responsibilities for the implementation and coordination of the project were under the Planning and Development Department of the provincial government of Balochistan through a steering committee. A project management unit (PMU) was set-up in Gwadar. The National Rural Support Programme (NRSP) was engaged as the main implementing partner for the community development and for fisheries related activities, following the Mid-term review (MTR). The implementation of the project was supported by 14 supervision and implementation support missions. ⁴
Changes during implementation	<p>In 2015, a grant from the Saudi Development Fund was approved and allocated to the construction of jetties and allied infrastructures.</p> <p>The project target that accounted for 20,000 household from 26 union councils at design was increased to 36,000 households and 30 union councils. Another target revision took place as a response to COVID-19 and an additional 8,200 household were targeted through cash grant. Given the low performance of the component “fisheries development” and the failure to construct the jetties, the related funds were re-allocated to component 1 and 3. Under component 1, asset transfer ceiling was enhanced and a business cooperatives model adopted for fishers communities in nine union councils replaced the community organisation (CO) model. Under component 3, the targets for road construction and community physical infrastructures (CPI) were increased by 25 km and 200 additional schemes, respectively. The implementation of activities related to fisheries, initially under the responsibilities of the provincial fisheries department, were transferred to the NRSP.</p>
Financing	The estimated cost of component 2 fisheries development accounted for 39 per cent of the total project cost and was significantly reduced to 12.5 per cent following the MTR, while its actual cost amounted to merely 3.30 per cent of the actual project cost. The

³ A project completion report validation (PCRv) is normally prepared based on a desk review, but this specific PCRv has been also informed by a field mission in the context of a country strategy and programme evaluation (CSPE) conducted in September and October 2020; evidence of the CSPE has been used to complement the Project Completion Report (PCR), when necessary.

⁴ Source: IFAD's Operational Results Management System.

	Saudi Fund grant did not materialize due to the lack of progress on the jetties construction (under component 2), which explains a zero per cent disbursement. The PCR noted that the counterpart funding was low due to the lower tax requirement and due to the fact that most of the project interventions were implemented by an implementing partner and COs, except for roads construction, which was implemented by the project directly.
--	--

Table 1
Project costs (US\$ '000)

<i>Funding source</i>	<i>Appraisal</i>	<i>% of appraisal costs</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>% of actual costs</i>	<i>% disbursed</i>
IFAD (loan)	30 000	78.39	25 543	96.20	85*
Saudi Development Fund (grant)	3 000	7.84	0	0	0
Government	4 727	12.35	867	3.27	18
Beneficiaries	543	1.42	143	0.54	26
Total	38 270	100	26 553	100	69

Source: IFAD's Operational Results Management System, PCR.

Table 2
Component costs (US\$ '000)

<i>Component</i>	<i>Appraisal</i>	<i>% of appraisal costs</i>	<i>Post-MTR</i>	<i>Actual</i>	<i>% of actual costs</i>	<i>% disbursed</i>
Community development	5 508	14.39	8 136	6 514	24.53	80.06
Fisheries development	14 905	38.95	4 787	877	3.30	18.32
Rural infrastructure	15 426	40.31	23 000	17 012	64.07	73.97
Project management	2 431	6.35	2 347	2 150	8.10	91.61
Total	38 270	100	38 270	26 553	100	69.38

Source: IFAD's Operational Results Management System, PCR.

*85 per cent in US\$ terms; 97.5 per cent based on XDR values.

III. Review of findings

<i>PCR finding</i>	<i>Rating</i>
A. Core Criteria	
Relevance	
1. The project was aligned with the Government's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, which highlights the importance of agriculture in terms of employment generation and poverty reduction. The project was also in line with the Government of Balochistan's Poverty reduction strategy and its emphasis on improved water resource availability, improved rural infrastructure, coastal infrastructures for fisheries, and improved social infrastructure. The project objective was in line with IFAD strategy outlined in the Country strategic opportunities programme 2009, precisely in terms of: (i) enhancing the access of poor rural men and women to productive assets, skills, and services; and (ii) strengthening the capacity of the local poor to engage in and benefit from local development process.	4
2. The project interventions were relevant to the context of the two covered districts. The rural infrastructure interventions were highly relevant to the needs of the target group and responded to existing challenges such as poor quality of rural roads and inadequacy of access to public services, to safe drinking water	

PCR finding	Rating
<p>and to energy supply. Skills development and productive assets were essential to reduce the level of poverty of the target group.</p> <p>3. Nevertheless, findings from the PCR and the 2020 CSPE mission indicated some weaknesses in the design. Technical and vocational training were not adequately offered in accordance with the context of each district but were rather similar in coastal areas and hinterlands. Moreover, asset transfers were more of a stand-alone intervention and could have benefited from additional support such as linkages with market, services providers, inputs, etc. The agriculture potential of Lasbela could have been harnessed with more related interventions.⁵ Finally, the assumption that the provincial government would take the lead in terms of fisheries development proved overambitious and the fisheries department lacked the capacity to implement the assigned activities. Youth was indicated as a target group, yet no specific targeting measures were incorporated in the design.</p> <p>4. Some adjustments made during implementation retained the relevance of the project, precisely in terms of increasing the number of rural infrastructures to ensure the basic needs of the target groups. While replacing the COs/Village organizations (VOs) model in coastal villages with a business cooperatives model adapted for fisher communities remained relevant, the capacities of the implementing partners to support this activity were over-estimated.</p> <p>5. In conclusion, the PCRV acknowledges the project's alignment to the Government and IFAD strategies and the relevance of the design to the needs of the target group. Some interventions could have been better adapted to the specificity or the covered areas, while the capacities of the implementing partners was overestimated in some cases. The PCRV rates this criterion <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>, one point below the PCR rating.</p>	
Effectiveness	
<p>6. Effectiveness is assessed in the following paragraphs against the three expected outcomes of the project components.</p> <p>7. <i>Outcome 1. Enhanced capacity for sustainable livelihoods; enhanced capacity for employment and productive self-employment.</i> The project contributed to the formation of COs and VOs, exceeding its target (133 and 138 per cent respectively). The organizations were capacitated through organizational and financial trainings, which enabled them to be actively involved in the selection and implementation of the project activities. An emerging finding from the PCR assessment and reinforced by the CSPE field mission indicated cases of exclusion of the poorest people from COs. The reason for this exclusion is plausibly related to the poverty scorecard targeting implemented by the project.⁶</p> <p>8. The project reached 73 per cent of its target in terms of vocational training, 79 per cent for both productivity enhancement training for farming and fishing communities and 79 per cent for training on CPI operations and maintenance. Vocational trainings delivered were not market-oriented and certifications were not recognized in the job market.⁷ Provision of productive assets, including cattle, goats, boats and fishing nets, and small-shops, represented 68 per cent of the target (4,196 assets transferred compared to a target of 6,154). While the PCR highlighted the importance of this intervention in addressing poverty, it stated the need to complement it with additional supports such as agricultural inputs and linkages with other entities. A community-managed financial services</p>	4

⁵ In Balochistan's coastal areas, over 90 per cent of the population is associated with fishery. In relatively inland areas, such as Lasbela, 70 per cent of the people are engaged in agriculture.

⁶ GLLSP household targeting was done using the poverty scorecard data developed for the Benazir Income Support Program. The NRSP was expected to carry out a validation exercise in community meetings to ensure that the project support is channelled to the most deserving households and to resolve any inconsistencies in the poverty scorecard data. Nevertheless, the methodology followed does not allow for poor households that were initially excluded from the Benazir Income Support Program data to be added to GLLSP targeted households.

⁷ According to the PCR and discussion during the CSPE mission, the agency also lacked capacity in undertaking a detailed market assessment and delivering sector specific trainings to the target beneficiaries (such as the fisher community). As a result, after a two-year stint, the Institute of Rural Management's contract was not renewed, and since the project was nearing completion, there wasn't sufficient time to bring another agency on board.

PCR finding	Rating
<p>facility⁸ was established, with women making up the majority of its beneficiaries with a 99.2 per cent repayment rate. In general, productive assets and access to finance enabled the beneficiaries to engage in income generating activities such as selling produce from livestock assets or opening small shops.</p> <p>9. <i>Outcome 2. Fisheries development: improved infrastructure; increased productivity, reduced wastage, strengthened local capacity.</i> Several factors hindered the achievement of this outcome, as reported by the PCR, including the lack of ownership of the fisheries department, the changes in the jetties design from floating to fixed and the long delays to obtain a no objection certificate from the Federal Ministry of Defence. All these factors resulted in dropping the construction of jetties and other related activities.⁹ Eight fisheries cooperatives were established and registered with the Social Welfare and Fisheries Department but their institutional development was not achieved;¹⁰ the PMU and the implementing partners lacked a dedicated expert to strengthen these cooperatives to become business-oriented entities. It has been agreed that the activity would continue under the second phase of the project.¹¹</p> <p>10. <i>Outcome 3. Increased access between communities, fish landing sites and national highways; enhanced access to basic services through CPIs.</i> The project enhanced significantly access to basic services through CPI (including drinking water schemes, irrigation, reverse osmosis and energy-related solar home systems), achieving 91.5 per cent of its target. These interventions contributed to the social and economical well-being of the beneficiaries. For instance, the solar-based reverse osmosis water plant, combined with a novel business approach, contributed to improved drinking water and proximity to water sources. The business approach enabled the beneficiaries to cover the maintenance cost, through selling extra water to neighboring villages. The roads constructed and rehabilitated by the project (100 per cent of target; 137.5 km in total length)¹² connected agriculture areas and landing sites to the main roads. It enabled an improved access to services and income opportunities, a reduction in the cost of water supplies, a quick access to fish landing sites and a reduction in the wastage of fish catch. These findings also emerged from the CSPE mission, which, in addition, confirmed the good quality of the infrastructure construction.</p> <p>11. On the one hand, the project failed to achieve its expected outcomes in fisheries development and the effectiveness of the vocational and technical trainings was moderately satisfactory. Yet, on the other hand, the COs proved to be active partners in implementing project activities and the achievements from the CPIs and road building were commendable and answered the needs of the target group. The PCRV agrees with the PCR assessment of effectiveness and rates this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>.</p>	
Efficiency	
<p>12. At completion, the IFAD loan was disbursed at 97.5 per cent.¹³ The project suffered from disbursement delays because of slow approval of the annual work plan and budget by the project steering committee. This led to late budget transfers and a slow pace of implementation, resulting in low disbursement in the early years of the project. Following the appointment of a new project director after the MTR, the disbursement rate significantly improved. The time</p>	4

⁸ The Community Managed Financial Services facility was to finance credit primarily for the purchase of nets, maintenance of boats, engine repair, etc. and also provide funding for microenterprises, especially those of women.

⁹ The initial project design proposed floating jetties. When the project took off, the government opted for fixed jetties instead, on the premise that floating jetties are not feasible in Gwadar's rough waters. This request, however, did not materialise due to delays in hiring international experts, getting no objection certificates from the government, as well as budget limitations. Consequently, the project decided to go back to the original idea of floating jetties. As a result, the whole component was dropped, and funds were re-allocated to roads and CPI schemes.

¹⁰ Findings of the CSPE field mission indicated that no requisite preparation or risks had been taken into consideration when introducing the cooperative model in the project post-MTR; including NRSP's own complete lack of experience in establishing cooperatives. However, despite the absence of the key enabling factors, eight cooperatives were registered on paper, and it was decided to roll over the activity to the second phase of the project.

¹¹ A second phase of the project was approved by the Executive Board on 08/05/2020.

¹² Seven roads in Gwadar totalling 54.278 KMs and 18 roads in Lasbela of 83.2 KMs.

¹³ Based on XDR values.

PCR finding	Rating
<p>from approval to entry into force was 20 months, above the average for the Pakistan portfolio (eight months) and the average for the Asia region (6.8 months), due to the time it took to fulfil the effectiveness conditions. However, the time from effectiveness to first disbursement (10 months) is within the average of the portfolio (7.6).</p> <p>13. Changes in the cost structure introduced at MTR changed the stream of benefits (the bulk of investments being concentrated in rural infrastructures).¹⁴ The project benefits were confirmed by the economic and financial analysis with the project's economic internal rate of return (EIRR) calculated at completion (27.2 per cent), higher than the EIRR estimated at appraisal (19.2 per cent) and the opportunity cost of capital (12 per cent). However, a review of the reported EIRR and economic and financial analysis by the CSPE team suggested a caution on drawing conclusions because of errors in formulas.¹⁵</p> <p>14. The management cost amounted for 8 per cent of the actual project cost and compares well with the average management cost of the portfolio (9 per cent).</p> <p>15. The PCRV agrees with the PCR assessment and rates the efficiency of the project as <i>moderately satisfactory</i> (4).</p>	
Rural poverty impact	
<p>16. The impact data provided in the PCR was drawn from a final impact assessment, which presented some weaknesses.¹⁶ Many findings were triangulated with the primary data collected during the CSPE mission, which overall suggest that IFAD-supported activities (in particular rural infrastructures) had positive impacts on the target group.</p> <p>17. According to the PCR, CPIs contributed to an increase in income through better access to safe drinking water, resulting in reduction of water costs and of water-borne diseases,¹⁷ which also reduced expenditures for health issues. The construction of roads had a visible impact on household incomes. It contributed to reduce wastage in fish catch and loss of vegetables and fruits. It also resulted in reduced road fares¹⁸ and enabled beneficiaries to invest in rickshaws as hired transport due to improved mobility. Furthermore, some beneficiaries opened small shops since it became easier and cheaper to restock goods from the main city. Such initiatives resulted in income generation and improved the lifestyles of local residents. Furthermore, an increase in income from several initiatives including from productive asset transfer, from microcredit, and from vocational training¹⁹ was also reported by the impact assessment and validated by the CSPE mission.</p> <p>18. An improvement in agriculture production and crop diversification through a combination of interventions including productivity enhancement training and irrigation was reported.²⁰ Asset transfer (such as goats used for self-consumption</p>	4

¹⁴ Activities under livelihoods enhancement interventions appear to be the main driver of net incremental benefits accounting for 62 per cent of total benefits in the economic analysis. Benefits deriving from agricultural and livestock development account for 33 per cent and those deriving from asset transfer and fisheries development for about 5 per cent.

¹⁵ Several formula errors were noticed in the review and pointed out to the economist especially with regard to aggregation of beneficiaries and inclusion of annual net incremental benefits into the EIRR. Despite the acknowledgement, changes were not rectified in the final PCR.

¹⁶ The available baseline was not used (it was reported that "the study was not conducted in line with the GLLSP logical framework"), therefore; the recall method was used to collect information related to "before the project". Moreover, impact data is not sufficiently disaggregated by gender, as there was no indication of the respondent's gender in the questionnaires used.

¹⁷ The focus group discussion reported approximately 75 per cent reduction in health expenditures (previously spending PKR 15,000-20,000 on health).

¹⁸ Reduction by 75 per cent (from Rs. 1,200/trip to Rs. 300) according to the focus group discussion during the CSPE mission.

¹⁹ The impact from vocational training is subtle given some issues in its effectiveness.

²⁰ The PCR indicated that the availability of irrigation water supplies has led to a major shift in cropping patterns in favour of high value crops like vegetables and the area under vegetables as a percent of total cropped area increased from 19 per cent in Pre-project conditions to 31 per cent. The CSPE team also noted crop diversification as a result of improved irrigation. For instance, in Lasbela (Winder) where previously farmers predominantly grew Sapodilla orchards (Chikoo), farmers are able to grow other crops including; wheat, peanuts, and cotton as well as a result of improved irrigation.

PCR finding	Rating
<p>and income generation) and the diversification of crops have likely improved household food security.²¹</p> <p>19. GLLSP reported a moderately satisfactory impact on human capital through improved knowledge in agriculture and livestock productivity enhancement (e.g. improved land preparation for agriculture crops, production techniques, improved animal management) and through vocational training. Interventions such as drinking water schemes and link roads have contributed to improving the overall community health, as reported above. The COs and VOs formed and strengthened by the project presented several weaknesses including: (a) lack of official recognition; (b) involvement in development activities limited to the project support, without any perspective beyond the project or linkages with other development partners, potentially limiting their sustainability. These findings were also evident during the CSPE field mission.</p> <p>20. Finally, activities related to policy reform and the strengthening of institutional capacity under the fisheries development remained unfulfilled, given that the fisheries development component was not implemented.</p> <p>21. The PCRV agrees with the PCR assessment of this criterion and rating as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>.</p>	
Sustainability of benefits	
<p>22. The involvement of COs in the planning, the implementation and the monitoring of infrastructure schemes created a strong sense of ownership. COs were effectively undertaking the operations and maintenance of community infrastructure (such as reverse osmosis water plants and solar water supply schemes) including the creation of management committees and the collection of charges fees. These findings were also reinforced by the CSPE mission.</p> <p>23. The sustainability of the roads is ensured by the Communication and Works department, which is the guardian of these infrastructures and their operation and maintenance.</p> <p>24. However, the benefits of technical and vocational training may be at risk. As mentioned under effectiveness, trainings lacked linkages with market and required certifications from recognized entities.</p> <p>25. The sustainability of the COs and fisheries cooperatives is questionable. The PCR suggested that NRSP would continue interacting with COs after the project completion, either through their own sources or some government/donor resources. Moreover, the PCR evidently highlighted the need for COs and VOs to develop a more comprehensive vision and plans, beyond planning and implementation of the project. The continuous support of NRSP to these institutions is not guaranteed after the project life (in the absence of project funding). The sustainability of the fisheries cooperatives is also at risk because they are not yet functional as businesses. This finding was also validated by the 2020 CSPE mission.²² While asset transfers were helpful in improving the socio-economic conditions of beneficiaries, the PCR noted the need for continued support in the form of assets management capacity building and linkages with government and private service providers.</p> <p>26. The prospect for the VO/local support organization level operations based on the community investment fund model might be more positive, given the tendency of continued presence of NRSP (through different projects, for social sector such as health and education or economic development) and its linkages with and support to three-tier structure, as well as the GLLSP II's plan to cover them into cooperatives.</p>	4

²¹ As a result of receiving the asset, the majority of surveyed beneficiaries (91 per cent) reported having reduced reliance on others, while 98 per cent also reported improved food security due to the increased availability of food. This may be a positive indication but it is not clear 98 per cent of which and how many respondents i.e. whether 98 per cent of only those indicating positive results.

²² This intervention has been rolled over to the second phase of the project (GLLSP II).

PCR finding	Rating
27. In summary, the benefits of interventions dependent on community engagement and the benefits of rural infrastructures are likely to be sustained. However, the trainings are not market-oriented and the rural institutions and asset transfer require continuous support. The PCRV rates this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> , in line with the PCR rating.	
B. Other performance criteria	
Innovation	
28. The PCR and the CSPE mission both highlighted some features introduced by GLLSP that were innovative in the context where the project operates. Innovative interventions included: (i) the use of solar energy for providing electricity which improved the availability of lighting at night in households; (ii) the reverse osmosis combined with a business plan for selling extra water and meeting its maintenance costs and contributing to improved quality of water and proximity to beneficiaries; and (iii) the integrated irrigation and drinking water scheme.	4
29. The PCR referred to the use of poverty scorecard for targeting as an innovation; however, the innovative feature of this approach is not clear given that it had been adopted by other donors prior to GLLSP. ²³	
30. While some innovations introduced by GLLSP were relevant to the context and to the target group's needs, not all the activities identified as 'innovations' were really innovative, as most of these features had already existed in other development projects in Pakistan. The PCRV rates this criterion <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> , in agreement with the PCR rating.	
Scaling up	
31. The PCR assessment of this criterion is solely based on the potential for GLLSP results to be scaled up. The PCR highlighted the prospects of replicating some interventions. ²⁴ This prospect notwithstanding, there is no actual evidence that GLLSP innovations have been taken up by the Government or by other actors, nor have pathways been identified for ensuring these approaches are scaled up, except for the reverse osmosis. The latter was replicated by the NRSP in other parts of the province.	3
32. The PCR also referred to the second phase of GLLSP as a scaling up. The PCR notes that replication of practices through further IFAD financing does not necessarily constitute scaling up, which should instead involve the leveraging of external resources and partners to deliver larger results, while the 2015 IFAD Operational Framework clearly states that "scaling up results does not mean transforming small IFAD projects into larger projects".	
33. The PCR and the CSPE mission both suggested that the project lacks analysis to disseminate the success of innovations in order to facilitate their scaling up.	
34. While, on the one hand, the PCRV recognises that GLLSP presents outcomes that have the potential to be scaled up, on the other hand, the PCRV notes the lack of actual scaling up having yet taken place. On balance, the PCRV rates scaling up as <i>moderately unsatisfactory (3)</i> , one point below the PCR rating.	
Gender equality and women's empowerment	
35. GLLSP fostered the participation of women through interventions tailored to their needs including: establishment of women COs, community investment funds, CPIs. Women represented 54 per cent of the project beneficiaries and 93 per cent of the Community Managed Financial Services' beneficiaries, while women COs accounted for 41 per cent of the total number of COs supported by the project.	4

²³ World Bank, PPAF III appraisal document. 2009.

²⁴ (i) Construction and operation and maintenance of the CPIs; and (ii) mobilization of women through COs and their participation in decision-making, based on GLLSP's approach.

PCR finding	Rating
<p>36. The establishment of women COs, actively promoted by GLLSP increased the voice and representation of women²⁵ It is likely that vocational trainings contributed to building the skills of women. It is also likely that it enabled them to engage in some income generating activities and to increase their income through selling of products or through savings generated by not having to purchase. The CSPE field mission confirmed these findings but noted that some opportunities to maximise the benefits were not explored, precisely the role of women in fisheries value chain and the linkages of training with market. CPIs including water supply schemes, reverse osmosis plant, solar panels and roads reduced women's drudgery, and improved their health and well-being.</p> <p>37. Women representation at the project management level indicated a gender gap. The PMU was only composed of male staff and a gender focal point was not appointed.</p> <p>38. In conclusion, GLLSP contributed to women's empowerment and reduced their drudgery. There were nevertheless missed opportunities to maximise the benefits. The PCRV rates this criterion <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>, in line with the PCR rating.</p>	
Environment and natural resources management	
<p>39. According to the Environmental and Social Review Note in the design report the project was not expected to have any significant negative environmental impact; its components did not require specific Environmental & Social Impact Assessment.</p> <p>40. The solar home system interventions utilized renewable energy resource and reduced the use of traditional energy sources including kerosene oil and wood and therefore reducing air pollution and the use of fossil fuels. The mandatory tree plantation drive with every CPI scheme was an environment-friendly step. Roads from landing sites to the main roads in Gwadar-Lasbela contributed to improved resilience of communities against natural disasters, enabling movement that were impossible earlier in times of flooding.</p> <p>41. Observations from the CSPE mission suggested the need for more environmental consideration for proper housing when distributing goats to prevent non-hygienic homesteads.</p> <p>42. The PCRV rates this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> in line with the PCR.</p>	4
Adaptation to Climate Change	
<p>43. The project recognized the challenges caused by climate change and included some interventions to strengthen the resilience of the target group.</p> <p>44. Rainwater harvesting in GLLSP was directly relevant to the effects of climate change (heatwave, drought, scarcity of water). CPIs such as water storage pond and check dams have strengthened the resilience to drought. Cross-drainage and side-drainage of structures were constructed so the road infrastructure could withstand adverse climate change events (e.g. flash floods).</p> <p>45. However, as noted by the CSPE, such co-benefits were not necessarily the result of an intentional climate risk-based design, which means that certain climate risks may have been overlooked. For example, the design considered the physical impacts of rising sea levels on the proposed infrastructure (floating jetties), but other impacts on the fishing industry as a whole do not appear to have been considered: climate change may affect fish availability due to extreme weather patterns and changing seasonality.</p> <p>46. The PCRV rates this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> in line with the PCR.</p>	4

²⁵ The impact evaluation conducted for GLLSP showed that 97 per cent of respondents perceived an improvement in women's participation in community issues while 67 per cent perceived an improvement in women's role in decision-making at the household level.

PCR finding	Rating
C. Overall Project Achievement	
<p>47. GLLSP was conceived to increase the incomes and enhance the livelihoods of the poor rural/fishers households in two coastal districts of Balochistan. The project was relevant to the needs of the target population and to the related policies of the Government and IFAD. The interventions responded to challenges faced by its target group. However, some interventions could have been better adapted to the specificity or the areas covered, while the capacities of the implementing partners was overestimated in some cases. Rural roads and CPIs are probably the most notable achievement of the project. There are positive indicators of the project's benefits sustainability, including the engagement of beneficiaries and their ownership of various interventions. On the other hand, the project implementation was hindered by a lack of leadership of the project steering committee, of timely approval of its annual work plan and budget and of an effective engagement of the fisheries department. This has consequently led the project to drop the fisheries development component.</p> <p>48. The PCRV rates the overall project achievement as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>, in line with the PCR.</p>	4
D. Performance of Partners	
IFAD	
<p>49. Supervision missions and the MTR were undertaken in a timely manner and provided regular support to the implementation process, although some adjustments were not implemented due to changes in the government priorities (i.e. construction of jetties). IFAD has demonstrated a proactive and flexible approach with regard to the reallocation of resources for jetty construction, and in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The country program officer and/or the country programme manager were present and leading all the missions. The PCR noted that more proactivity from IFAD could have resulted in a more effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and knowledge management.</p> <p>50. The PCRV rates the performance of IFAD as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i>, in line with the PCR.</p>	4
Government	
<p>51. The performance of the communication and works department and the quality of their construction work were assessed by the PCR as satisfactory. The clear role of this department for ensuring the operation and maintenance of roads and landing sites was also noted as a strong indicator of sustainability for these investments.</p> <p>52. However, the implementation of the project was affected by several factors related to the performance of the government including: (a) the lack of ownership and capacity of the fisheries department; and (b) the limited role of the project steering committee that remained instrumental in addressing issues of strategic nature, its lack of leadership and delays in resolving issues and approval of annual work plans and budgets.</p> <p>53. Although the CSPE mission found there was relatively limited involvement and collaboration with some government departments, in particular with the agriculture department to foster agricultural potential, it is recognised that this was also an issue of project design.</p> <p>54. The PMU witnessed frequent transfers and delays in hiring staff, which affected its performance. Performance improved following the arrival of a new director and the hiring of an M&E officer. Delays in the provision of counterpart funding led to some delays in procurement. The M&E system was established and functioning but did not generate analysis beyond the output level.</p> <p>55. The PCR recognised that delays in procurement and decision-making (particularly with regard to the project steering committee) affected the overall project performance. At the same time, it is acknowledged that project management</p>	4

PCR finding	Rating
improved noticeably post-MTR, and that the Government played a strong role in ensuring the quality and sustainability of GLLSP infrastructure investments. On balance, the PCR rates this criterion as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> , in line with the PCR rating.	

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

PCR finding	Rating
Scope	
56. All the chapters foreseen in the PCR guidelines and relevant annexes were adequately covered. The annex of the workshop findings rather focused on the upcoming second phase of the project instead of focusing on the PCR validation. The PCR rates the Scope of the PCR as <i>satisfactory (5)</i> .	5
Quality	
57. Given the measures imposed by the Government in relation to the COVID-19 epidemic, a final workshop to validate the PCR findings was not undertaken. This was compensated by several meetings that were held with different stakeholders, except for the beneficiaries. The discussions during these meetings, reported in the PCR, concentrated rather on the second phase of the project and less attention was given to validate the findings of the PCR.	4
58. The findings presented in the PCR were in general in line with the findings from the CSPE mission. Given the lack of data on outcomes and impact, the M&E system was supplemented by an impact assessment. The reliability of the impact assessment data cannot be guaranteed, given that the exercise lacked control groups and the data collected was not disaggregated by sex where relevant. The PCR rates the quality of the PCR as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> .	
Lessons	
59. The PCR included sound lessons that were drawn from the project design and from the project implementation based on concrete findings and are likely to be adhered to in phase 2. The PCR rates the lessons of the PCR as <i>satisfactory (5)</i> .	5
Candour	
60. The narrative of the PCR is objective, presenting both positive and negative results. Nevertheless, for some criteria, the ratings were not always in line with the narrative. The PCR rates the candour of the PCR as <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> .	4
Overall rating of the PCR	
61. The PCR followed the project completion guidelines, validated its findings through a stakeholder workshop and supplemented its M&E system with additional assessment. However, the validity of some data remains uncertain, while ratings do not always match the narrative text. The overall rating for the PCR is <i>moderately satisfactory (4)</i> .	4

V. Final remarks

Issues for IOE follow up (if any)
No issues have been identified for follow up by IOE.

Definition and rating of the evaluation criteria used by IOE

Criteria	Definition *	Mandatory	To be rated
Rural poverty impact	Impact is defined as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions.	X	Yes
	<i>Four impact domains</i>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household income and net assets: Household income provides a means of assessing the flow of economic benefits accruing to an individual or group, whereas assets relate to a stock of accumulated items of economic value. The analysis must include an assessment of trends in equality over time. 		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	X	Yes

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

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

Rating comparison^a

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

Performance of partners^d			
IFAD	4	4	0
Government	4	4	0
Average net disconnect			-2/12=0.17

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

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

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

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

Ratings of the project completion report quality

	<i>PMD rating</i>	<i>IOE PCRVR rating</i>	<i>Net disconnect</i>
Candour		4	
Lessons		5	
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)		4	
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

CO	Community organization
CPI	Community physical infrastructure
CSPE	Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation
EIRR	Economic internal rate of return
GLLSP	Gwadar-Lasbela Livelihoods Support Project
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MTR	Mid-term Review
NRSP	National Rural Support Programme
PCR	Project Completion Report
PCRV	Project Completion Report Validation
PMU	Programme Management Unit
VO	Village organization

Bibliography

- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). 2011. *Gwadar-Lasbela Livelihoods Support Project. Design Report*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2016. *Gwadar-Lasbela Livelihoods Support Project. Mid-Term Review*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2014-2019. *Gwadar-Lasbela Livelihoods Support Project. Supervision reports.*, Rome: IFAD.
- _____. 2020. *Gwadar-Lasbela Livelihoods Support Project. Project Completion Report*, Rome: IFAD.
- Cynosure Ltd. 2019. *Gwadar-Lasbela Livelihoods Support Project. Impact assessment*, Pakistan: Cynosure.