

Country Name	<b>Project for Community Development for Improvement of Livelihood in the Conflict-Affected Areas in the Gitega Province</b>
Republic of Burundi	

## I. Project Outline

Background	<p>In Burundi, conflicts had been repeated since its independence in 1962. The Gitega province heavily suffered from such conflicts and had the largest number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in the country. Thus, camps for IDPs remained there, and socially vulnerable groups, such as widows, orphans and ex-combatants lived there. Their livelihood mainly relied on agriculture, but it was severe due to land devastation through conflicts and recent droughts and pests. In order to improve the situation, a communal plan for community development (PCDC) was formulated with a support from the German International Cooperation (GIZ). However, PCDC was just a project list on the basis of citizens' needs and was not properly implemented. This was because of the lack of budget and the inadequate capacity of government officials in charge. In addition, technical guidance on agriculture was not sufficiently provided to citizens from officials or extension workers dispatched by the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock.</p>														
Objectives of the Project	<p>The project aimed at preparing concrete action plans along with PCDC, carrying out pilot projects targeting certain communes, drawing knowledge and lessons learned from the pilot projects, developing manuals and capacity development programs for Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock to promote the improvement of livelihood in the Gitega province based on the knowledge and lessons, and proposing recommendations for the revision of PCDC in the selected communes in the Gitega province.</p> <p>1. Expected Goals through the proposed plan<sup>1</sup>: 1) The agricultural productivity and production in irrigation areas of the Gitega province increase, 2) The livelihood of farmers in the target communes in the Gitega province is improved.</p>														
Activities of the Project	<p>1. Project Site: Makebukoko commune, Itaba commune, Bukirasazi commune, and Buraza commune in the Gitega province</p> <p>2. Main Activities: 1) Survey on current situations of target communes, 2) Analysis of challenges to promote PCDC and consideration of their measures, 3) Implementation, monitoring and evaluation of pilot projects, 4) Development of actions plans and manuals for PCDC based on the results of the pilot projects, etc.</p> <p>3. Inputs (to carry out above activities)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Japanese Side</td> <td>Burundian Side</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1) Mission members: 12 persons</td> <td>1. Staff allocated: 11 persons</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Trainees received: 10 persons</td> <td>2. Land and facility: Project office in the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock, public land and farmers properties</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) Training in the Third Country: 9 persons (Sierra Leone)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4) Equipment: Milling machines, mixer of sweet potato, processing machine for banana wine, shelves of the tile making, carpentry machines, ceramic machine, etc.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5) Local expenses: Cost for project activities</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			Japanese Side	Burundian Side	1) Mission members: 12 persons	1. Staff allocated: 11 persons	2) Trainees received: 10 persons	2. Land and facility: Project office in the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock, public land and farmers properties	3) Training in the Third Country: 9 persons (Sierra Leone)		4) Equipment: Milling machines, mixer of sweet potato, processing machine for banana wine, shelves of the tile making, carpentry machines, ceramic machine, etc.		5) Local expenses: Cost for project activities	
Japanese Side	Burundian Side														
1) Mission members: 12 persons	1. Staff allocated: 11 persons														
2) Trainees received: 10 persons	2. Land and facility: Project office in the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock, public land and farmers properties														
3) Training in the Third Country: 9 persons (Sierra Leone)															
4) Equipment: Milling machines, mixer of sweet potato, processing machine for banana wine, shelves of the tile making, carpentry machines, ceramic machine, etc.															
5) Local expenses: Cost for project activities															
Project Period	March 2012 – March 2014	Project Cost	(ex-ante) 680 million yen, (actual) 825 million yen												
Implementing Agency	Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock (Direction Provinciale pour Agriculture et Elevage: DPAE), Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (Ministere de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage: MINAGRIE)														
Cooperation Agency in Japan	NTC International Co., Ltd. KENSETSU GIJUSTU CENTER, LTD.														

## II. Result of the Evaluation

### <Constraints on Evaluation>

- The field survey for the ex-post evaluation could not be carried out at a satisfactory level due to the following reasons: 1) all the main staff of the implementing agencies left due to the 2015 political crisis, and no one knows the situation at the time of project implementation, 2) the presidential election in May 2020 kept the implementing agencies busy, and they could not spend the sufficient amount of their time on the ex-post evaluation, 3) the Ministry of Water, Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (the successive agency of MINAGRIE) moved to the Gitega in July 2020 along with the relocation of the capital from the Bujumbura to the Gitega, 4) the internet connection has not been set up satisfactory in Burundi, and 5) all surveys were remotely undertaken due to the global pandemic of COVID-19. Thus, the information and data related to the project could not be collected at a sufficient level for the ex-post evaluation.

### 1 Relevance

#### <Consistency with the Development Policy of Burundi at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation >

The project was consistent with Burundi's development policy of "Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper II" (2012-2015), which was being drafted at the time of ex-ante evaluation, positioning an agricultural sector as one of the most prioritized challenges and aiming at the strengthening of agricultural productivity through development of flatland and lowland.

#### <Consistency with the Development Needs of Burundi at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation >

The project was consistent with Burundi's development needs of the capacity building of government officials and the provision of the

<sup>1</sup> The degree of achievement of expected goals is not to be assessed in principle at the time of ex-post evaluation, since it is defined as the medium-to-long-term goals which will be attained as a result of crystallizing the proposed plan ("output" of the project).

technical guidance on agriculture from such officials to citizens in order to implement PCDC.

<Consistency with Japan's ODA Policy at the Time of Ex-Ante Evaluation>

The project was consistent with Japan's ODA policy for Burundi (2012)<sup>2</sup> raising "agricultural development support", such as improvement of agricultural productivity, support of community development and infrastructure development, as one of the two priority areas.

<Appropriateness of Project Design/Approach>

As described below, PCDC has not been disseminated across whole areas in the Gitega province. The main reason is that the political instability since 2015 after project completion has hindered the dissemination and promotion of PCDC. Even though the political and security instabilities in Burundi were pointed out even at the time of ex-ante evaluation, the project was decided to be implemented, expecting that it would contribute to the reduction in such instabilities. However, the political crisis since 2015 had been beyond the expectation, and if the event had not occurred, the staff of the implementing agencies trained by the project would have stayed at their agencies and disseminate and promote the Action Plans and the Manual for promotion of PCDC. In fact, as written later, the pilot projects implemented by the project have continued in the target communes. Therefore, the project design/approach is considered to be appropriate.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, the relevance of the project is high.

## 2 Effectiveness/Impact

<Status of Achievement for the Objectives at the time of Project Completion>

The objectives of the project were achieved by the time of project completion. The project collected and analyzed basic information such as population and existing infrastructure about all collines of Makebuko commune, Itaba commune, and Bukirasazi commune while reviewing existing PCDC to improve its contents (Output 1). Based on the results of the analysis and review, eight pilot projects<sup>3</sup> were planned and implemented in the three target communes. Moreover, as urgent pilot projects, irrigation facilities were constructed for the three target communes, and the provincial road 212, which was the most important access route to other communes, was rehabilitated for Bukirasazi commune and Buraza commune (Output 2). Furthermore, by conducting on-the-job-training (OJT) through the implementation of the pilot projects, trainings in Japan and Sierra Leone as well as cascade trainings from a provincial level to a colline level, the project improved the capacities of various stakeholders to plan, coordinate, supervise and execute PCDC (Output 3 and 4). Through these activities mentioned above, the Action Plans for the three target communes and the Manual for promotion of PCDC mainly in an agricultural sector were formulated. Several suggestions to improve PCDC, such as allocation of staff and budget, were pointed out in the final report through the analysis of PCDC (Output 5).

<Utilization Status of the Proposed Plan at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

The proposed plan has not been utilized at the time of ex-post evaluation. The pilot projects commenced by the project have still been implemented in the three target communes because the local staff trained by the project still know the details of the Action Plans and the Manual and has sustained the knowledge and skills necessary to plan, coordinate, supervise and execute PCDC (Indicator 1). On the other hand, such project effects have not been disseminated to other non-targeted communes for the following two reasons: 1) insecurity and displacement of the communes caused by the 2015 political crisis, which made it difficult to implement community development activities and 2) the government officials trained by the project left their positions due to the political crisis and their knowledge and experiences were not well-transferred to their successors (Indicator 1). As for integration of the recommendations proposed by the project into PCDC (Indicator 2), minimum conditions (allocation of staff and budget, societal and security situation of communities, etc.) to revise PCDC were not met due to the 2015 political crisis. The cascade training methodology established by the project has been continuously used in some fields including agriculture by Provincial Office of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (Bureau Provincial de l'Environnement, de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage: BPEAE)<sup>4</sup>, the Ministry of Water, Environment, Agriculture and Livestock, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to teach beneficiaries different agricultural techniques such as soil plowings, seeds supply, and sowing methods. The beneficiaries are commune agronomists, zone agronomists, colline monitors and farmers. According to commune agronomists, the reason for the continuous adoption of the cascade training methodology is that the methodology is useful to disseminate the project effects (Indicator 3).

The provincial road 212 rehabilitated by the project has been cleaned and maintained on a daily basis. However, according to an administrator of Bukirasazi commune, as they have not had sufficient funds to carry out large-scale maintenance, some parts of the road have been left unrehabilitated. Additionally, according to communities for the irrigation facilities constructed by the project, the facilities themselves have still existed but not been maintained well. For instance, many canals have been covered with earth and weeds. In the background, Burundi faces financial difficulties, especially after the 2015 political crisis, and sanctions by several donors so that national and local governments cannot secure a sufficient amount of budget for their activities, and associations in charge of operation of the facilities have not had enough technical supervision and suffered from lack of funds for the maintenance.

<Status of Achievement for Expected Goals through the Proposed Plan at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

The expected goals through the proposed plan have not been achieved at the time of ex-post evaluation. As mentioned above, because PCDC has been functional to some extent in the target three communes, the agricultural production of all four products (rice, banana, sweet potato, and maize) in the communes increased from 2015/16 after project completion to 2017/18 (Indicator 1). However, in terms of the livelihoods of farmers in the target communes of the Gitega province, data on the average income of the farmers showed a reduction from USD300 in 2015/16 to USD274 in 2016/17 and there were no available data for the period between 2018 and 2020. On the other hand, according to BPEAE, the average income of farmers in the target communes is generally high in comparison to the ones in the non-target communes because of increased rice production in marshland with different agricultural techniques introduced by the project (Indicator 2). However, the Gitega province has 8 other communes, and such communes have yet to introduce PCDC because social, political and security conditions to implement the activities have not been met since 2015 (Indicator 1). Nevertheless, achievements against the expected

<sup>2</sup> Ministry of Foreign Affairs "ODA Databook 2012"

<sup>3</sup> The types of the pilot projects were marsh development, environmental protection, soil fertility improvement, selected seed solidarity chain, livestock promotion, agricultural products processing promotion, marketing promotion and handicraft industry promotion.

<sup>4</sup> DPAAE was reformed to BPEAE in July 2018.

goals are unknown as data on neither agricultural productivity and production nor livelihood of farmers are not available.

<Other Impacts at the time of Ex-post Evaluation>

There were some positive impacts observed at the time of ex-post evaluation. Due to the introduction of PCDC, female farmers who had originally been engaged in the agricultural activities have become more emancipated by working with men and participated in marsh association structures elections and being represented in more leadership. Moreover, irrigation systems established by the project play another role as a drainage system during heavy rains and floods, and water do not stay on grounds for a long period of time, which results in reducing the consequences of floods. Growers collaborate more especially for seeds supply or intra-distribution from one farmer to another. Furthermore, skills to works with different stakeholders is improved. Promotion of women's participation and self-confidence as well as collaborative works among different stakeholders within communities are considered to be remarkable impacts from a perspective of peacebuilding especially in conflict affected areas like the Gitega province.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, the effectiveness/impact of the project is low.

Status of Achievement of Utilization Status of the Proposed Plan and Expected Goals through the Proposed Plan

Aim	Indicators	Results
(Status of Achievement of Outputs)	1. Collection and analysis of related information including existing PCDC and collines's profile.	Status of the Achievement: Achieved (Project Completion) • The project collected and analyzed basic information such as population and existing infrastructure about all collines of Makebuko commune, Itaba commune and Bukirasazi commune while reviewing existing PCDC to improve its contents.
	2. Pilot projects for the improvement of livelihood are implemented in the target communes. For Buraza commune, the poorest commune in the Gitega province, roads, which are obstacles for development of the commune, are urgently developed and rehabilitated to build a based for the improvement of livelihood.	Status of the Achievement: Achieved (Project Completion) • Based on the results of the analysis of the basic information about the target communes and the review of existing PCDC, eight pilot projects were planed and implemented in the three target communes. Moreover, as urgent pilot projects, irrigation facilities were constructed for the three target communes, and the provincial road 212, the most important access route to other communes, was rehabilitated for Bukirasazi commune and Buraza commune.
	3. Implementation capacities of officials and community leaders under Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock of the Gitega province for development plans are enhanced, and additionally, mid- and long- term programs for capacity enhancement are prepared.	Status of the Achievement: Achieved (Project Completion) • The project improved the capacities of various stakeholders to plan, coordinate, supervise and execute PCDC by conducting OJT through the implementation of the pilot projects, providing trainings in Japan and Sierra Leone and holding cascade trainings from a provincial level to a colline level.
	4. Capacity of officials of Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock of the Gitega province to promote development plans in the target communes is enhanced, and additionally, action plans and manuals to promote the implementation of the development plans are prepared.	
	5. Concrete recommendations for the revision of PCDC in the Gitega province are proposed.	Status of the Achievement: Achieved (Project Completion) • Several suggestions to improve PCDC, such as allocation of staff and budget, were pointed out in the final report through the analysis of PCDC.
(Utilization Status of the Proposed Plan)	1. Implementation of PCDC is promoted based on the Action Plan using the Manual prepared by the project in the target communes and non-target communes in the Gitega province	(Ex-post Evaluation) Partially Achieved • After the project completion, PCDC has been continuously implemented in the target three communes but not been fanned out to other communes.
	2. Recommendations proposed by the project are integrated into PCDC	(Ex-post Evaluation) Not Achieved • Minimum conditions (allocation of staff and budget, social and security situation of communities, etc.) to revise PCDC were not met due to the 2015 political crisis.
	3. Capacity program development formulated by the project for officials of Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and community leaders is used at Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock at a national level.	(Ex-post Evaluation) Partially Achieved • The cascade training methodology established by the project has been continuously used only in some fields including agriculture by BPEAE, MINAGRIE and NGOs to teach beneficiaries different agricultural techniques such as soil plowings, seeds supply and sowing methods. The beneficiaries are commune agronomists, zone agronomists, colline monitors and farmers.
(Expected Goals through the Proposed Plan)	1. The agricultural productivity and production in irrigation areas of the Gitega	(Ex-post Evaluation) Unverified • After the project completion, the agricultural production in the target three communes increased more or less. However, data on agricultural

	<p>province increase</p> <p>2. The livelihood of farmers in the target communes in the Gitega province is improved.</p>	<p>productivity and production in all the 11 communes in the Gitega province is not available at the time of ex-post evaluation. Moreover, these data for 8 non-target communes after the completion of the project is not available. Therefore, the achievement level of the indicator is unverifiable.</p> <p>[Agricultural production in irrigation areas of Makebuko Commune]</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item/Year</th> <th>2015/16</th> <th>2016/17</th> <th>2017/18</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rice (tons/ha)</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>2.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Banana (kg/plant)</td> <td>7.9</td> <td>7.9</td> <td>8.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sweet potato (tons/ha)</td> <td>5.8</td> <td>11.9</td> <td>17.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maize (tons/ha)</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>4.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>[Agricultural production in irrigation areas of Itaba Commune]</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item/Year</th> <th>2015/16</th> <th>2016/17</th> <th>2017/18</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rice (tons/ha)</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Banana (kg/plant)</td> <td>11.0</td> <td>12.0</td> <td>13.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sweet potato (tons/ha)</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maize (tons/ha)</td> <td>7.0</td> <td>7.0</td> <td>7.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>[Agricultural production in irrigation areas of Bukirasazi Commune]</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item/Year</th> <th>2015/16</th> <th>2016/17</th> <th>2017/18</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rice (tons/ha)</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>2.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Banana (kg/plant)</td> <td>14.0</td> <td>17.0</td> <td>18.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sweet potato (tons/ha)</td> <td>7.0</td> <td>7.0</td> <td>8.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maize (tons/ha)</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>3.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Ex-post Evaluation) Unverified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The average income per a farmer in the target communes in the Gitega province reduced between 2015/16 and 2016/17 due to external factors such as the political instability in 2015 and the stagnation of production in parallel with big population growth. On the other hand, according to BPEAE, the average income of farmers in the target communes is generally high in comparison to the ones in the non-target communes because of increased rice production in marshland with different agricultural techniques introduced by the project.</li> </ul> <p>[Average income per a farmer in the target communes of the Gitega province (Unit: US dollar)]</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2015/16</th> <th>2016/17</th> <th>2018/19</th> <th>2019/20</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>300</td> <td>274</td> <td>N.A.</td> <td>N.A.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item/Year	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Rice (tons/ha)	1.3	1.8	2.4	Banana (kg/plant)	7.9	7.9	8.5	Sweet potato (tons/ha)	5.8	11.9	17.4	Maize (tons/ha)	0.6	1.2	4.6	Item/Year	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Rice (tons/ha)	3.0	3.5	3.5	Banana (kg/plant)	11.0	12.0	13.5	Sweet potato (tons/ha)	3.0	3.2	3.5	Maize (tons/ha)	7.0	7.0	7.5	Item/Year	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Rice (tons/ha)	2.5	2.3	2.7	Banana (kg/plant)	14.0	17.0	18.0	Sweet potato (tons/ha)	7.0	7.0	8.0	Maize (tons/ha)	3.0	2.8	3.3	2015/16	2016/17	2018/19	2019/20	300	274	N.A.	N.A.
Item/Year	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18																																																																			
Rice (tons/ha)	1.3	1.8	2.4																																																																			
Banana (kg/plant)	7.9	7.9	8.5																																																																			
Sweet potato (tons/ha)	5.8	11.9	17.4																																																																			
Maize (tons/ha)	0.6	1.2	4.6																																																																			
Item/Year	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18																																																																			
Rice (tons/ha)	3.0	3.5	3.5																																																																			
Banana (kg/plant)	11.0	12.0	13.5																																																																			
Sweet potato (tons/ha)	3.0	3.2	3.5																																																																			
Maize (tons/ha)	7.0	7.0	7.5																																																																			
Item/Year	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18																																																																			
Rice (tons/ha)	2.5	2.3	2.7																																																																			
Banana (kg/plant)	14.0	17.0	18.0																																																																			
Sweet potato (tons/ha)	7.0	7.0	8.0																																																																			
Maize (tons/ha)	3.0	2.8	3.3																																																																			
2015/16	2016/17	2018/19	2019/20																																																																			
300	274	N.A.	N.A.																																																																			

Source : Final Report, Questionnaire and interview to Principal Advisor of Gitega Governor, Chief of Crop Production Division in BPEAE, Ministry of Plan Representative in Gitega Province, Bukirasazi commune Administrator, Water Users Organization Committee leader in Mutukura-Kamirange Marsh, Water Users Organization Committee leader in Kibuye Marsh, Former Project Coordinator of NTC International Co., Ltd., Former -GIZ staff member in PCDC preparation

### 3 Efficiency

Although the project period was within the plan (ratio against the plan: 100%), the project cost exceeded the plan (ratio against the plan: 121%). The outputs were mostly produced as planned. Therefore, the efficiency of the project is fair.

### 4 Sustainability

#### <Policy Aspect>

“National Strategy of Agriculture Development” (2015-2025), “National Strategy of Marshland and Watershed Management” (2011) and “National Strategy of Water” (2015-2020) aim to promote the agricultural development. As the project aimed at the agricultural development through PCDC, it has been endorsed by such national policies.

#### <Institutional/Organizational Aspect>

##### [National level]

There was an institutional/organizational change in the implementation and promotion of PCDC introduced by the project. MINAGRIE was reformed to the Ministry of Water, Environment, Agriculture and Livestock. The Ministry of Water, Environment, Agriculture and Livestock takes over MINAGRIE’s responsibilities such as agricultural extension so that the reform has not negatively affected the sustainability of the project effects. Due to the limitation of the field survey, the exact number of the staff allocated to the Ministry of Water, Environment, Agriculture and Livestock could not be confirmed, but according to the organization, the number of the staff has not been enough.

##### [Provincial level]

There was an institutional/organizational change for the implementation and promotion of PCDC introduced by the project. DPEA was reformed to BPEAE. BPEAE takes over DPEA’s responsibilities so that the reform has not negatively affected the sustainability of the project effects. Due to the limitation of the field survey, the exact number of the staff allocated to BPEAE could not be confirmed, but according to the organization, the number of the staff has not been sufficient as the staff sometimes needs to work for many development programs with a wide range of stakeholders.

##### [Commune level]

One commune agronomist, one zone agronomist and colline extension workers are placed at each administrative division. Commune agronomist has been responsible of implementing agriculture policies in communes with commune administrator and submitting monitoring reports to BPEAE. Zone agronomist has been in charge of managing/supervising 10-12 collines and submitting monitor reports to commune agronomist. Colline extension worker has taken responsibilities of introducing different agricultural techniques proposed by

the MINEAGRIE. Due to the limitation of the field survey, the exact number of the staff allocated to each organization could not be confirmed, but considering that the dissemination of PCDC has been limited, the number of the staff is considered to have been insufficient.

<Technical Aspect>

[National, provincial and commune levels]

Considering that PCDC has been continuously implemented in the target communes, the staff of the above-mentioned organizations at national, provincial and commune levels has had a certain level of the knowledge and skills to plan, coordinate, supervise and execute PCDC. However, according to BPEAE, they need refresh trainings for PCDC and new agricultural techniques.

[Manuals]

According to commune agronomists, some of the manuals developed by the project have continuously been used to implement the PCDC as they are practical even though their names could not be identified due to the limitation of the field survey.

<Financial Aspect>

No budget data was available due to the political and financial crisis in the country. According to BPEAE, they have not secured the sufficient budget to implement the PCDC introduced by the project because of the political instability preventing other stakeholders from having an interest in the implementation.

<Evaluation Result>

In light of the above, major problems have been observed in terms of institutional/organizational, technical and financial aspects of the implementing agency. Therefore, the sustainability of the effectiveness through the project is low.

#### 5 Summary of the Evaluation

The project implemented the pilot projects in the target communes and developed the Action Plans and the Manuals for promotion of PCDC with the implementing agencies. As a result, the capacity of the implementing agencies to plan, coordinate, supervise and execute was improved, and the pilot projects have continuously been implemented by them even after the project. However, due to external factors such as the 2015 political crisis, PCDC has not been disseminated to other non-target communes, while the achievement against expected goals through the proposed plan (i.e. to increase the agricultural productivity and production in irrigation areas of the Gitega province and to improve the livelihood of farmers in the target communes in the Gitega province) is unknown due to constraints for the ex-post evaluation. As for sustainability, the implementing agencies have not secured the sufficient number of the staff, the sufficient level of the knowledge and skills and the sufficient amount of the budgets for the implementation and promotion of PCDC. As for efficiency, the project cost exceeded the plan.

Considering all of the above points, this project is evaluated to be unsatisfactory.

### III. Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Recommendations for Implementing Agency:

- The PCDC action plan and manuals produced in the target communes have improved the planning, coordination, supervision and execution capabilities of the implementing agencies, and the pilot project continues to be implemented after the project. However, due to the chronic financial difficulties in Burundi, it is difficult to secure financial resources in the target area, resulting in low sustainability. If it is difficult for the implementing agencies alone to deal with it, they should request various donors including JICA to provide financial and technical support.
- The livelihood of farmers in the target communes in the Gitega province have not been confirmed at the time of ex-post evaluation. In order to achieve the goal, Burundi side shall cooperate with the livelihood improvement advisor, who is expected to be dispatched by JICA in the future to confirm the status quo and conduct necessary follow-up activities.