



Burkina Faso

Country strategy and programme evaluation

Evaluation Committee, 104th Session
28 March 2019

Independent Office
of Evaluation



Investing in rural people

Introduction

- **CSPE Scope:**

- Period covered: 2007 - April 2018
- Portfolio; Non lending activities (Partnership, Knowledge management and Policy engagement); and Performance of partners (in country programme management).

- **IFAD in Burkina Faso**

- 14 projects since 1981; US\$548.4 (49% by IFAD)
- Two COSOPs (1998-2006 and 2007-2012)
- One Country Strategy Note 2017-2018
- Main strategic objectives addressing: a) Rural income, b) Food security and c) Natural resources management

Portfolio of projects



Portfolio: 8 projects (six completed, one on-going (midterm reviewed in June 2018) and one newly approved); 71% of IFAD's total financing (since 1981)

Country context

- **Political stability** over 2007-2018, only with a turbulent transition between 2014 and 2015
- Increasing security challenges since 2015
- Agricultural sector remains very important: **30% contribution to GDP; 86% of the active population.**
- National poverty index: 40%; with 90% of poor people living in rural areas
- Average of **12% of national budget allocated to agricultural sector**



Findings

Relevance

- **Objectives were aligned** with country policies and strategies, likewise IFAD objectives (COSOP)
- **Coherence** of project **implementation approaches**.
- However, **relatively high dispersion**: 11/13 regions covered.
- Targeting approach for **micro-enterprises promotion inadequate to include, poor to poorest groups**.
- Approach to support the operationalisation of the new rural land rights law not sufficiently anchored to the realities.

Effectiveness and Impact

- **Increased production and improved food security** through increased access to inputs, improved agricultural practices and rural infrastructures.
- **Rural employment opportunities created** through promotion of micro-enterprises, and increased income of beneficiaries;
- **Increased effectiveness of farmers' organisations**, through capacity building and empowerment actions;
- **Improved** land and water management **practices**;
- But poor results in terms of access to rural finance and security of land rights.

Efficiency, Sustainability and Gender

- Relatively **important delays to start projects**; and **high management costs**;
- **Effective disbursement** of counterpart funds, albeit with delays;
- Weak project exit strategies;
However, **beneficiaries' efforts to sustainably maintain equipment**.
- **Progress made for improving gender indicators**;
But persistent sociocultural barriers.

Environment and Climate change

- Continuous actions for better management of **soil fertility and available rainfall water for crop production**; But few on forests, pastures, and groundwater.
- Improved practices contributed **reducing the vulnerability of farmlands**;
- Considerations of climate change adaptation very recent in the portfolio actions;
- However, actions **contributed to improve adaptation capabilities**, even if the magnitude is low.

Partnership

- **Enhanced strategic partnership** with the Government through Ministries in charge of Finance and of Agriculture.
- **Co-financing was effective** with other partners, but a decreasing trend in the recent years.
- Technical partnership was weak, especially with RBAs;
- However, **effective interactions among partners**, including RBAs, ensured through regular consultative meetings.
- **Operational partnerships** were successful **for research - actions**; But mixed results with private providers.

Knowledge management and Policy engagement

- Knowledge management objectives poorly addressed;
- **Knowledge products developed and/or tested** (even in local languages), but not disseminated;
- Support to farmers' organizations enabled **to increase their strategic role**: increased participation in policy dialogues;
- IFAD's support was critical in **drafting the 2009 law on rural land tenure rules**;
- But missed opportunities to enhance pro-poor policies for smallholder farms and for promoting rural microenterprise.

Conclusion

- **Positive achievements:**
 - Relevance of approaches; Effectiveness and Impact;
 - Strategic partnerships: with Government and Farmers' organizations;
 - Operational partnerships with Research centres;
- **Areas for improvements:**
 - Sustainable and secure access to resources and services;
 - Actions related to environment management and adaptation to climate change;
 - Improved system of knowledge management system and capitalisation of lessons learned.

Recommendations

- **Recommendation 1.** To limit interventions regions and establish an effective and results oriented monitoring and evaluating system.
- **Recommendation 2.** To proceed with the value chain approach by targeting pro-poor commodities; and enabling inclusive and continuous access to productive resources, supports and services.
- **Recommendation 3.** To increase and expand actions for sustainable management of natural resources in synergy with other development partners.

Recommendations

- **Recommendation 4.** To improve IFAD engagement in policy dialogues in favour of rural poor, especially to enable sustainable and secure access to productive resources.
- **Recommendation 5.** To develop and implement an operational plan for knowledge management and systematic learning within the portfolio and also support the Government in this direction for the rural sector.

Thank you for your attention

