Guinea Bissau: IFAD Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation

Key findings and recommendations
• Evaluated period: 2008 – 2022; Three projects, one completed, one on-going (extended) and one newly approved. Total of US$ 95.75; IFAD: US$ 33.1 millions


• Mixed-methods approach applied.
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- **PRRDC**: Tot US$6.62; IFAD US$4.68
- **PADES**: Tot US$ 23.3; IFAD US$12.4
- **REDE**: Tot US$65.7; IFAD US$27.7

**COSOP 2003-2018**
**Note de Stratégie Pays**
**Nouveau COSOP 2022-2027**

• Evaluated period: 2008–2022; Three projects, one completed, one on-going (extended) and one newly approved. Total of US$ 95.75; IFAD: US$ 33.1 millions


• Mixed-methods approach applied.
Findings: Strengths

- Community development approach was pertinent to context;
- Choices of themes and regions convergent with other partners;
- Confirmed comparative advantage: family farming of rice crop.
- Good projects effectiveness timeframe: 4.63 months (vs. 9.9) and moderate unit cost of community-based investments;
- Simplicity of infrastructure constructed.
- Access to villages thanks to rural tracks constructed: ~ 150km
- Expansion of wetland rice production by ~10,000Ha;
Findings: Strengths

- Increased vegetables production in wetland gardens (~30Ha)
- Grassroots’ organizations created to manage investments;
- Indications of improved rice production, food security and human and social capital, but lack of robust evidence.
- Support for income diversification: 10,916 beneficiaries (52% women).
- Women participation objective achieved: 57% (30% target);
- Gardening activities contributed to improving women income and financial capacity.
- Functional literacy capacity building useful for women.
Findings: Strengths

- Relatively good ownership of investment by local organizations strengthened;
- Easiness of infrastructure maintenance for farmers;
- Rehabilitation of wetland areas conducive for a better management of natural resources;
- Distributed and used rice seeds well suitable to local conditions;
- Diversification of income sources enabled.
Findings: areas to improve

• Building of projects’ achievements was very low;
• Discontinuity in the program oversight by IFAD (5 managers in 14 years)
• Usage of outdated COSOP from 2010 to 2018.
• Institutional strengthening not embedded in project designs
• Weak harmonization and coordination of rural development interventions.
• Weak monitoring and evaluation system.
• Low level of co-financing.
• Insufficient support for post-production: processing, aggregation and marketing.
Findings: areas to improve

- Grassroots organizations still fragile, not fully structured;
- Consistent delays in launching of projects’ actions
- Procurement challenges and heavy management cost;
- Low quality of women participation;
- Weak support for marketing of women’ products;
- Lack of technology to easing garden work for women.
- No linkage of projects with government budget programs;
- Inefficient water management by farmers within the perimeters;
- Lack of protection actions for watersheds.
Conclusions

- Strategic choices of the program in line with the country fragile context;
- But did not include explicitly weak institutional challenges.
- Failure to update the COSOP contributed to overlooking the criticality of institutional challenges.
- Positive achievements on rice production through expansion of rice cropping in lowland areas (mangrove and non-mangrove related);
- Insufficient actions for value addition of the rice value-chain segments.
Recommendation 1

- Include in the new COSOP, strategic orientations on: (i) Natural resource management and adaptation to CC, (ii) knowledge management and engagement in agricultural policy dialogue; (iii) institutional capacity building.

Recommendation 2

- Together with other country partners, support the government for effective coordination of interventions in the agricultural sector. Need to improve the monitoring and evaluation systems, not only of projects supported by IFAD, but also of central and decentralized technical departments of the ministry.

Recommendation 3

- Further pursue support for the development of cropping systems in wetlands (mangroves and lowlands), by gradually deploying a value chain approach, with actions at various segments.
Recommendation 4

• Increase sustainably support in strengthening community-based and farmers organizations, for their formalization and structuring, from the bottom to the top, in order to enabling them to perform their functions efficiently and effectively.

Recommendation 5

• Pursue supports aiming at reducing gender inequalities, in particular by promoting of economic opportunities for women, functional literacy for them, strengthening their management and leadership skills, as well as enabling access of women to secure and profitable markets.