

Document:	<u>EB 2007/90/R.33</u>
Agenda:	<u>16</u>
Date:	<u>7 March 2007</u>
Distribution:	<u>Public</u>
Original:	<u>English</u>

**E**



## **Progress report on cooperation agreements with Member Governments: The IFAD/Belgian Survival Fund Joint Programme**

Executive Board — Ninetieth session  
Rome, 17-18 April 2007

---

For: **Information**

## **Note to Executive Board Directors**

This document is submitted for the information of the Executive Board.

To make the best use of time available at Executive Board sessions, Directors are invited to contact the following focal point with any technical questions about this document before the session:

**François Lemmens**

Programme Manager, BSF  
telephone: +39 06 5459 2072  
e-mail: [f.lemmens@ifad.org](mailto:f.lemmens@ifad.org)

Queries regarding the dispatch of documentation for this session should be addressed to:

**Deirdre McGrenra**

Governing Bodies Officer  
telephone: +39 06 5459 2374  
e-mail: [d.mcgrenra@ifad.org](mailto:d.mcgrenra@ifad.org)

## Contents

<b>Abbreviations and acronyms</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>I. Background</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Institutional framework</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III. Joint Programme Strategic Framework 2001-2011</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IV. Characteristics of the IFAD/BSF partnership</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>V. Joint Programme achievements</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>VI. Evaluation as part of the Joint Programme strategy</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>VII. Operational research: Innovative approaches for project design, planning and evaluation</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>VIII. Knowledge development and management</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>IX. Joint Programme partners</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>X. Future challenges</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Attachments</b>	
I. Joint Programme portfolio as at December 2006	9
II. Evaluations of BSF projects	11
III. Grants approved during the three phases of the Joint Programme	12

## **Abbreviations and acronyms**

BSF	Belgian Survival Fund
CPPE	comprehensive participatory planning and evaluation
DGDC	Directorate-General for Development Cooperation
ITM	Institute of Tropical Medicine
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
RIMS	Results and Impact Management System
UWESO	Uganda Women's Effort to Save Orphans

## **Progress report on cooperation agreements with Member Governments: The IFAD/Belgian Survival Fund Joint Programme**

### **I. Background**

1. The Belgian Survival Fund (BSF) was established in October 1983 in response to growing public concern in Belgium over the magnitude of drought-related deaths in Ethiopia and sub-Saharan Africa. Its mandate was to cofinance programmes and projects aimed at combating hunger, malnutrition and underdevelopment in the world's most vulnerable countries, for which it received an initial endowment of approximately US\$280 million. Although it was recognized that Asia contained the greatest number of poor people, mortality rates were highest in Africa, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. Consequently, it was decided to limit BSF interventions to that region.
2. Given this mandate, a major role was envisaged for the specialized agencies of the United Nations, whose experience and knowledge were deemed indispensable. IFAD was the first multilateral institution to respond positively to the challenge through a major allocation of its resources, particularly human resources. On 10 May 1984, the IFAD/Belgian Survival Fund Joint Programme (the Joint Programme) was established as the main channel for BSF development assistance. The rationale behind this partnership was that sustainable economic development could only be achieved by focusing on improving the social conditions of prospective beneficiaries of development projects.
3. Other BSF partners – in particular the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Capital Development Fund, the United Nations Children's Fund, Belgian NGOs and the Belgian Technical Cooperation – followed IFAD's example, contributing, in their respective roles, to a common goal: helping poor people in rural areas to overcome poverty.
4. In 1995, a supplementary agreement was signed for the second phase of the Joint Programme. An approach was agreed linking IFAD's agricultural and rural development loans with BSF's social development grants in order to strengthen the incremental income benefits from increased agricultural production and subsequently translate these into enhanced household food security and nutritional well-being. This coupling arrangement implied joint programme design, closer linkages with the IFAD lending programme and the application of IFAD's rules and regulations.
5. In 1999, a new act was ratified by the Belgian Parliament redefining the Belgian Survival Fund's mandate. While the overall focus of the BSF remained the same, two new dimensions were added: (i) a strengthened capacity for programme supervision, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and nutrition; and (ii) poverty reduction in peri-urban areas. At this time, Parliament allocated an additional US\$250 million to the BSF, which was to be disbursed in yearly tranches. This second allocation is expected to be fully attributed to different projects by the end of 2008.
6. The long-standing partnership between IFAD and Belgium was further strengthened in February 2004 with the signing of a memorandum of understanding detailing the procedures of a new government policy on the Joint Programme. In order to bring its contribution closer to project disbursement, Belgium would replenish the IFAD/BSF account according to the disbursement needs of all ongoing joint projects and programmes for each calendar year.
7. In 2005, the twentieth anniversary of the IFAD/BSF Joint Programme was marked at the twenty-eighth session of IFAD's Governing Council. The Ugandan President Mr Yoweri Museveni and the Belgian Prime Minister Mr Guy Verhofstadt highlighted the achievements of the partnership at that session.

8. An independent external mid-term evaluation of the overall BSF was commissioned in 2006 by the Evaluation Unit of the Directorate-General for Development Cooperation (DGDC). It will focus on learning from partners, the added value provided by BSF and BSF's foundations and mechanisms. This evaluation is expected to form the basis for decisions concerning a new replenishment of the BSF.

## **II. Institutional framework**

9. As an integral part of the DGDC, the BSF reports directly to the Belgian Federal Minister for Development Cooperation. Within the context of its official strategic framework, BSF partners submit programmes and projects for approval by the Minister or Secretary-General for Development Cooperation. Decisions are based on technical recommendations made by a committee of DGDC technical advisers.
10. The advisory body of the BSF is the BSF Working Group, comprising parliamentarians and representatives of international partner organizations, federations of NGOs, Belgian Technical Cooperation and DGDC. The working group recommends strategic approaches to be adopted by BSF on the basis of programme and project evaluations, for which at least 1 per cent of the annual budget is earmarked. Periodic consultations provide a forum for the review of evaluation reports, and regular field visits to BSF projects are organized.
11. The overall BSF strategy paper emphasizes the multisectoral approach of BSF-funded projects and programmes. The BSF does not provide food aid or direct aid but finances long-term programmes to tackle the root causes of food insecurity and malnutrition. The programmes aim at rural development through the promotion of food security and the provision of social services for health, nutrition and education.
12. The Programme Support Unit of the Joint Programme is housed in the External Affairs Department (EAD) of IFAD. The Programme Manager reports to the President of IFAD through the Assistant President, EAD.
13. The Joint Programme Steering Committee – which meets annually and is composed of representatives from the Belgian Government, the participating agencies and IFAD – is considered to be the partnership's governing body. It provides general policy guidance and approves the Joint Programme annual programme of work and budget.

## **III. Joint Programme Strategic Framework 2001-2011**

14. The main features of the Joint Programme strategic framework for the third phase (2001-2011) are the following:
  - improvement of the household food security and nutritional status of the target group as an entry point for an integrated approach to sustainable livelihoods, drawing on synergies among various components;
  - a comprehensive, integrated, participatory and multisectoral approach to strengthen household food security and nutritional status;
  - the coupling of grant-financed BSF projects or components with IFAD-financed agricultural and rural development projects;
  - attention to local governance and strengthening the capacity of civil society;
  - a process approach with built-in flexibility and continuity;
  - improvement of M&E through inclusion of such elements as nutritional surveillance, project impact assessment, cost-effectiveness, sustainability and the replicability of project activities; and
  - the joint programme with the International Land Coalition and specialized institutions, such as the Institute of Tropical Medicine in Antwerp.

### **Geographical spread**

15. On the basis of specific socioeconomic indicators, 15 countries are considered eligible for BSF cofinancing during the period covered: Angola, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, the Niger, Rwanda, Somalia, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania.

### **Targeting**

16. Within the selected countries, Joint Programme projects specifically target the poorest subregions. The target group is generally defined through a demand-driven, participatory approach based on a thorough situation analysis. BSF components may extend to more economically and socially marginalized beneficiaries within the same communities or to countries not (yet) eligible for IFAD loans. BSF experience in targeting consists mainly of: (i) geographical targeting, which is largely, but not exclusively, carried out in the design phase; (ii) self-targeting, ensuring that the activities selected are of concern to highly food-insecure and marginalized rural people; and (iii) gender targeting, which focuses on women household heads or woman-headed households as a group with special needs instead of targeting individual rural women within their households.

## **IV. Characteristics of the IFAD/BSF partnership**

17. The exchange of inputs from BSF to IFAD, and vice versa, is exceptionally high and goes beyond simple cofinancing. In fact, this synergistic partnership of mutual interests has had a greater impact than it would have had if BSF and IFAD projects had been implemented individually. This has contributed to the high success rates of joint initiatives aimed at reducing the poverty and vulnerability of the poorest and makes the Joint Programme a unique example of partnership with a clear strategic rationale, as noted by the Independent External Evaluation of IFAD.

### **Relevance**

18. The partnership with the BSF is of high relevance to IFAD because of its contribution to achieving the Fund's strategic objectives. IFAD's strength lies in enabling the rural poor to overcome poverty – as perceived by the poor themselves – by fostering economic and social development, gender equity, income-generation, improved nutritional status, environmental sustainability and good governance. Although improving household food security is one of IFAD's key strategic thrusts, the availability of BSF grant funding for specifically targeted local-level activities and the distinct mandate of the Joint Programme have ensured that nutritional well-being is an explicit objective of IFAD/BSF projects.

### **Impact**

19. As a bilateral partnership, the Joint Programme has shown itself to be particularly successful in reducing the poverty and vulnerability of the poorest. It has made a significant contribution to participatory and holistic approaches focusing on communities' basic socioeconomic needs (water, sanitation, health, nutrition and education), income-generating activities and local capacity-building. Through its targeting mechanisms, it focuses attention on the poorest community members.
20. All evaluations show that this partnership, through the synergy between social and economic development (coupling IFAD loans with BSF grants), is contributing significantly to the household food security and nutritional well-being of the poorest. Improvements in services promoting human-resource development, provided as part of BSF grants, are likely to translate the income increases emanating from agricultural loan projects into improved food and nutritional security (e.g. the Zone Lacustre Development Project – Phase II in Mali, with its focus on intensifying both agriculture production and improving the target population's health and nutritional status).
21. Furthermore, IFAD's role in poverty reduction has been enhanced in BSF target countries through BSF funding of IFAD-initiated projects in those countries not yet

eligible for IFAD loan financing because of specific country situations or administrative bottlenecks. In the cases of countries in conflict or in post-conflict situations, IFAD-initiated projects have been entirely funded by BSF resources when, for instance, specific country environments have prevented IFAD from participating (e.g. in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Somalia). These stand-alone grants offer a more flexible way to fund activities and often lay the groundwork for an eventual IFAD portfolio in the country by creating local ownership and adopting community-driven approaches. Reliance on such approaches has provided the Joint Programme with useful lessons, which were also shared with partners.

### **Interaction**

22. The partnership offers a platform for continuous interaction among the various partners through: (i) the regular involvement of the Programme Support Unit of the Joint Programme in project formulation, appraisal, supervision and evaluation processes; (ii) regular annual Joint Programme Steering Committee meetings; (iii) the regular involvement of Belgian Embassy attachés in project design, supervision and evaluation; (iv) the visits of Belgian parliamentarians to IFAD/BSF projects (Mali, the Niger, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania ); and (v) the participation of BSF in IFAD seminars.

### **Knowledge diffusion**

23. The partnership is a mutual learning process enriched by the continuous advocacy and catalytic role of the BSF. For example, the design of the IFAD-funded Southern Nyanza Community Development Project in Kenya built upon the BSF-supported Farmers' Groups and Community Support Project, capturing the benefits of considerable capacity-building efforts. Health, water and sanitation now form one of the components of the Southern Nyanza project, mainly funded by IFAD loan resources.
24. The Support Programme for Kenya Women's Finance Trust and the Uganda Women's Effort to Save Orphans (UWESO) Development Programme were two early experiences demonstrating not only that poor people need ways to save the money they earn and to borrow funds to start businesses, but also that providing such basic financial services can be highly effective. These and other IFAD experiences yielded important lessons about the benefits of microfinance and also contributed to a greater understanding of issues and policies relating to orphans.
25. The BSF emphasis on M&E contributes to IFAD's Results and Impact Management System (RIMS). BSF also attaches considerable importance to the comprehensive participatory planning and evaluation (CPPE) approach, in which planning and evaluation are viewed as a continuum and form a fully integrated, flexible process. This approach was specifically designed to help overcome difficulties in planning and evaluation.

## **V. Joint Programme achievements**

26. Since 1983, BSF has financed or cofinanced over 40 IFAD projects in sub-Saharan Africa. The objectives of these projects have ranged from addressing post-conflict reconstruction needs to fostering social development within an integrated development approach (see attachment III).
27. By end-2006, Belgium's total contributions, through the Joint Programme, amounted to about US\$152.8 million, with a further US\$31.3 million receivable. These amounts, together with the incremental investment income, have enabled IFAD to:
- provide approximately US\$178.4 million in 52 grants financing 40 projects and programmes in countries targeted by BSF;
  - provide grant financing for project and programme evaluations;
  - cover the special grants and special operations facility; and



- provide for administrative costs (including for the Programme Support Unit, project design, supervision and implementation follow-up).
28. The first phase of the Joint Programme (1983-1995) was devoted to financing stand-alone agricultural projects with strong health and water supply components. These projects largely complemented ongoing IFAD-financed agricultural and rural development projects in a number of key countries. The Joint Programme responded to the food insecurity of the sub-Saharan region by giving emphasis to the multisectoral and locally sustained development of food production and basic social services. During that phase, 17 grants were approved for a total of about US\$72 million and served to establish Joint Programme projects in Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Namibia, Somalia, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania.
  29. The second phase (1996-2000) was characterized by a focus on two key aspects: (i) prevention of conflicts in post-conflict conditions and in an extended target area (beyond the Greater Horn of Africa to Africa's Great Lakes region, and the central Sahel countries); and (ii) financing of new and additional components within IFAD projects aimed at ensuring household food security and nutritional well-being. Twenty grants were approved during this phase, totalling about US\$52 million.
  30. Following the publication of the second BSF act, Belgium approved a new strategic framework for the third phase (2001-2011) of the IFAD/BSF partnership. At the start of the phase, activities focused on the issue of evaluations, knowledge management, increased dialogue with the Belgian Government and more effective project implementation support. Project supervision and M&E processes were also emphasized to ensure that the lessons learned from previous BSF-funded operations were fully taken into account in the design of new projects.
  31. By the end of 2006, 15 grants had been approved since the start of the third phase, for a total of about US\$60.3 million. At that time, the Joint Programme portfolio consisted of 13 ongoing programmes, two projects approved but not yet effective, and five projects in the pipeline (see attachment I).

## **VI. Evaluation as part of the Joint Programme strategy**

32. In the 1999 BSF act, article 11 states explicitly that the BSF will allocate not less than 1 per cent of its annual budget for project and programme evaluation purposes. In this context, the new Joint Programme strategy placed special emphasis on evaluation, recognizing it as an important tool in refining operational strategies so as to strengthen project impact. Over the past ten years, two or more Joint Programme projects have been evaluated each year (see attachment II).

### **Lessons learned through the regular evaluations**

33. The regular evaluations have yielded the following lessons:
  - (a) More emphasis is needed on nutrition. Reducing malnutrition is central to reducing poverty. The adoption of nutrition indicators (stunting and wasting) in the context of IFAD's RIMS represents a significant shift in IFAD's approach to malnutrition. Because of weak definitions of nutrition activities during project formulation and low project staff capacities to undertake appropriate nutrition programmes, nutrition is generally accorded a low profile. Furthermore, a global view of the causes of malnutrition and food insecurity seems to be lacking.
  - (b) Post-conflict situations require careful and appropriate project design, implementation follow-up and support. The flexible BSF grant instrument – with priority on increasing people's access to basic minimum needs (water, health care, food and employment) along with capacity-building and empowerment – indirectly creates the basic conditions for preventing conflicts (Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Somalia). Community development funds seem to be an ideal vehicle for

empowerment and vulnerability reduction, through income-generating activities that are managed by the local communities themselves and are likely to remove their immediate resource constraints. Furthermore, under these circumstances, project design should take into account higher operational costs due to security requirements and the absence of local institutions.

- (c) Pro-poor measures need to be specifically designed and targeted. The challenge is to target rural households that are most vulnerable to food insecurity in order to have a greater impact on poverty reduction. Poor and vulnerable members of rural communities can be reached through specifically designed and targeted pro-poor measures without necessarily relying on the trickle down effect of initiatives benefiting the community as a whole.
- (d) Rural women need to be more involved in project implementation. When appropriately empowered, women have proved both able and willing to participate in village committees concerned with social development, and can, in fact, be a driving force for project effectiveness in terms of poverty reduction. One example is the UWESO savings and credit scheme, managed by women and used to empower foster families.
- (e) Functional M&E mechanisms are essential. Two elements typically constrain attempts to quantify project impact on rural poverty: the lack of structured monitoring of project operations in relation to expected outputs; and the failure to undertake detailed baseline surveys and subsequent assessments to measure the impact of interventions. Effective implementation of the RIMS and systematic use of the CPPE are likely to improve this situation. The CPPE has been applied by IFAD in the planning of seven projects cofinanced by the Joint Programme (in Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Uganda) and is systematically applied throughout the project cycle.
- (f) The low level of implementation and disbursement rates needs to be addressed proactively. Experience shows how crucial it is to carry out an in-depth analysis of disbursement concerns (including country environment, local capacities, conditions for effectiveness). Different options need to be explored and systems designed to improve performance. Proactive, realistic and corrective measures should be taken by both the donor and the respective Government(s) to address the issue of low disbursement levels.

## **VII. Operational research: innovative approaches for project design, planning and evaluation**

- 34. The Belgian Government considers the BSF as a learning laboratory for development cooperation. Over the past years, it has been recognized that there was a real need for an operational research avenue in the Joint Programme portfolio. The two following examples illustrate the innovative dimension of the partnership. Both highlight the importance of measuring nutritional change in a way that permits the observed outcomes to be convincingly attributed to Joint Programme project activities.
- 35. The first example concerns the Southern Region Cooperatives Development and Credit Project in Ethiopia. A comprehensive baseline survey organized in 1998 by the Institute of Tropical Medicine (ITM) on behalf of BSF to analyse the actual situation with regard to water supply, sanitation, health and nutrition before the start-up of the project's BSF-funded component. This innovative approach made it possible to use nutritional assessments and activities to improve intersectoral coordination with a view to assuring greater household food security and nutritional well-being among target group members. The BSF-funded water supply, health and basic sanitation component (added to the project in 1997) was completed in December 2005 and, in

that same year, a survey was carried out under the coordination of ITM to assess its impact.

36. The entire impact assessment was based on supply, need and demand using the CPPE approach as a guide. It formed the basis for the provision of training, learning and capacity-building (with indicators provided by the local partners). In the preparation of the questionnaires, special attention was paid to alignment with IFAD's RIMS and with national policy, as well as to the replicability of the method and the reflection of local needs. Different surveys showed positive trends in several indicators used for measuring the impact on nutrition and health. However, it appeared that more work was needed to really "measure" IFAD/BSF synergies; at the same time, the limitations of the impact assessment were highlighted.
37. This learning exercise revealed that impact assessments were affordable, quite simple and efficient in generating information when local structures were used. A participatory approach, moreover, enhanced the relevance of indicators, built capacity, empowered project and local government staff, and formed the foundation for M&E systems. However, limitations inherent to such an impact assessment exercise were also apparent.
38. The second example is drawn from the Transitional Programme of Post-Conflict Reconstruction in Burundi. Based on the expertise acquired by BSF and ITM, a similar exercise has been used in this programme for the formulation of its BSF component, "support to the most vulnerable groups". This component has been formulated in an innovative way, using the results of a comprehensive survey conducted by local institutions under the guidance of ITM. BSF support is also focusing on the establishment of a functional M&E system.

### **VIII. Knowledge development and management**

39. Among the main objectives of the Joint Programme are knowledge development and dissemination, which are considered fundamental for increasing the impact of rural poverty reduction activities. Given its years of experience in implementing programmes in the rural water, sanitation, health and nutrition sectors, BSF is in a particularly good position to share relevant knowledge in these areas.
40. Preparatory work has been completed on a thematic water and health review (financed jointly by BSF and Swiss supplementary funds). Its primary objective will be to identify the key findings and lessons from Joint Programme development initiatives, in particular with regard to water, sanitation, health and nutrition programmes, and make recommendations on the overall strategic orientation of future programmes. The review will also further understanding of the reciprocal interdependence of IFAD's economic development programmes and BSF-funded social programmes.

### **IX. Joint Programme partners International Land Coalition**

41. The International Land Coalition uses projects as a means to exchange knowledge, strengthen networks of civil society organizations and test innovations that can widen understanding of the ways in which the rural poor can obtain secure access to land and related support services. Given the crucial importance of people's access to land for household food security, the Joint Programme decided to finance the Coalition's Programme for the Collaborative Action on Land Issues in the Niger and Uganda. The objectives of this programme, launched in 2005, include: (i) identifying practical ways to incorporate land issues into existing and planned pro-poor rural development programmes; (ii) improving policy formulation and design for future land-related interventions based on community realities, and bringing land issues into the mainstream of rural development programmes; and (iii) improving collaboration among key stakeholders, in particular government, civil society, donors and intergovernmental organizations.

### **Institute of Tropical Medicine**

42. ITM provides advisory services to IFAD/BSF projects and programmes. These include contributing to the design, planning and evaluation of projects; providing input to and revising project documents on nutrition, health, water and sanitation concerns; and addressing specific queries raised. It also assists in preparing training manuals (one example being the CPPE manual).

## **X. Future challenges**

### **Consolidation of efforts to make nutrition more central to development**

43. BSF will further assess how best to exploit the synergetic effects of its partnerships to promote the better health and nutrition status of mothers and children in BSF target countries. This is a complex activity requiring a holistic and comprehensive approach that combines various activities: (i) an initial analysis of nutritional problems (e.g. lack of food, unsafe water, hygiene and sanitation practices); (ii) community participatory approaches to identify activities likely to improve, among other aspects, maternal and child health care services and vitamin/mineral supplementation; (iii) promotion of community-level income-generating activities (such as the production of low-cost fortified blended foods based on local ingredients, small livestock production, informal saving and credit schemes) to enhance women's financial, technical and managerial capacities; (iv) national capacity-building through staff training, technical guidance, analytical support and coordination among partners in the field of nutrition; and (v) advocacy and support for national nutrition policy development.

### **Use of tools for better monitoring and evaluation throughout the project cycle**

44. Appropriate methodological practices and tools, such as the CPPE and nutrition assessments (including nutrition action plans) are likely to improve current weaknesses in participatory approaches and should be used throughout the project cycle. They ensure the effective participation of rural people in project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; and help the Joint Programme strengthen its role as a "knowledge storehouse", leading to improved performance and greater project and programme impact.

### **Greater emphasis on local capacity-building**

45. Local capacity-building is essential for the identification, planning, management and maintenance of project interventions responding to poor and vulnerable groups' needs.

### **A strengthened knowledge management dimension and wider dissemination of successful innovations**

46. Both these activities are likely to facilitate the replication of the IFAD/BSF partnership model.

## Joint Programme portfolio as at December 2006

### IFAD/BSF projects with ongoing BSF component

<i>Country</i>	<i>Project/Programme</i>	<i>BSF grant amount ( euros)</i>	<i>BSF component</i>
Angola	Northern Region Foodcrops Development Project	2.15 million + 525 000	Community rehabilitation
Burkina Faso	South West Rural Development Project	1.98 million	Health and education
Chad	Food Security Project in the Northern Guéra Region Phase II	3.86 million	Socio-sanitary component
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Agricultural Revival Programme in Equateur Province	5.4 million	Rehabilitation of social services
Eritrea	Gash Barka Livestock and Agricultural Development Project	3.96 million	Community social services
Kenya	Central Kenya Dry Area Smallholder and Community Services Development Project	4.59 million	Public health care and water development
Kenya	Kenya Women's Finance Trust Development Programme 2002/3-2006/7	1.29 million	Support to the NGO in order to enable poor rural women to generate income
Mali	Northern Regions Investment and Rural Development Programme	4.93 million	Improved access to basic services
Mozambique	Sofala Bank Artisanal Fisheries Project	3.72 million	Strengthening the capacity of communities/Support to the Social Infrastructure Fund
Niger	Project for the Promotion of Local Initiatives for the Development in Aguié	3.78 million	Establishment of a local innovation and initiatives support fund/Strengthening of a local service – delivery capacity
Somalia	North-Western Integrated Community Development Programme	5.33 million + 320 024	Rural health and water services/Agricultural and rural development.
Uganda	District Development Support Programme	4.07 million + 1.87 million	Health, nutrition, water and sanitation
Niger/Uganda	Programme for the Collaborative Action on Land Issues <sup>a</sup>	425 000	

<sup>a</sup> Administered by the International Land Coalition.

**BSF grants approved but not yet effective<sup>a</sup>**

<i>Country</i>	<i>Project/Programme</i>	<i>BSF grant amount (euros)</i>	<i>BSF component</i>
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Agricultural Rehabilitation Programme in the Oriental Province	5.2 million	Access to basic social services
United Republic of Tanzania	Agricultural Sector Development Programme/Livestock	3.97 million	Health and water development (pilot project: link with a sector-wide approach project)

<sup>a</sup> The status indicated refers to BSF's internal procedures.

**BSF cofinancing in the pipeline**

(as of 31 December 2006) <sup>a</sup>

<i>Country</i>	<i>BSF-funded components</i>	<i>IFAD project/programme</i>
Burundi	Support to the most vulnerable groups	Transitional Programme of Post-Conflict Reconstruction
Mali	Access to basic social services	Integrated Programme for the Rural Development of Kidal
Niger	Access to basic social services	Agricultural and Rural Rehabilitation and Development Initiative Project
Uganda	Access to basic social services	District Livelihoods Support Programme
Somalia		Extension of the North-Western Integrated Community Development Programme will be decided in light of the findings and recommendations of its completion evaluation

<sup>a</sup> The status indicated refers to BSF's internal procedures.

## Evaluations of BSF projects

1. During the period 2000-2006, mid-term reviews were conducted for eight projects, exceeding the two project evaluations per year recommended by the Joint Programme Steering Committee. The evaluated programmes are the following:
  - Northern Region Food Crops Development Project (Angola)
  - UWESO Development Project (Uganda)
  - Northern Fishing community Development Programme (Angola)
  - Zone Lacustre Development Project – Phase II (Mali)
  - South West Rural Development Project (Burkina Faso)
  - North Western Integrated Community Development Programme (Somalia)
  - Sofala Bank Artisanal Fisheries Project (Mozambique)
  - Gash Barka Livestock; and Agricultural Development Project (Eritrea)
  
2. Interim and completion evaluations were undertaken for the following projects:
  - UWESO Development Project (Uganda)
  - Eastern Lowlands Wadi Development Project (Eritrea)
  - District Development Support Programme (Uganda)
  - Ouadis of Kanem Agricultural Development Project (Chad)
  - Northern Regions Livestock Development Project (Namibia)
  - Support Programme for Kenya Women's Finance Trust Phase II (Kenya)
  - Kagera Agricultural Environmental and Management Project (United Republic of Tanzania)
  - Support for Women's Groups Project in North Kivu (Democratic Republic of the Congo)
  - North Western Integrated Community Development Programme (Somalia)

## Grants approved during the three phases of the Joint Programme

Table 1  
Grants approved during the first phase of the Joint Programme,  
1983-1995<sup>a</sup>

Country	Project/Programme name	Grant No.	Grant agreement date	Effectiveness date	Closing date	Grant amount		Net of cancellation	
						Euros	United States dollars	Euros	United States dollars
Eritrea	Eastern Lowlands Wadi Development Project	013	30.01.95	01.03.95	30.06.06	2 974 722	3 922 617	2 974 722	3 922 617
	Eastern Lowlands Wadi Development Project (UNICEF)	014	17.04.95	17.04.95	30.06.01	1 115 521	1 470 982	968 237	1 276 766
Ethiopia	Rehabilitation Programme for Drought-Affected Areas	002	04.04.85	04.04.85	30.06.94	7 932 593	10 460 314	7 843 750	10 343 161
Kenya	Farmers' Group and Community Support Project	001	04.01.85	04.01.85	14.01.92	2 553 303	3 366 913	2 479 377	3 269 430
	Dry Area Smallholder and Community Services Development Project	006	29.05.91	18.10.91	30.06.02	2 726 829	3 595 733	2 722 607	3 590 166
	Farmers' Group and Community Support Project	007	29.05.91	18.10.91	31.12.99	5 081 817	6 701 138	4 822 229	6 358 832
	Kwale-Kilifi District Development Project (KWFT I)	SUP 002	07.09.93	07.09.93	30.06.97	182 078	240 097	168 818	222 612
Namibia	Northern Regions Livestock Development Project	SUP 005	24.11.94	24.02.95	30.09.04	1 588 998	2 095 332	1 588 998	2 095 332
Somalia	Mahadday Weyne Integrated Development Project	003	16.05.85	16.05.85	30.09.90	2 478 935	3 268 848	2 435 536	3 211 620
	Wanle Weyne Integrated Development Project	004	09.06.87	28.12.87	31.12.92	4 586 030	6 047 368	2 962 521	3 906 528
	Beyond Relief Programme	008	15.12.93	15.12.93	30.06.01	3 569 667	4 707 141	3 569 363	4 706 741
Uganda	Hoima District Integrated Community Development Project	005	20.09.90	11.10.91	31.12.98	8 180 486	10 787 198	8 180 486	10 787 198
	UWESO Development Project	009	17.06.94	06.02.95	30.06.99	1 239 468	1 634 424	1 239 468	1 634 424
	UWESO Development Project	SUP 003	23.06.94	23.06.94	31.12.94	19 869	26 200	19 869	26 200
United Republic of Tanzania	UWESO Development Project	SUP 010	12.11.99	12.11.99	31.12.00	470 998	621 082	-	-
	Rehabilitation of Refugee Affected Areas in Kagera Region	010	13.09.94	13.09.94	31.12.95	2 543 770	3 354 342	1 189 703	1 568 802
	Water Supply and Health Project in Marginal Areas	011	10.11.94	15.03.95	31.12.02	7 436 806	9 806 544	7 201 148	9 495 794
<b>Total</b>		<b>17</b>				<b>54 681 890</b>	<b>72 106 274</b>	<b>50 366 832</b>	<b>66 416 223</b>

<sup>a</sup> United States dollars columns for indicative purposes only, based on EUR/US\$ exchange rate at 0.7583513 as at 31 December 2006.



Table 2  
**Grants approved during the second phase of the Joint Programme,  
 1996-2000<sup>a</sup>**

Country	Project/Programme name	Grant No.	Grant agreement date	Effectiveness date	Closing date	Grant amount		Net of cancellation	
						Euros	United States dollars	Euros	United States dollars
Angola	Northern Region Food Cops Development Project	024	24.04.96	02.01.97	30.06.07	2 149 237	2 834 091	2 149 237	2 834 091
	Northern Fishing Communities Development Programme <sup>b</sup>	SUP 008A	05.06.98	15.02.99	30.06.05	888 454	1 000 000	888 454	1 000 000
Burkina Faso	South West Rural Development Project	025	22.01.97	12.01.98	31.03.07	1 975 711	2 605 271	1 975 711	2 605 271
Chad	Ouadis of Kanem Agricultural Development Project	027	22.10.97	04.12.97	31.12.03	2 094 700	2 762 176	2 094 700	2 762 176
	Food Security Project in the Northern Guéra Region Phase II	031	25.08.00	12.12.01	30.06.10	3 863 793	5 094 991	3 863 793	5 094 991
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Support for Women's Groups in North Kivu	SUP 009	25.01.99	06.07.99	30.06.03	4 734 766	6 243 499	4 734 766	6 243 499
Ethiopia	Southern Region Cooperatives Development and Credit Project	029	10.11.98	27.04.99	31.12.05	2 925 144	3 857 241	2 925 144	3 857 241
Kenya	Support Programme for Kenya Women's Finance Trust	SUP 006	25.05.97	26.05.97	30.09.02	580 071	764 911	578 502	762 842
Mali	Zone Lacustre Development Project Phase II	023	20.06.96	12.06.97	30.06.06	2 035 206	2 683 724	2 035 206	2 683 724
Rwanda	Central Services for Socio-Sanitation Programme	019	14.06.96	05.08.96	30.06.02	753 596	993 729	695 256	916 799
	Management Project for Rural Areas Buberukuka	020	14.06.96	06.09.96	30.06.02	364 404	480 521	339 205	447 293
	Rural Development of Byumba Phase II	021	14.06.96	05.08.96	31.12.01	651 960	859 707	441 945	582 771
	Rural Development Project of Gikongoro	022	14.06.96	05.08.96	30.06.01	1 083 295	1 428 487	643 028	847 929
Uganda	Masindi District Integrated Community Development Project	015	19.10.95	28.03.96	30.06.00	3 718 403	4 903 272	3 718 403	4 903 272
	District Development Support Programme	030	11.02.00	19.07.00	31.12.06	4 065 454	5 360 911	4 065 454	5 360 911
	UWESO Development Project	032	03.07.00	31.08.00	30.09.06	3 049 090	4 020 683	3 049 090	4 020 683
United Republic of Tanzania	Mara Region Farmers Initiative Project	017	19.01.96	25.06.96	30.06.03	1 628 660	2 147 633	1 510 944	1 992 406
	Rehabilitation of Refugee Affected Areas in Kagera Region	018	01.03.96	01.03.96	31.03.97	892 417	1 176 786	892 417	1 176 786
	Kagera Agricultural and Environmental Management Project	026	20.02.97	10.09.97	31.12.04	1 942 246	2 561 143	1 938 887	2 556 713
	Kagera Agricultural and Environmental Management Project	028	-	13.07.98	31.07.99	139 886	184 461	139 886	184 461
<b>Total</b>		<b>20</b>				<b>39 536 493</b>	<b>51 963 237</b>	<b>36 704 317</b>	<b>50 833 859</b>

<sup>a</sup> United States dollars columns for indicative purposes only, based on EUR/US\$ exchange rate at 0.7583513 as at 31 December 2006.

<sup>b</sup> Grant denominated in United States dollars. The approved amount is US\$1,000,000.

Table 3  
**Grants approved during the third phase of the Joint Programme,  
 2001-2006**

Country	Project/Programme name	Grant No.	Grant agreement date	Effectiveness date	Closing date	Grant amount		Net of cancellation	
						Euros	United States dollars	Euros	United States dollars
<b>Angola</b>	Northern Region Foodcrops Development Project	024 bridge				525 000	692 291	525 000	692 291
<b>Democratic Republic of the Congo</b>	Agricultural Revival Programme in Equateur Province	039	24.05.05	11.10.05	30.06.11	5 400 000	7 120 710	5 400 000	7 120 710
	Agricultural Revival Programme in Oriental Province	041	29.03.06	Expected 25.03.07	01.01.16	5 200 000	6 856 980	5 200 000	6 856 980
<b>Eritrea</b>	Gash Barka Livestock and Agricultural Development Project	037	17.07.02	24.02.03	30.09.09	3 962 000	5 224 491	3 962 000	5 224 491
<b>Kenya</b>	Central Kenya Dry Area Smallholder and Community Services	033	27.02.01	01.07.01	31.03.09	4 586 030	6 047 368	4 586 030	6 047 368
	Support Programme for Kenya Women's Finance Trust	SUP 011	08.03.04	02.04.04	31.12.09	1 290 000	1 701 059	1 290 000	1 701 059
<b>Mali</b>	Northern Regions Investment and Rural Development Project	040	29.09.05	10.04.06	31.12.13	4 930 000	6 500 945	4 930 000	6 500 945
<b>Mozambique</b>	Sofala Bank Artisanal Fisheries Project	036	20.02.02	02.09.02	31.03.09	3 718 403	4 903 272	3 718 403	4 903 272
<b>Niger</b>	Aguié Local Initiative Promotion Project	038	15.09.03	05.05.05	31.12.13	3 775 000	4 977 904	3 775 000	4 977 904
<b>Somalia</b>	Northwestern Integrated Community Development Programme	035	17.01.03	03.02.03	30.09.07	5 333 730	7 033 323	5 333 730	7 033 323
	Northwestern Integrated Community Development Programme	035A	-	01.04.01	30.09.07	320 024	422 000	320 024	422 000
<b>Uganda</b>	District Development Support Programme	034	04.05.01	19.06.01	31.12.06	1 874 075	2 471 249	1 874 075	2 471 249
	UWESO Development Project	SUP 12	17.11.05	17.11.05	30.09.06	400 000	527 460	400 000	527 460
<b>United Republic of Tanzania</b>	ASDP-Livestock Support	042	08.05.06	Expected 30.01.07		3 970 000	5 235 041	3 970 000	5 235 041
<b>Niger/ Uganda</b>	International Land Coalition Pilot Programme	SUP 013	27.01.06	27.01.06	31.07.08	425 000	560 426	425 000	560 426
<b>Total</b>		<b>15</b>				<b>45 709 262</b>	<b>60 274 519</b>	<b>45 709 262</b>	<b>60 274 519</b>

