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• **IFAD in Burundi since 1979**: 3 COSOP, 14 projects, US$ 668.9 million;

• **First CSPE** carried out by IOE; **objectives**: (i) to assess the performance and results of the strategy and the programme and (ii) to draw recommendations for the future partnership between the Government of Burundi and IFAD.

• **CSPE scope**: 2009-2020; **10 projects** (US$ 566.7 million: 42% funded by IFAD, 43% by international co-financers, 15% by government and beneficiaries) and **8 grants** (US$ 9 million).

- Evaluation carried out in 2020, in the **difficult context of the pandemic**. A **mixed-methods approach** was applied, including a two-week field mission.
Main evaluation findings – Portfolio strengths

- **Objectives** were well aligned with country and IFAD strategies and the needs of rural poor population;

- Good **internal consistency** and **good adaptation** to the changing context;

- Contribution to the **development of 20% of the country marshlands** (rice productivity) and to the increase in **milk production and manure**;

- 65% of beneficiary households have **improved their income** by at least 30%, but lack of data on the most vulnerable households;

- Promising approaches in relation to **food security and nutrition** for the most vulnerable;

- Good results in terms of **women economic empowerment**, less in other areas of IFAD’s gender pillars.
Main Evaluation findings – Portfolio challenges

- Geographic and socioeconomic targeting showing limits in terms of inclusivity and to contribute to solve the high land pressure in the country;

- Systemic vision of investments in value chains lacking, links with other actors not sufficiently developed, rural finance results to be consolidated;

- Exceeding project implementation deadlines and management costs in relation to designs;

- Sustainability of results not totally assured;

- Insufficient consideration of critical ecosystems to ensure local resilience.
Main Evaluation findings – Non lending activities

STRENGTHS

- Contribution to the legislative and regulatory framework for local development and livestock;
- Solid and fruitful partnerships with ministries and deconcentrated & decentralized levels;
- Good cofinancing with other TFP (~40%); interesting partnerships with WFP and FAO.

CHALLENGES

- Some grants with too limited size and duration and lack of integration with programme;
- Knowledge management too focused on communication;
- Missed opportunities in terms of policy dialogue: land management, Agricultural and Rural Finance Regulation.
Conclusion – Performance of the country strategy

- In a fragile context, the program **achieved most of its objectives**, but baseline and monitoring **data were not disaggregated** enough;

- The strategy could have done more to address **challenges related to the scarcity of productive land**;

- The **integrated watershed approach** remains to be operationalized. Cumulative impacts and protection of buffer zones not fully considered.

- **Value chains investments** are still too concentrated upstream, links between actors not yet sufficiently developed, including access to credit.

- Some key results lack the necessary financial and technical resources to ensure their **sustainability** and regulatory frameworks are to be reinforced.
1. Complete the transition to the **program approach** and consolidate IFAD's **comparative advantage**;

2. Consolidate the **holistic approach of pro-poor value chains**;

3. Prioritize strategies and actions to **reduce land pressure** and facilitate **access to assets for the most vulnerable**;
4. Pursue and strengthen the **regulatory and financial provisions** to ensure the **sustainability** of achievements;

5. Reinforce actions to develop the **resilience of populations and infrastructures in relation to climate risks**;

6. Pursue and **scale up** interventions to improve the **food and nutritional security**.
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