

Mid-Term Review of
Building Climate Resilience Project (BCRP)

Adaptation Fund

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

February/March 2026

Contents

Acronyms.....	4
1. Executive Summary	6
2. Introduction and Background	11
2.1 Evaluation features	11
2.2 Report introduction	12
2.3 Object of evaluation	14
2.4 Implementation context	15
3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives.....	18
3.1 Evaluation Scope	18
3.2 Evaluation Criteria	18
3.3 Evaluation questions	19
3.4 Evaluation matrix	20
4. Evaluation Approach and Methods.....	21
4.1 Evaluation principles	21
4.2 Evaluation data sources.....	21
4.3 Data collection methods	21
4.4 Evaluation data analysis	22
4.5 Evaluation stakeholder engagement	22
4.6 Evaluation Ethical considerations.....	23
4.7 Methodological limitations.....	23
5. Evaluation Findings and Conclusions.....	24
5.1 Mission findings.....	24
5.1.1 Overall project implementation:.....	24
5.1.2 Project Outreach and coverage	25
5.1.3 The project's theory of change.....	27
5.1.4 Updated BCRP Project Logframe.....	27
5.1.5 Scope and targeting.....	27
5.1.6 Project progress by component.....	29
5.1.7 Project Management Performance	32
5.1.8 Revised project costs and financing	37
5.1.9 Economic and financial analysis	40
5.2 Conclusions of the assessment	41
5.2.1 Relevance	41
5.2.2 Coherence.....	42

5.2.3	Effectiveness	42
5.2.4	Efficiency	43
5.2.5	Impact.....	43
5.2.6	Equity.....	44
5.2.7	Adaptive project management	44
5.2.8	Scalability/Extensibility	44
5.2.9	Human and ecological sustainability security	45
6.	Lessons learned	47
7.	Annexes.....	52
Annex 1: Result Tracker		52
Annex 2: Evaluation Terms of Reference		53
Annex 3: Additional methodological information		61
Annex 4: Logframe.....		70
Annex 5: Revised Results' Framework with Comparison to the Original		73
Annex 6: Summary of budget data to date		75
Annex 7: Stakeholder or landscape analysis/ mapping.....		82
Annex 10: Technical Note: Strengthening Rice Seed and Input Renewal Mechanisms under BCRP		90
Annex 10: Bibliography /Reference list		96
Annex 11: Pictures (selected) from the mission		97

Acronyms

AAMT	Advanced Audio Magnetotelluric
ADMT	Audio Magnetic Telluric
AESA	Agro-ecosystem Analysis
AF	Adaptation Fund
AWPB	Annual Work Plan and Budget
BCRP	Building Climate Resilience Project
BoQs	Bill of Quantities
CARI	Central Agriculture Research Institute
CDA	Cooperative Development Agency
DA	Designated Authority
DOA	Department of Agriculture
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESMP	Environment and Social Management Plan
FBO	Farmers Based Organization
FFS	Farmer Field School
GALS	Gender Action Learning System
GOL	Government of Liberia
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanism
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
Ips	Implementing Partners
IVGs	Integrated Vegetable Gardens
IVS	Inland Valley Swamp
LACRA	Liberia Agricultural Commodity Regulatory Authority
LHS	Liberia Hydrological Service
LMS	Liberia Meteorological Service
MFDP	Ministry of Finance and Development Planning
MIA	Ministry of Internal Affairs
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MVR	Measurement, Reporting and Verification
MS	Moderately satisfactory
MT	Mid Term
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
MTR	Mid Term Report
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NOTUS	No Objection Tracking Utility System
PC	Project Coordinator

PEC	Project Execution Costs
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PO	Procurement Officer
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPR	Project Performance Report
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PSP	Private Sector Partner
TCEP	Tree Crop Extension Project
TORs	Terms of Reference
TOT	Training of Trainer
VC	Value Chain

1. Executive Summary

A joint mission of the Government of the Republic of Liberia and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), including independent consultants, took place from 16 to 27 February 2026 to conduct the mid-term review (MTR) of the "Building Climate Resilience Project (BCRP)". The MTR assessed the level of results achieved and took stock of the project's implementation by identifying its strengths and constraints through an analysis of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and induced effects/impact. This enabled the proposition of corrective and adaptive measures necessary for the project to achieve its expected outcomes, given its current performance.

This MTR is being carried out in the 4th year, with actual implementation starting in April 2022, two years after project approval. The majority of the project activities related to production site development commenced late in 2024 due to delays in project start-up and delayed disbursement in 2023. This MTR report presents the findings and recommendations of the BCRP MTR. The MTR was conducted in the three participating counties in the project- including Nimba, Lofa and Bong.

The overall objective of the project is to address key climate vulnerabilities in agriculture and water resources management in the rice and cocoa value chains, and hence contribute to immediate and longer-term development and resilience needs of poor vulnerable smallholder farmers in Liberia.

Summary of the main findings and recommendations

The project's design remains aligned with the Adaptation Fund's objective of reducing vulnerability and increasing adaptive capacity of communities exposed to climate risks. Early results suggest that the project is contributing to improved awareness of climate risks, enhanced institutional coordination, and the introduction of climate-resilient practices in target areas. However, delays in procurement processes, coordination challenges among implementing partners, and the late start of some key activities have limited the extent of measurable outcomes at this stage. Overall, while progress has been slower than originally envisaged, the project remains on a viable trajectory toward achieving its development objectives, provided that implementation challenges are addressed and activities are accelerated during the remaining implementation period.

Overall Project Implementation

Implementation of the BCRP has progressed unevenly across components. The project has made notable progress in establishing institutional partnerships and coordinating with national agencies responsible for climate change adaptation, environmental protection, and meteorological services. Collaboration with key government entities, including the Ministry of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Liberia Meteorological Service (LMS), has

supported the implementation of climate-related interventions and strengthened the country's institutional framework for climate resilience.

At the community level, the project has initiated activities to strengthen local adaptive capacity. These include awareness-raising initiatives, training programmes, and the introduction of climate-resilient agricultural practices. These interventions have helped improve community knowledge of climate risks and adaptation strategies, particularly among rural populations that depend heavily on climate-sensitive livelihoods. However, implementation progress has been slower than planned in several areas. Infrastructure-related activities and field interventions have experienced delays due to procurement processes, administrative procedures, and logistical challenges. Financial disbursement and physical implementation levels, therefore, remain below initial projections at mid-term. Despite these delays, the project has built an important foundation for scaling up activities during the remaining implementation period.

Main Constraints

The Mid-Term Review identified several key constraints that have affected project implementation and performance.

- First, procurement delays and administrative procedures have slowed the implementation of key project activities, particularly those involving infrastructure development or the procurement of specialized equipment and services. These delays have had a cascading effect on other project activities that depend on timely procurement processes.
- Second, institutional coordination challenges among implementing partners have limited the efficiency of implementation. While multiple institutions are involved in delivering project outputs, coordination mechanisms have not always functioned optimally, which has affected the timely execution of activities and information sharing.
- Third, capacity limitations within implementing structures have affected the speed and quality of implementation. Technical and operational capacities within some institutions require strengthening to effectively deliver project activities and ensure compliance with project requirements.
- Finally, monitoring and reporting challenges have constrained the ability to track progress comprehensively. In some cases, project data and reports were not readily available or were provided late for the evaluation mission, limiting the ability to fully assess progress.

Addressing these constraints will be essential to ensure that the project can accelerate implementation and achieve its intended results during the remaining project period.

Relevance

The evaluation finds that the BCRP remains highly relevant to Liberia's development priorities and climate change adaptation needs. Liberia is highly vulnerable to climate variability and extreme weather events, which affect

agricultural productivity, food security, and rural livelihoods. The project's focus on strengthening climate resilience among vulnerable communities directly responds to these challenges. The project is well aligned with national climate and development strategies, including Liberia's climate change policy framework and sector strategies related to agriculture, environmental management, and disaster risk reduction. By supporting both institutional strengthening and community-level adaptation measures, the project addresses critical gaps in the country's climate resilience efforts. The interventions implemented by the project also correspond to the needs expressed by communities and local stakeholders, particularly in rural areas where livelihoods are highly dependent on natural resources and climate-sensitive activities. As such, the project's design remains relevant and responsive to both national priorities and local needs, and is therefore rated Satisfactory.

Coherence

The project demonstrates good coherence with national policies, institutional frameworks, and other development partner interventions. The MTR rates the project's coherence as satisfactory. Collaboration with key government agencies responsible for climate change adaptation and environmental management has supported alignment with national priorities and facilitated policy integration. The project also contributes to broader climate resilience efforts supported by other development partners. However, opportunities remain to strengthen coordination with related programmes and initiatives in order to maximize synergies and avoid duplication. Improved information sharing and collaboration among projects operating in similar sectors could enhance the overall impact of climate change adaptation efforts in Liberia.

Effectiveness

At mid-term, the project's effectiveness is assessed as moderately satisfactory. Several activities implemented under the project contribute directly to achieving the expected outputs and outcomes. Institutional strengthening activities have improved collaboration among climate-related agencies, while community-level interventions have increased awareness and knowledge of climate risks and adaptation practices. Nevertheless, the delayed implementation of some planned activities means the project has not yet fully achieved the anticipated mid-term results. The extent to which the project can achieve its intended outcomes will depend on the implementing partner's ability to accelerate activities and strengthen coordination during the remaining implementation period.

Efficiency

The efficiency of project implementation has been affected by administrative, procurement, and coordination challenges. Delays in procurement processes and approvals have slowed the implementation of several activities, which in turn have affected financial disbursement rates and overall implementation progress. The project's efficiency is rated as moderately satisfactory. While the project has made efforts to allocate resources strategically, the pace of implementation has reduced the efficiency with which resources have been utilised. Strengthening operational

planning, streamlining administrative procedures, and improving coordination among implementing partners would help improve efficiency and ensure that project resources are used effectively during the remaining implementation period.

Effects / Impact

At the mid-term, it is still too early to observe significant long-term impacts. However, the project has begun to generate positive environmental, institutional, and social effects. It has increased awareness of climate risks among stakeholders at the national and community levels. It has also strengthened collaboration among institutions responsible for climate change adaptation and environmental management, which is critical to improving the country's capacity to respond to climate change. At the community level, early interventions to promote climate-resilient practices and improve adaptive capacity have begun to influence local approaches to climate risk management. These initial results provide a strong basis for achieving greater impacts as project activities expand and mature. The project is therefore rated as moderately satisfactory.

Equity

The project is rated satisfactory in terms of equity. It adopts an inclusive and gender-responsive approach, recognising the need to ensure that vulnerable populations benefit from climate change adaptation interventions. Women, smallholder farmers, and other vulnerable groups are key beneficiaries of the project's activities. Efforts have been made to promote participation and inclusion in project activities, particularly through community engagement and training initiatives. However, there is scope to strengthen systematic monitoring of equity outcomes to ensure that benefits are distributed fairly and that vulnerable groups are effectively reached.

Adaptive project management

The project used a participatory approach involving host communities, decentralised local authorities, and decentralised institutions in the counties. The project demonstrated effective adaptability in deploying technical assistance and mobilising additional support, including an agronomist, for project implementation. The Enhanced Quality Assurance - service providers, with technical oversight from project field staff, ensure better seed handling, germination conditions, and uniform growth—resulting in stronger, healthier seedlings. The focus on enhanced technical is considered moderately satisfactory in adaptive response. Human and ecological sustainability security.

Scalability/Extensibility

A strategy for the private sector to upscale the marketing of vegetables and the development of cocoa seedlings has been developed. The government has also expressed its intention to scale and extend BCRP to other counties, which indicates the project's scalability.

Human and ecological sustainability security

On Institution building, the project has made good progress in supporting the Farmers Business Organisations (FBOs) and Cooperatives. Along with other IFAD projects such as TCEP II and STAR P, and in line with the project's scope, the BCRP project contributes to strengthening the capacity of the CDA, EPA, the Liberia Agriculture Commodity Regulatory Authority (LACRA), and the Seed Development and Certification Agency (SDCA) to provide oversight, commodity regulation, and seed certification.

In terms of empowerment and social sustainability, the project demonstrates positive progress in promoting the participation of women and youth in productive activities. Women's engagement in IVS development, vegetable production and post-harvest activities contributes to income generation and household food security.

The service providers and suppliers generally demonstrated satisfactory responsiveness during contract implementation and execution. In goods procurement, deliveries were largely completed within the contract timelines, with no significant non-performance observed and no formal disputes recorded. The procurement of cocoa seedlings, implemented through a framework arrangement, demonstrated adequate market participation and competition. Minor documentation gaps were noted in some contract files (e.g. undated signatures and inconsistencies in submission registers), but these issues did not materially affect service delivery or contract performance.

The project exit and sustainability strategy has been developed. For each project component, the project has identified institutions at the community, district, and national levels as targets for partnerships and capacity building, as part of the strategy to operationalise exit.

Overall, the mobilisation of local communities observed in the field demonstrates their level of commitment, participation and ownership of the project's benefits. Overall, the project's performance is considered satisfactory in terms of human and ecological sustainability and security.

Project Restructuring

The MTR suggests that targeted adjustments to project implementation could improve performance and help achieve project objectives within the remaining implementation period. Potential measures include revising implementation timelines, prioritising high-impact activities, strengthening coordination among implementing partners, and improving monitoring and reporting systems. These adjustments would help address the challenges identified during the evaluation and accelerate project activities. With appropriate corrective measures and strengthened coordination, the project has strong potential to achieve its intended outcomes and contribute meaningfully to building climate resilience among vulnerable communities in Liberia.

2. Introduction and Background

2.1 Evaluation features

This MTR covers the Adaptation Fund (AF) project 'Building Climate Resilience Project (BCRP)', implemented by the International Fund for Agricultural Development and executed by the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA). The MTR was prepared in accordance with AF evaluation policies.

Purpose: The AF Evaluation Policy requires projects with a duration of more than four years to conduct an MTR. The objective of the MTR is to compare baseline results with midterm findings to assess progress toward achieving the project objectives and results. The MTR also provides an opportunity to critically assess administrative and technical issues, identify implementation constraints, and recommend corrective actions for the remainder of the project. The findings of the MTR may further inform the final evaluation.

Scope:

- Time period being evaluated:

The BCRP project, funded by the Adaptation Fund and managed by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), has a budget of US\$9 million and became effective for disbursement on 20 January 2021. BCRP is implemented in Nimba, Lofa, and Bong counties. The project's completion date is 14th April 2027, and the closing date is 31st March 2028.

- Target beneficiaries:

The target population comprises smallholder farmers and communities most vulnerable to climate change. The Project is designed to reach 25,000 smallholder farmers, including 10,000 rice producers and 10,000 cocoa producers, and 5000 from other enterprises, of whom at least 40 per cent will be women and 40 per cent young people. The Project will indirectly benefit 150,000 people along the targeted cocoa and rice value chains through improved regulatory systems, increased access to climate-resilient planting materials, and greater access to markets, as well as other downstream effects of improved agricultural systems. The Project will be implemented over six years and will consist of three main and complementary sub-components.

- Geographic coverage:

BCRP is implemented in Nimba, Lofa, and Bong counties of Liberia.

- Baseline compared to MTR results:

The extent of achievement of the project results, in accordance with the original project, is highlighted in the Result Tracker and Framework in Annex 1 of the document.

2.2 Report introduction

The BCRP was approved by the Adaptation Fund on 23rd September 2020, but actual implementation began only in April 2022. The majority of the project activities related to site development only commenced in 2024 due to delays in project start-up and a lack of funding availability to the project in 2023. Following the start of activities in April 2022, the expected completion is April 2027. It is in this context that the MTR was organised from February 17 to 27, 2026. The MTR's overall objective is to assess and document the BCRP's qualitative and quantitative performance indicators to evaluate the level of results achieved at mid-term.

From 17 to 22 February 2026, the MTR team visited the project sites to meet and exchange views with beneficiaries and implementing partners. This report presents the evaluation results, lessons learned, and recommendations to improve implementation and achieve the project's final objectives. It is intended primarily for the Government of Liberia, which has made every effort to facilitate the mission in the country; the Adaptation Fund Secretariat; IFAD, the implementing agency; the project coordination unit and its implementing partners; the local authorities where the activities are being implemented; and the project beneficiaries.

In accordance with the guidelines of the AF and IFAD, the report is organised as follows: (i) Introduction and Background; (ii) Evaluation Scope and Objectives; (iii) Evaluation Approach and Methodology; (iv) Evaluation Findings and Conclusions; (v) Lessons Learned; (vi) Evaluation Recommendations; and (vii) Annexes

Approach to Mid Term Evaluation

The methodology of the evaluation follows a standardized approach as presented in the AF "Draft guidance note, Mid-Term Review Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AFTERG-AFB/EFC.31/8/Add.8)". The evaluation logic covers the usual criteria: (1) Relevance, (2) Efficiency, (3) Effectiveness, (4) Impacts, (5) Sustainability. Evaluation questions are presented at the beginning of every section. This allows answers to the different expectations expressed in the ToRs (Terms of Reference).

The Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) adopted a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders were informed and consulted throughout the evaluation process to increase their (and other stakeholders') ownership of the evaluation findings. All contributions to the MTE from stakeholders (written and verbal) have been treated with confidentiality. The MTR also noted the outcome of the most recent IFAD mission conducted in October 2025. Given that it's just about 5 months since that mission, most of the observed results and the recommendations have not changed significantly. Any changes are reported during the MTR.

The findings of the evaluation are based on a review of the project's implementation, progress and logic, conducted in close consultation with project partners; a desk review of key documentation, including project documents,

annual progress reports, meeting minutes and relevant correspondence; project outputs; and interviews (individual or group).

Field visits

The preliminary results of the MTE were presented to the BCRP PIU. Following their feedback, an updated report was submitted to the IFAD Country Office on March 19, 2026. This meeting with the PIU provided another opportunity to consult further on key issues emerging from the MTE, ahead of the presentation of the final report.

The MTR faced some limitations, particularly regarding the time required to conduct field visits and consolidate inputs from the MTR team. While semi-structured questionnaires were used and sufficient time was intended for field visits, the limited timeframe did not allow full delivery of both aspects. With more time, it would have been interesting to consult more with project stakeholders and to collect quantitative data. This was further compounded by the late, and in some cases non-provision, of the needed reports by the PIU.

The MTR team had access and held meetings with the government ministries/institutions responsible for different aspects of the project, including the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Liberia Meteorological Service (LMS), among others.

The MTE was implemented using the following steps:

1. Preliminary review of literature: The first step was to review the project documentation needed to prepare the report. This review allowed identification of questions and indicators, which guided the evaluation process.
2. Mission preparation: The MTR consultants interacted with a list of stakeholders, including the Project coordinator, the Adaptation Officer and the M&E Officer throughout the mission. The mission field itinerary was planned with their support. A final version of the field visit program was agreed upon with the IFAD MTR team to ensure the validity of the sampling. The evaluation team was diverse, and each member took responsibility for providing feedback on their areas of expertise, which was then synthesised and collated by the MTR lead.
3. Interview meetings with stakeholders on the sites of the project: Face-to-face consultations with a wide range of stakeholders, using “semi-structured interviews” with a key set of questions in a conversational format (Photo 1). Triangulation of results, i.e., comparing information from different sources (such as documentation and interviews) or interviews on the same subject with different stakeholders, was used to corroborate findings and assess their reliability. The annexes include the various question sheets from interviews conducted with stakeholders, samples, and reasons for their relevance to the MTE.

4. In-depth analysis of the information in view of evaluation criteria: Following the field mission, information was compiled and analysed to ensure an objective evaluation of the project, given the IFAD and AF evaluation policy. Quantitative and qualitative data have been gathered based on the results of several interviews, observations, and a documentary review.
5. Writing draft reports: A first draft of the Midterm Review report was submitted to the IFAD team on 19 March 2026. The IFAD team subsequently provided feedback on 2 April 2026, which informed the revision and finalisation of the report.
6. Writing final report: The final document has been submitted on 17 April 2026, taking into account stakeholders feedback in order to meet the expectations.

Evaluation report structure

The report follows the template provided by the Adaptation Fund for preparing the Midterm report, with minor adjustments to the subsections. After a brief presentation of the Introduction and Background of this MTE (section 1), the Evaluation Scope and Objectives are outlined, and the Evaluation Approach and Methods are briefly described. Then, the report presents the evaluation team's findings (sections 3-5), structured into Evaluation Findings and Conclusions, Lessons Learned, and Evaluation Recommendations. The final section was the annexes that contain some of the mandatory reports of the Adaptation Fund, among others.

2.3 Object of evaluation

In accordance with the funded Activity Agreement between IFAD and the AF, IFAD is required to deliver an independent MTR report to the AF Secretariat. The MTR has two purposes. First, it will provide accountability to the AF and to the national government of Liberia. Second, it will serve a critical learning purpose by assessing progress towards the results and the contribution to the objectives set by the project to date. The MTR will also assess the extent to which the BCRP is consistent with the Gender and Environmental and Social Policies of the Adaptation Fund. The MTR will focus on the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, and timeliness of project implementation; highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and present initial lessons learned regarding project design, implementation, and management. The findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations to enhance implementation during the final half of the project term.

Specific objectives of the mid-term evaluation are to:

- i. review the Project overall progress in physical and financial implementation;
- ii. assess readiness to absorb the approved financing;
- iii. assess the effectiveness of Project's approach and strategy;

- iv. assess the level of project implementation against MTR outputs and outcomes targets;
- v. set the basis to refocus priorities, if necessary, to achieve Project's objectives;
- vi. re-examine the basic assumptions and the risk factors identified during the design of the Project, and if necessary, make the necessary readjustments;
- vii. propose modifications to the original design where appropriate to enable more efficient and effective implementation of the project;
- viii. assess the various achievements in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability;
- ix. assess any need for project extension;
- x. analyze constraints and lessons learned and make recommendations for the achievement of the Project results at the end of implementation.

2.4 Implementation context

The Government of Liberia has received an Adaptation Fund grant of US\$8.84 million to finance the Building Climate Resilience in Liberia's Cocoa and Rice Sectors Project (BCRP), with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) serving as the Implementing Agency. The goal of the BCRP is to improve the livelihoods and climate change resilience of rural farming households in Liberia. The Project Development Objective is to promote agriculture as a business to enhance incomes and reduce rural poverty in Bong County. The Project became effective for disbursement on 20 January 2021, after fulfilling the conditions set by IFAD.

However, the project start date is 14 April 2022, the date of the project inception workshop. The BCRP is managed by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) with MoA as the Executing Agency, and EPA is the Designated Authority (DA). BCRP is implemented in Nimba, Lofa and Bong counties. According to the AF website, the project's completion date is 14 April 2027; however, the newly approved extension puts the completion date at 30 September 2027, and the closing date is 31 March 2028.

The project funds have been disbursed to the tune of 47% of the approved amount of USD 8.84 million. However, 60% of these disbursements have been utilised so far. From October 2023 to May 2024, funds were not accessible due to the delayed submission and approval of the first implementation year project performance report (PPR), which was due in April 2023.

The overall objective of the project is to contribute to "Enhancing smallholder farmers and rural population's resilience to climate change". The Project objective will be accomplished through the implementation of three interrelated components and sub-components with activities and outputs as follows:

Component 1: Climate-proofed agricultural production and post-harvest combined with livelihood diversification: This component will focus on household / village-

level interventions in climate-resilient and sustainable agriculture to reduce the negative impacts from climate change and climate variability, and to contribute to agricultural and rural livelihood development through income diversification.

Sub-Component 1.1: Climate-Proof agriculture production and post-harvest handling

Sub-Component 1.2: Income-generating activities (gardening) are promoted as livelihood diversification measures. Under this sub-component, the actions to be undertaken include: (1) construction of earth dams; and (2) establishment of integrated vegetable gardens.

Component 2: Climate resilient rural infrastructure: This component will focus on climate-proofed rural transportation, water and storage infrastructure.

Sub-Component 2.1: Rural transportation and storage infrastructure have been rehabilitated and upgraded to withstand weather extremes. Key activity under this output includes warehouse rehabilitation to withstand wetter climatic conditions.

Sub-Component 2.2: Potable water supply increased and sanitation infrastructure-built accounting for current and future climate risks. Activities include: (1) climate-proofed construction and rehabilitation of drinking water supply and sanitation; and (2) capacity building for potable water management will complement the construction and rehabilitation.

Component 3: Institutional capacity development and policy engagement: This component will focus on “support to meteorological institutions and provide improved climate services to smallholder farmers and rural populations”.

Sub-Component 3.1: Governmental capacities are strengthened for climate change adaptation: The activities will consist in: (1) strengthening of EPA's capacities and staff on climate change adaptation; (2) strengthening of the Meteorological Department, including capacity building through technology enhancement and training to enhance institutional capacity; and (3) providing technical assistance to improve policy frameworks and mainstream climate risks into sectoral strategies and policies.

Sub-Component 3.2: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and Coordination of the Adaptation activities: Under this sub-component, activities to be undertaken are: (1) support to the development of a Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system of climate response programs; (2) support to improved monitoring & evaluation and knowledge management activities under the Project; and (3) project management and coordination, including the recruitment of technical specialists for the duration of the Project and staff training on adaptation-related issues.

The BCRP is implemented in ten (10) districts in Bong County, five (5) districts in Nimba County, and three (3) in Lofa County over a period of six (6) years. The project is an integrated initiative to promote climate resilience in cocoa and rice value chains in Liberia and is expected to strengthen organisations and support increased production and productivity of rice and cocoa, by training the farmers

on good agronomic practices, supporting their access to inputs, equipment and infrastructure, and linking them to markets.

MoA is the executing agency. The National Climate Change Steering Committee (NCCSC) / National Steering Committee (NSC) provide strategic guidance for Project implementation, oversees planning, reviews progress and impact, and ensures linkages with related projects, government services, and relevant value chain stakeholders.

3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives

3.1 Evaluation Scope

The scope of this evaluation is covered by its objective, the criteria set out in the AF guidelines, the geographical coverage of the project area and the evaluation questions to be answered. The objective of the MTE of the BCRP is to document qualitative and quantitative performance indicators to assess the level of results achieved at mid-term. The aim is to take stock of the project's implementation by identifying its strengths and constraints through an analysis of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and induced effects/ impact. This accountability and learning exercise will enable the proposal of corrective and adaptive measures to ensure that the project achieves its expected effects based on its current performance. The main objective of the evaluation of the project is to analyse the project's progress in order to fulfil the outputs described in the Project Document. This evaluation aims to identify any corrective actions needed to ensure the project achieves its original goals, based on actual performance and progress as of February 2026.

3.2 Evaluation Criteria

In accordance with the Fund's guidelines, the BCRP MTR mission evaluated the project according to the following nine evaluation criteria:

- (i) Relevance — the extent to which the project's objectives and design respond to the needs of the beneficiaries, national policies and the AF's objectives;
- (ii) Coherence — the extent to which the project is compatible with interventions in the country;
- (iii) Effectiveness — the extent to which the project has achieved its objectives and achieved the expected results, including differential results between groups (taking into account the extent to which the evaluator has achieved the targets of the Fund's Strategic Results Framework indicators);
- (iv) Efficiency — the extent to which the project is effective and timely in relation to costs, and does not consume time and resources unnecessarily. This includes value for money, which encompasses the appropriateness, soundness and fairness of expenditures as well as the reduction of expenditures;
- (v) Impact — the extent to which the project has generated positive or negative, intended or unintended effects at the highest level;
- (vi) Equity — in line with the Fund's environmental and social policy, the extent to which the design and implementation include input from the designated authority and vulnerable groups, such as women, young people, persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, minorities and other potentially marginalised groups or locations. This criterion also encompasses the

- extent to which the intervention reduced or perpetuated inequalities, and the extent to which benefits were equitably distributed among vulnerable groups;
- (vii) Adaptive management — the extent to which the project has adapted during implementation in response to lessons learned and reflections during implementation; and the extent to which the intervention supports the use, development or dissemination of innovative practices, tools or technologies that improve or accelerate adaptation to climate change;
 - (viii) Scalability — the extent to which the project demonstrates that climate change adaptation can be increased or continued on a larger scale, as well as in other contexts;
 - (ix) Human and ecological sustainability and security — the extent to which the intervention is likely to generate positive or negative, intended and unintended effects beyond its lifetime, taking into account social, institutional, economic and environmental systems.

3.3 Evaluation questions

In line with the evaluation criteria, questions drawn from the AF guidelines were used to guide discussions between the consultants and project implementers in the context of this evaluation. A summary of the evaluation questions is presented in Table 1 below. See the evaluation questions table in Annex 3.

Table 1: Evaluation criteria and specific questions

Criteria	Specific questions
Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right thing?	Climate change: Are the project interventions helping project beneficiaries to adapt to droughts, heat waves, torrential rains? Priorities: Are the project intervention in line with national and local priorities?
Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?	How well do the activities fit together? To what extent is the implementation of the project aligned and coherent with the relevant national and sub-national policy actions and priorities?
Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?	Are targets as set in the results framework reached? Provide justification why yes or no?
Efficiency: How well are resources being used?	Targets reached with available budget and timeline?
Impact: What difference does the intervention make?	What is the impact / change for beneficiaries and are they satisfied with the result
Equity: Are the benefits of the intervention shared fairly between groups and geographies?	Are the gender targets reached as per the results framework and gender action plan? Why yes / no?

Adaptive management: Does the intervention make evidence-based decisions?	Are changes in implementation justified and relevant?
Scalability: Can the intervention be replicated at a greater scale?	What interventions can be replicated and why yes / no?
Human and ecological sustainability and security: Does the intervention affect the ability of human and natural systems to support the equitable life of all species on the planet? Is the intervention sensitive to conflict and fragility?	ESMP implemented properly (without negative effects)?

3.4 Evaluation matrix

Assessments of the project's implementation levels at the MTR, in line with the evaluation criteria and questions adopted during the mission, indicate the levels of satisfaction based on the results obtained (Annex 3.2). This assessment grid was applied across all levels of project assessment (Table 2). The objective elements that guided the mission's assessment are summarised in the matrix below.

Table 2: Project evaluation matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Key Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Data Points	Data Sources/Methods
Relevance	Does the project address the specific climate vulnerabilities of the target area?	Alignment with national climate policies (NAP/NDC).	Project document review, stakeholder interviews.
Effectiveness	To what extent were the planned adaptation outcomes achieved?	Number of beneficiaries, acres of land restored, early warning systems installed.	Monitoring reports, beneficiary surveys, field visits.
Efficiency	Were resources (funds, human resources) used efficiently to achieve results?	Cost per beneficiary, project timeline adherence, budget variance.	Financial audits, management reports.
Sustainability	How likely will outcomes continue after funding ends?	Institutional capacity built, financial mechanisms in place.	Sustainability plan review, stakeholder interviews.
Gender/Social	Did the project equitably benefit women and vulnerable groups?	% of women in leadership/receiving benefits, adherence to ESP.	Gender-disaggregated data, focus groups.

4. Evaluation Approach and Methods

4.1 Evaluation principles

To ensure a credible and effective evaluation process that generates practical lessons and actionable recommendations for achieving the project objectives and meeting the donor's expectations, the MTR was guided by the seven AF evaluation principles. These principles were integrated into the evaluation mission's methodological approach to uphold quality, credibility, and ethical standards throughout the assessment process.

The principles are (i) relevance and usefulness, (ii) credibility and robustness, (iii) transparency, (iv) impartiality and objectivity, (v) equitable and gender-responsive inclusion, (vi) complementarity, and (vii) sensitivity and adaptability to complexity.

4.2 Evaluation data sources

The MTR applied a predominantly qualitative assessment approach to capture stakeholder perspectives, guided by the AF's evaluation criteria. The review also adopted a participatory and gender-responsive approach, which informed the analysis and reporting of the evaluation findings. The evaluation data comes partly from documentation available to the project and its implementing partners, IFAD and partly from direct interviews with: (i) the PIU team in Monrovia and project stakeholders (project steering committee, local implementing partners: MoA, EPA); (ii) focus groups with project beneficiaries/target groups, and local authorities.

4.3 Data collection methods

The evaluation adopted a consultative and transparent approach with all project stakeholders. The consultants followed approaches based on evidence analysis through triangulation of data and information gathered during discussions with the project team and partners and especially during field visits.

Several tools were used in the BCRP MTE, including: the Evaluation Matrix; semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and beneficiaries; direct observation during field visits; and a summary of conclusions and findings from post-field-visit meetings with the consultant. Each result was assessed using the following scale: Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately satisfactory (MS), Moderately unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). The consultants used various data collection methods to obtain factual information and ensure triangulation. These included:

:

- the use of documentation provided by the coordination team;
- presentation and discussion meetings with all stakeholders (coordination, implementation partners, the government agencies and the ministry);
- direct interviews with project coordination, stakeholders and partners in the field;
- focus groups with project beneficiaries/target groups;
- field visits (See Annex 3.2 for the list of field visits).

4.4 Evaluation data analysis

The results are analysed for each expected output/outcome using evaluation questions aligned with the adopted evaluation criteria. The answers to these questions are presented in light of the associated judgment criteria and findings. Key lessons are also presented and analysed.

4.5 Evaluation stakeholder engagement

The MTR team had the opportunity to assess stakeholders' involvement during the field mission and to interview stakeholders from different categories. Interviews with national, regional, and county representatives captured committee members' views on communities' and cooperatives' involvement in the project. Interviews with associations and cooperatives revealed that the project is well on track at all levels of governance and that stakeholders are involved and active.

At the local level, the communities are satisfied with the project implementation, as many of the communities met were either very satisfied or satisfied. According to them, the reasons for their satisfaction are the quality of consultation, the unity the project has fostered across the communities, enabling them to organise into groups, and the livelihoods they are experiencing or expect (as reflected in the majority of the communities visited). When they were not satisfied or did not provide their opinion, it was because the livelihood projects or community projects (boreholes) were still underway and not yet completed.

As a consequence, the majority of the communities that met in the field have very high or high levels of engagement in the project. This engagement is reinforced by their satisfaction from access to inputs and finance, as well as the expectation of an improvement in livelihoods due to increased incomes when the ongoing farm outputs are sold (they are confident about their future). This provides a good foundation to build sustainability.

Service providers, key implementing partners and decentralised government structures involved in implementation are key players due to their roles in the effective and efficient execution of project activities on the ground. They receive some capacity-building support, e.g., from CARI, to better fulfil their different

roles. As such, these structures are second-level beneficiaries that must continue to work harder to efficiently target the ultimate beneficiaries (grassroots populations).

4.6 Evaluation Ethical considerations

The data collected and field findings will be kept strictly confidential and used solely for this MTR. The consultants have worked with national stakeholders and beneficiaries in a professional manner to ensure the evaluation's ethical conduct and credibility. No personal information has been collected or used in the context of this evaluation.

4.7 Methodological limitations

The assessment mission was conducted independently and impartially. No significant methodological limitations were encountered during fieldwork. Access to all the requested stakeholders and communities has been provided. Furthermore, the MTR mission benefited from conditions that allowed for concise, serious work, which provided a clear picture of the project's achievements on the ground, and from technical, logistical and administrative support from the IFAD country office, the project coordination team and its partners.

5. Evaluation Findings and Conclusions

5.1 Mission findings

5.1.1 Overall project implementation:

From project inception to the midterm, the BCRP has made significant progress in implementing planned activities across the rice, vegetable, and cocoa value chains. The project has also made commendable progress in reaching women and youth across the supported value chains. Cumulative outreach has reached 14,698 beneficiaries, of whom 45% are women and 38% are youth, demonstrating sustained efforts to meet IFAD's inclusion benchmarks.

For the cocoa value chain, the project supported 4,798 cocoa farmers by providing 808,887 disease-resistant and hybrid cocoa seedlings to establish 728 hectares of cocoa farms. On the rice value chain, 546 ha was planted (982 ha that have been brushed, a further 287 ha has been de-stumped, and 129 ha laid out) in Bong and Nimba counties; 365 MT of rice has been milled. Integrated Vegetable Gardens (IVGs) have significant potential to diversify both incomes and diets and to ensure year-round productivity. Cumulative support has been extended to 51 women's and mixed vegetable groups to enable them to pursue alternative livelihoods (70 groups reached thus far, comprising males and females), improve dietary diversity, and enhance food security in target communities.

Additionally, the project procured and supplied 36,618 kg of fingerlings and 16,917 kg of feed. Support in the form of tools, equipment, and seeds has been provided to 10 vegetable groups, and 25 fishponds have been constructed for six groups. Distribution of 60 power tillers to rice and vegetable farmers; provision of 25 sets of rice milling machines; distribution of 20 heavy-duty tricycles to support farm produce transport and improve incomes; and measures to reduce post-harvest losses, including provision of 20 sets of rice parboilers to 20 rice-milling groups.

Women are actively engaged in Inland Valley Swamp (IVS) development, vegetable production and post-harvest activities, while youth participation is particularly visible in cocoa and vegetable value chains. The targeting strategy remains broadly relevant; however, the MTR notes that further consolidation is needed to strengthen the qualitative dimensions of empowerment, including women's leadership in producer organisations, access to financial services, and structured business development support. The MTR noted that BCRP experienced delays in implementation and in achieving the expected results due to a delayed start, disbursement delay following the first disbursement, the absence of technical specifications of farm track and low allocation to road works, even though the project's implementation pace has improved, particularly for activities under Component 1. With disbursement at 47% and the project in its fourth year of implementation, the MTR presents an opportunity to formalise the restructuring proposal developed to reprioritise activities under Components 1 and 2.

5.1.2 Project Outreach and coverage

Since the inception of the BCRP project, 14,698 beneficiaries across all value chains in Bong, Lofa, and Nimba Counties have been reached, representing 59% of the targeted end-outreach of 25,000. Of these, 7,720 are rice farmers who have received agro-inputs, and some have also received rice mill sets (including a mill, destoner, thresher, winnower, weighing scale, stitching machine, and thread), power tillers and their implements for lowland area development, training in good agronomic practices, and technical support to establish approximately 1,500 hectares of lowland swamp. Additionally, 4,798 cocoa farmers have received support through the supply of agro-inputs and disease-resistant, high-yield cocoa seeds, facilitating the establishment of 117 community village nurseries targeting 708 hectares. A total of 258 cocoa lead farmers have also received Farmer Field School training (ToT). Furthermore, 2,120 vegetable farmers have benefited from high-yield hybrid vegetable seeds, agro-inputs, agrochemicals, and technical support on good agricultural practices, and are cultivating approximately 40 hectares of high-yield vegetable crops. Lastly, 60 fish farmers from five communities received support to establish 25 fishponds across those communities.

Table 3: Cumulative outreach per value chain and social category

Social Category	Value Chain	Male Adult	Female Adult	Male youth	Female Youth	Total
2022 Outreach	Rice	621	397	272	210	1500
	Cocoa	1049	355	394	146	1944
	Veg	200	407	155	339	1101
	Total per VC	1870	1159	821	695	4545
2023 Outreach	Rice	120	170	210	320	820
	Cocoa	488	240	170	104	1002
	Veg	51	63	23	41	178
	Total per VC	659	473	403	465	2000
2024 Outreach	Rice	516	441	452	391	1800
	Cocoa	86	157	15	24	282
	Veg	107	126	116	102	451
	Fish	8	28	14	10	60
	Total per VC	717	752	597	527	2591
2025 Outreach	Rice	1070	992	853	685	3600
	Cocoa	658	536	233	143	1570
	Veg	121	142	67	60	390
	Total per VC	1849	1670	1153	888	5560
Cumm. Of Outreach per VC	Total	5095	4054	2974	2575	14698
	%	34.7%	27.6%	20.2%	17.5%	100%

Rice Value Chain Development: Since its inception, the BCRP has made substantial, tangible progress in strengthening the rice value chain across Bong, Lofa, and Nimba Counties. A total of 7,720 rice beneficiaries have been reached, comprising 2,327 male adults, 2,000 female adults, 1,987 male youth, and 1,606 female youth. Targeted investments in the development and rehabilitation of inland valley swamps have expanded productive land and enabled more reliable irrigation, while distribution of processing and mechanisation assets has begun to

reduce post-harvest losses and improve value addition. These interventions have strengthened farmer capacity, promoted inclusive participation of women and youth, and laid the foundation for improved productivity, market access, and climate resilience in participating communities. Please see table two for details.

Table 4: Summary of Rice Beneficiaries 2022 – 2025

Rice Beneficiaries 2022 – 2025						
Social Category	2022 Outreach	2023 Outreach	2024 Outreach	2025 Outreach	Total	%
Male Adult	621	120	516	1070	2327	30%
Female Adult	397	170	441	992	2000	26%
Male youth	272	210	452	853	1787	23%
Female Youth	210	320	391	685	1606	21%
<i>Total</i>	1500	820	1800	3600	7720	100%

Hectares under cultivation: Since inception, BCRP has strengthened agricultural productivity across Bong, Lofa, and Nimba. Between 2022 and 2024, the project established 279 hectares of lowland rice cultivation, laying the foundations for good practices and community engagement. In 2025, BCRP targeted an additional 1,000 hectares through incentives to support brushing, clearing, de-stumping, field layout, water management construction, and ploughing. Preparations for the 2026 season are well advanced, with de-stumping and field layout underway across 982.22 hectares (including the earlier 279 hectares). To date, IVS development includes 982 hectares brushed, 286.69 hectares de-stumped, 129.40 hectares laid out, 375 hectares ploughed, and 545.57 hectares planted with improved rice varieties. These interventions are improving land readiness, accelerating planting, and strengthening prospects for higher yields and climate resilience among participating households. Technical support will continue as development progresses, and planting across targeted IVS sites is expected to be completed by the end of the project year. See Table 3 for a detailed breakdown.

Table 5: Hectares under cultivation

County	District	Target ha	Progress in contract implementation					Qty Harvest (MT)
			Ha brushed	Ha Destumped	Ha Laid out	Ha Ploughed	Ha Planted	
Nimba	Saclepea-Mah	591.7	253.1	67.7	24.2	175.3	169.5	71
Nimba	Zoe Gbao	161.2	62.0	34.1	10.1	26.5	34.5	43.6
Nimba	Tappita	39.8	23.9	11.7	6.9	14.8	14.6	16.3
Nimba	Yarwin-Mehnsonnoh	311.1	148.1	3.5	1.1	84.0	85.4	0
		1103.9	487.1	117.0	42.3	300.6	304.1	130.9
Bong	Jorquelleh	119.5	100.3	72.2	19.5	15.1	41.0	0
Bong	Kpaili	260.6	202.3	62.3	44.8	35.9	108.0	5.8
Bong	Salala	23.3	19.2	9.2	7.1	2	17.2	0
Bong	Panta	55.3	19.8	7.6	6.5	3.1	8.0	0

Bong	Sanoyea	103	86.8	5.0	0	4.3	14.8	0
Bong	Zota	38.8	31.5	8.0	9.2	8.5	8.9	1.0
Bong	Suakoko	29.0	12.7	2.6	0	0.7	23.9	0
Bong	Sub Total	629.5	472.8	166.9	87.1	69.6	221.9	6.8
Lofa	Salayea	5	5	2.7	0	2.2	2.2	0
Lofa	Zorzor	17	17.4	0	0	2.6	17.4	5.0
Lofa	Sub Total	22	22.2	2.7	0	4.8	19.6	5.0
	Grand Total	1755.4	982.2	286.7	129.4	375.0	545.6	142.7

5.1.3 The project's theory of change

No satisfaction or impact surveys had been conducted at the time of the review mission, as they had not yet been planned. Furthermore, given the level of implementation of the project, the initial activities carried out, and the mission's findings in the field, the expected change from the project could be achieved if the necessary measures are taken to improve project coordination so that the activities planned under the project (which are considered relevant) can be carried out. The level of project implementation and the lack of a study of the project's effects prevent the theory of change from being tested at this stage. The mission concludes that the theory of change formulated at the start of the project is relevant.

5.1.4 Updated BCRP Project Logframe

The project team is actively collecting output data to update the project Logframe, providing a comprehensive assessment of progress towards achieving project targets. As of this update, the project has reached 14,698 beneficiaries, representing 59% of the overall target of 25,000 beneficiaries. Analysis of beneficiary data reveals that women's participation stands at 45%, while youth engagement accounts for 38% of beneficiaries reached. The collection and analysis of this data is critical to monitoring the project's outputs and making adjustments where necessary to improve impacts. The project is developing a plan for all outcome indicators. Given the timing of this Logframe update, detailed reporting on all expected outcome indicators is not presented during the MTR. The revised result framework, with a comparison to the original, is presented in Annex 4.

5.1.5 Scope and targeting

a. Geographic and socio-economic targeting

Geographically, according to the project document, BCRP interventions are planned to cover the Nimba, Lofa and Bong counties. From the inception of the

BCRP project to date, the project has reached a total of 14,698 beneficiaries across all value chains in Bong, Lofa, and Nimba Counties, accounting for 59% of the end-targeted outreach of 25,000. Geographic targeting was applied (as planned during the project development and the update of the project document) to select the communities supported for cocoa and rice production, fishery and poultry production, taking into account climate change impact, potential for further deforestation, and the legacy factor from previous IFAD-assisted interventions. The project mainstreamed gender-sensitive approaches and farmer-led innovations using the Gender Action Learning System (GALS) methodology and promoted gender equity and the participation of women and youth in all value chain activities.

b. Beneficiary targeting

The project targets about 25,000 direct beneficiaries drawn from smallholder farmers, Farmer-based organizations (FBOs), including cooperatives, partnering financial institutions, small-scale rural entrepreneurs, women and rural youth (18 – 35 years). The project developed a beneficiary targeting plan that was approved by stakeholders at project inception. At mid-term under BCRP, to date 14,698 beneficiaries out of a total end-target of 25,000 have been reached by the project, of whom 45% are women, exceeding the set quota of 40%, while youth are 2% below the set target of 40%. The mission notes the efforts to target women and young people, and even though not a target at design, the project made efforts to ensure that persons with disabilities or physical challenges are not left out.

Due to the limited disaggregated data generated by the project monitoring and evaluation in the shared report during the mission, it is difficult to conclude that the objectives of the targeting strategy (set out in the project design document) have been achieved, particularly regarding the alignment between the profiles of target groups and the activities they benefited from. The monitoring and evaluation report does not provide comprehensive information on the socio-economic profile of beneficiaries (including the social status of women and young people), and therefore does not allow for an assessment of the level of vulnerability of the targeted households (widows, widowers, single parents with children, heads of households with reduced mobility, etc.) or the proportion of households headed by women, for example.

c. Gender equality and empowerment of women and young people

Gender equality, youth inclusion and nutrition considerations are increasingly embedded in project implementation; however, they remain stronger at the outreach level than at the systemic institutional level. While the project is performing well in quantitative inclusion targets, further efforts are required to consolidate qualitative empowerment outcomes, strengthen women's and youth leadership participation, and enhance monitoring of nutrition-sensitive results. The remaining implementation period provides an opportunity to institutionalise gender-responsive planning, reinforce social inclusion monitoring mechanisms,

and better document social and human capital benefits accrued, thereby ensuring sustainable and equitable project impacts.

5.1.6 Project progress by component

Component 1: Climate-proofed agriculture production and post-harvest combined with livelihoods diversification.

The main achievements under this component include the provision of inputs (tools, seeds and fertiliser) for 7,720 rice producers; 546 ha planted with rice (out of the 982 ha that have been brushed, a further 287 ha has been de-stumped and 129 ha laid out) in Bong and Nimba counties; 365 MT of rice has been milled; 728 ha is under cocoa production following the distribution of 808,887 hybrid seedlings. Support in the form of tools, equipment, and seeds has been provided to 10 vegetable groups, and 25 fishponds have been constructed for six (6) groups. BCRP groups continue to face significant challenges in business planning and record-keeping.

Farmer Field School: The FFS ToT programme is central to improving agricultural practices through Agro-ecosystem Analysis (AESA), equipping farmers with the skills to systematically assess and improve their farming ecosystems. To date, 258 lead farmers have been trained using the FFS approach. The lead farmers are cascading training to their farming group members, though not in all cases. During the MTR mission, the impact of an active lead farmer's successful mentoring of a young woman farmer was noted.

Boreholes and irrigation schemes: While aimed at enhancing climate resilience through irrigation and greenhouses, the project is investing in sustainable water and production infrastructure to extend the growing season, including the dry season. Four solar-powered irrigation systems are planned, and their engineering design has been completed. Furthermore, two greenhouses will be established, with two shelters to be erected at each site. The procurement process was ongoing at MTR.

Strengthening early warning system: Discussions with beneficiaries revealed a strong need for farmers to access reliable, localized climate information to support their agricultural planning. The procurement and installation of weather stations, the dissemination of weather information and the early warning system service for farmers have experienced significant delays. These delays stem primarily from challenges in implementing the EPA-MoA MoU.

As noted in earlier missions, the review team supports assigning responsibility for the procurement, installation and maintenance of agrometeorological infrastructure and associated equipment directly to the Liberia Meteorological Service (LMS). The PIU should facilitate discussions with the LMS, EPA, the MoA Decentralized Offices, and the Liberia Hydrological Service (LHS) to determine the most appropriate and sustainable information delivery mechanisms (such as community radio broadcasts, television, SMS alerts, extension officer networks, hoisting flags in different colours, engaging community champions such as group leaders of smaller groups and using WhatsApp or social media platforms) to ensure

timely and reliable climate information reaches farmers. Given that the planting season is expected to commence in April, it is critical that these arrangements be expedited so that farmers can begin receiving weather updates at the onset of the rainy season. Procurement of the weather stations should commence with a clear sustainability and exit plan, supported by standard operating procedures (SOPs) and formal land-use agreements for the designated station sites.

Development of Integrated Vegetable Gardens (IVGs): As part of its climate-resilient agriculture strategy, the BCRP is investing in sustainable irrigation. The goal is to support year-round vegetable production by establishing Integrated Vegetable Gardens (IVGs). This initiative aims to enhance irrigation capacity, stabilise production across seasons, and strengthen smallholder resilience to climate variability. Four solar-powered irrigation systems, each covering about five hectares, are being developed in strategic locations. Each IVG will include a solar-powered borehole, water storage tank, and a reticulation network for irrigation. Preliminary feasibility studies, schematic designs, and Bills of Materials (BoMs) have been completed and submitted for procurement. However, the initial procurement process was unsuccessful, necessitating re-tendering of the packages, which ultimately delayed the start of implementation. The preliminary hydrogeological investigation conducted using Vertical Electrical Sounding (VES) indicated low groundwater yield and limited suitability for groundwater development. As a result, the potential irrigated area was estimated at approximately 1–2 hectares.

To ensure long-term sustainability and to meet the target of irrigating 5 hectares of land for vegetable gardens, a reassessment was carried out by the PIU using the more advanced geophysical technique, the Advanced Audio Magnetotelluric (AAMT) method, to improve the reliability of borehole siting and groundwater detection during the planning and design phase of these activities. Soil fertility management could be further improved by using more compost and adopting mulching with bulky organic matter to encourage rainfall infiltration, retain moisture, and reduce soil erosion. The adoption of biochar supplementation should be assessed, and a technical note was appended to the last supervision mission report to help initiate small-scale use of this soil amendment. To ensure irrigation system resilience, the design should consider three major factors: crop water requirements, weather data, and soil characteristics. It is also imperative to evaluate the water demand estimated during the design of the irrigation system against the borehole yield upon construction, using yield tests with a typical duration of 12–24 hours of constant-discharge pumping. The PIU has already included provisions in the design and cost estimates for this measure.

Development of Rice Value Chains – Inland Valley Swamps (IVS): As part of its objective to strengthen food security and promote climate-resilient agriculture, the project continues to support the development and rehabilitation of Inland Valley Swamps (IVS) for lowland rice production through a community-based implementation model. A total of 1,500 ha of IVS has been targeted across 170 communities in Bong, Lofa, and Nimba Counties. According to project reports, cumulative progress to date includes brushing (982.22 ha completed); de-stumping (286.69 ha completed); and fully developed layout IVS – 129.40 ha. Field observations and discussions with implementing partners confirmed that community participation in land preparation and development remains high. However, the earlier mission noted the absence of formal engineering designs for

most IVS sites and limited technical supervision at the field level which is also observed at MTR. Oversight responsibilities are currently undertaken primarily by agronomists, but with limited coverage due to the extent of the project locations, as well as limitation in the engineering aspects of IVS infrastructure. In a few cases, particularly in Nimba County, where beneficiaries engaged local technicians to support the layout and structural aspects of swamp development, the results were notably better, with improved water control, bund alignment, and overall quality. These examples demonstrate the value of dedicated technical input in ensuring sustainable and functional IVS infrastructure. The mission was pleased to note that the PIU has considered recruiting additional technicians to support this activity. The mission also observed instances of inconsistencies between reported and actual work in IVS development.

An earlier mission recommended adopting standardised engineering designs across all IVS sites, including proper layout, bund alignment, drainage, and water control structures, with qualified engineers and technicians supervising site selection, design, and construction to ensure quality and sustainability. It is recognised that the MoA is taking action on this and has developed a standardised design for IVS development. Discussion with rice farmers revealed a key sustainability concern. Although NERICA 19 is an OPV that can be replanted for 2–3 seasons under farmers' conditions, periodic renewal with certified seed remains necessary to maintain productivity and varietal purity. However, no structured seed renewal mechanism is currently in place at the cooperative level. In addition, farmers are not formally linked to certified input suppliers, and no revolving fund or market-based arrangement was identified to ensure sustained access to quality seed and agri-inputs. This situation points to a sustainability gap that could gradually undermine productivity gains achieved in the rehabilitated IVS schemes.

Construction of Earth Dams/Fish Ponds: As part of its efforts to promote sustainable aquaculture, the BCRP supported selected farmer groups in constructing and rehabilitating fish ponds. Twenty-five (25) ponds were established or rehabilitated. Field observations during the last supervision mission at selected sites revealed several technical deficiencies in the construction of the earth dams. The main protective dykes were not adequately compacted, and the embankments lacked adequate protection, resulting in erosion along the sides of the ponds. Furthermore, limited beneficiary engagement in routine maintenance and pond management raises concerns regarding the long-term sustainability of these investments. Based on the above, the mission recommended phasing out fisheries activities.

Component 2. Climate-resilient rural storage and water infrastructure

The remaining activities under this component include support for smart weather radars and information dissemination, construction of climate-proof water supply and sanitation infrastructure, capacity building for potable water management, and warehouse construction, which were introduced during the project restructuring. Additionally, based on experience from earlier projects, particularly regarding road rehabilitation costs per kilometre, the budget allocated under the project was insufficient to rehabilitate the planned 120 km of roads. Consequently, the road component was cancelled, and the funds were reallocated with the anticipation of utilising IFAD funding to support the road rehabilitation.

Climate proofing water supply and sanitation infrastructure: Procurement for construction work is currently at the evaluation stage and on track for completion by the end of June 2026. Once completed, it will deliver four solar-powered irrigation systems at selected integrated vegetable sites, four warehouses, two community flush latrines, two greenhouses, two model demonstration gardens, and five community hand pumps in Bong County. These investments will secure reliable access to water, improve post-harvest storage, strengthen hygiene and sanitation, and create demonstration sites. Together, they will enhance productivity, safeguard household health, and increase the climate resilience and income opportunities of participating communities.

Community water points, Flush latrines and Warehouses: In addition to its core agricultural interventions, the BCRP is supporting the development of essential community infrastructure to improve rural livelihoods. The planned facilities include ten (10) community flush latrines to improve rural sanitation; nine (9) community water points, each comprising an overhead storage tank and a solar-powered pump, to provide reliable and sustainable access to potable water; and four (4) warehouses which were only budgeted during the restructuring to enhance post-harvest handling, reduce losses, and improve market readiness. Technical designs, cost estimates, and specifications have been completed. The works are currently at the procurement stage (bid evaluation).

Component 3. Institutional capacity development and policy engagement

This component focuses on strengthening government capacities for climate change adaptation and improving the monitoring, evaluation, and coordination of adaptation activities. Key activities include building institutional capacity within the EPA/CARI/MoA and the Meteorological Department through training, exchange visits, equipment provision, and technological enhancements; developing a MRV system for climate response programmes; providing technical assistance to integrate climate risk into sectoral policies and strategies; and supporting monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge management to ensure effective coordination and tracking of adaptation efforts.

Progress under this component has been moderately unsatisfactory because EPA struggled to carry out its assigned tasks. After being inactive since 2023 due to post-election transitions, EPA re-engaged in the last quarter of 2025 and began implementing activities. The institutional strengthening of CARI is ongoing, while that of the Meteorological Department has been planned but requires more concerted efforts to achieve the expected results and objectives. Capacity strengthening of the MoA has largely been provided at the decentralised level for the ministry's extension services.

5.1.7 Project Management Performance

Project Steering Committee Meeting

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) meets twice a year under the MoA Joint PSC to provide management guidance, offer feedback to project management, and approve the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) for the BCRP and other MoA projects. These meetings have been useful for reviewing and revising AWPBs,

resolving implementation issues, and supporting the delivery of key project targets and activities.

Representation of all expected BCRP PSC members within the broader MoA projects steering committee appears appropriate; however, reports shared with the MTR mission indicated that the operational PSC functions as part of the ministry's established structure that provides top-level policy direction for all projects under the ministry. This arrangement gives the impression that BCRP discussions are often embedded within TCEP-II deliberations, which most likely provide adequate oversight to the project. Nevertheless, it is evident that mechanisms are needed to integrate the anticipated role of the National Climate Change Steering Committee into the existing and larger PSC structure. This arrangement will provide the needed technical oversight to the project and should be activated going forward.

Coherence between AWP&B and implementation

The AWPB remains the key project tool for guiding implementation. The 2025 AWPB and the BCRP procurement plan were submitted in December 2024. The 2026 AWPB has also been prepared and approved in time. Throughout the year, revisions and approvals are processed in the IFAD system (OPEN) to ensure that project implementation remains within approved conditions. All revisions and IFAD approvals follow PSC decisions and IFAD No Objections. Feedback from discussions with the PIU indicated that consultations on the AWPB preparation and review process have improved, involving all units, including field staff. At the time of the mission, physical implementation of the 2026 AWPB was still very low, given the timing of the mission at the beginning of the year.

Monitoring and evaluation

The project has adequate staffing capacity to carry out M&E activities. The PIU M&E structure includes the Head of M&E, who supervises the county M&E officer in the field. M&E activities are adequately budgeted in the AWPB, enabling the M&E Unit to track project implementation and output indicators to support updating the project's log-frame. The required periodic log-frame updates at the end of the year and during supervision missions have been effective. Project activities and outputs were tracked to prepare the first, second and third project performance reports.

The project has several data collection tools in place, including newly developed tools for tracking project activities and outputs. The M&E Unit has prepared an input management strategy covering acquisition, distribution and reporting, and has completed thematic studies on the adoption of Good Agricultural Practices in the project. The project M&E activities have largely followed the development of data collection and monitoring tools for input distribution, the monitoring and tracking of waybills for all implements for beneficiaries, spot checks and verification of delivered materials, and the monitoring and verification of works, as well as the tracking and collection of data, compiling, analysing and reporting. The project has made efforts to geo-reference project investment sites, but progress has been slow. Having identified nearly all project sites, further efforts are needed to accelerate and complete georeferencing. The project M&E data management practice poses a risk of losing project data, as most project M&E tools are paper-based and there is no repository of project M&E data. The web-

based MoA M&E system is ineffective and is not regularly populated by the project. Further to this, the project's data are stored on staff computers, and the PIU is at risk of losing essential project data due to individual staff.

Equally, there are obvious challenges in accessing project reports, and little attention has been paid to promoting project visibility at the national, county, district and even community levels. There is also a need for greater availability of project documents and training materials. At the same time, mechanisms should be put in place to inform key decision-makers at the county and district levels about the project's technical outputs. To this end, communication at all levels of the project should be strengthened. More thought is needed on how to achieve this, but the MTR would like to emphasise improvements to the project's visibility.

Climate and environmental focus

The project has implemented a range of safeguard measures to protect natural habitats within its intervention areas. Land development and expansion of cocoa and rice production were carefully sited to avoid critical habitats, forest reserves, and community-protected areas. Community awareness sessions and FFS training sessions included modules on sustainable land use, agroforestry, and biodiversity conservation, ensuring that both farmers and communities are informed about their environmental responsibilities. Farmers were trained to enhance on-farm biodiversity through crop diversification, tree planting, and integrated pest management, reducing reliance on chemical pesticides. The project also promoted the use of organic fertilisers, while emphasising compost preparation and application, particularly for vegetable production, to improve soil health and reduce pollution risks. Rice production incorporates IVS development, while cocoa production emphasises agroforestry and reforestation.

Notably, MoA, in collaboration with the EPA, developed a climate adaptation brochure for vegetable, cocoa, and rice farmers. Field visits confirmed the adoption of some good agronomic practices in secondary lands, including the use of climate-resilient crops, drainage construction, line planting, crop rotation, diversification, and field sanitation. Notwithstanding the progress achieved, farmers still need to strengthen the adoption of climate-resilient practices such as integrated soil fertility management, soil and water conservation, and water-use efficiency measures to optimise yields at the farm level. The effective implementation of these practices requires continuous capacity building through targeted training and demonstration plots. However, reinforcement is particularly needed among cocoa farmers, as the step-down training from lead farmers to Kuu groups has not been fully effective. This challenge may be linked to the current training format, where ToT sessions cover the full content of the FFS manual in a single delivery. It is therefore recommended that the FFS curriculum be modularized and that climate change adaptation be systematically integrated into the various modules. A modularized approach would promote more effective step-down training, improve knowledge retention, and enhance the adoption of climate-resilient practices throughout the production cycle.

E&S Compliance

The project has developed a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) framework that has been validated by stakeholders, including project staff and implementing partners. Dedicated email channels have been established, and GRM structures have been constituted at the BCRP and Central PIU levels. Toll-free phone lines

are expected to be assigned to each structure to facilitate access. However, the project has yet to publicise the GRM framework widely among farmers. Two grievances were reported during project implementation, both related to internal governance issues within farmer groups. The first concerned a leadership dispute and alleged misuse of agro inputs. The project, in collaboration with the MoA decentralised team, facilitated mediation and dialogue with the group, which led to the reinstatement and restructuring of the leadership; the allegations of agro-input misuse were found to be unsubstantiated. The second grievance involved mistrust within another farmer group regarding alleged misappropriation of group assets and finances. Through engagement facilitated by the project and the MoA team, the issue was resolved by establishing an ad hoc management committee to oversee group activities for three months, after which the group reconsolidated and resumed normal operations.

Despite the EPA's mandate to provide stewardship on environmental and social safeguards, compliance monitoring has remained limited due to the Agency's prolonged inactivity between 2023 and 2025. In addition to these challenges, the scope of the earlier MoU did not clearly define the EPA's compliance monitoring responsibilities. Following the Agency's renewed engagement, a compliance monitoring visit was undertaken in December 2025, primarily focused on lowland sites under development; however, the report from that mission is yet to be shared with the project. As the project prepares to commence various infrastructural activities, it is recommended that the PIU revise the MoU with the EPA to explicitly include provisions for environmental assessments, compliance monitoring, screening, and certification, and to ensure systematic oversight of all activities, including infrastructure-related works.

Quality of financial management

The quality of financial management is moderately satisfactory, with qualified staff, reliable accounting and robust financial controls around segregation of duties, validation of payments and electronic archiving. Significant progress has also been noted in the implementation of the recommendations of supervision missions. However, noted areas for improvement include: (i) the preparation of an AWPB that is unrealistically ambitious and lacks coherence with the Procurement Plan (PP); (iii) the completeness in the attachment of supporting documents relating to farming materials; (iv) long outstanding partners advances from 2022 and 2023 that remain unjustified.

1. **Staffing.** Staff with appropriate qualifications and professional experience are in place. The use of interns helps the project to meet functional needs, through the accomplishment of certain administrative and financial tasks. Key Finance staff have attended IFAD Financial Management training and overall, annual staff appraisals showed good performance.
2. **Budgeting.** As of September 30, 2025, the execution rate of 2025 AWPB was at 58%. The project failed to perform a proper analysis of budgetary variance and explain the low disbursement. In its 4th year of implementation, BCRP has a cumulative disbursement rate of 47%. An analysis of disbursements by category shows that the Works category is under-disbursed (1%), attributable to the delayed start of the project and cancellation of roads works.

3. **Funds flow.** The project has sufficient liquidity to finance activities of its AWPB. Overall, no bottlenecks have been noted in the disbursement of funds by the Central Bank.
4. **Internal controls.** Strict controls exist in terms of segregation of duties, validation of payments and electronic archiving. Internal audit is carried out by a dedicated team, a full member of MoA. Audit missions are carried out annually and show an acceptable rate of implementation of recommendations from previous internal audits. However, weak controls were noted around the monitoring of fuel consumption. The latest annual asset verification is still in progress.

The review of transactions focused on the justifications for Withdrawal Applications (WAs) submitted since the last supervision mission, across all financings. In total, the Mission verified 36 transactions valued at USD 400,660, representing 57% of the total WAs. Shortcomings were noted in the distribution of seeds (USD 64 118), where inconsistencies were found between quantities on delivery notes and actual quantities distributed.

Regarding contract provisions, consultancy agreements and large purchase orders do not include late penalties. A Project Implementation Manual (PIM) exists but needs revising to align with the current IFAD template, which is being prepared at MTR. The distribution list from end-beneficiaries for supplied seedlings was not fully provided to the Mission. Advances from 2022 and 2023 remain unaccounted for by the partner EPA (US\$ 92,498). This is a long-standing issue that was flagged by previous supervisions and the recent IFAD Headquarters Audit. Within three months, EPA is required to either provide adequate documentation to support the use of funds and/or refund unused funds. Otherwise, this advance will be declared ineligible. At some sites in Bong and Nimba Counties, reported and paid IVS activities do not align with field conditions. If confirmed by the MoA's upcoming mission, this may reveal oversight gaps and reporting inconsistencies, highlighting the need for independent follow-up verification.

5. **Accounting and Reporting.** Interim Financial Reports (IFRs) are automated in TOMPRO software. However, IFRs were not submitted within the stipulated deadlines.

Counterpart Funding

Although no beneficiary contributions were expected under the BCRP, some in-kind contributions were recorded. There is room for improvement in how in-kind contributions are captured across their various forms (e.g., labour, land). During field interviews with beneficiaries, a lack of awareness of the requirement to capture in-kind contributions was noted. The project would benefit from systematizing the use of existing tools for valuing beneficiary contributions, particularly lands in use.

Procurement

Procurement performance continues to strengthen, with the PIU actively utilising OPEN for procurement planning and oversight. Notable progress has been observed at the bidding stage, including improved documentation practices and enhanced management of competitive processes. The 2025 Procurement Plan included twelve approved activities (8 goods and 4 works). Implementation of

goods procurement has progressed well and largely in line with the approved plan, demonstrating the PIU's capacity to efficiently manage smaller and time-sensitive packages. Seven (7) work activities are approved for implementation in 2026 under the revised Procurement Plan. Four (4) work activities initially scheduled in 2025 were rescheduled to allow for strengthened technical validation. Following comprehensive hydro-geophysical investigations, including the application of advanced Audio Magnetic Telluric (ADMT) methods, improved site feasibility assessments were completed. These enhanced technical studies have enabled the activities to be reintroduced under the 2026 Procurement Plan with greater implementation readiness and technical confidence. Evaluation processes were generally well-structured and properly documented, demonstrating improved internal organisation and adherence to IFAD procurement procedures.

Additional procedural refinements, for better strengthening documentation discipline and risk management, rather than indicating any systemic non-compliance, are recommended include:

- Standardizing clarification provisions within RFQs to ensure consistency, fairness and better competition;
- Providing clearer guidance to bidders regarding mandatory administrative documentation to reduce avoidable disqualifications at preliminary examination;
- Ensuring submission registers are systematically recorded and the date and time of receipt;
- Strengthening documentation completeness (e.g., dated signatures, complete issuance logs) to enhance audit trail robustness.

Penalties for late delivery were not requested in the RFQ requirements (MOA/PMU/IF AD/BCRP/GC/NS/23); the RFQs do not include any penalty clauses for delivery delays; the mission suggests that the PIU include a 2% penalty per week, with a maximum of 5% of the PO/Contract Value. For cocoa seedlings procurement, the framework agreement structure was appropriately established. Competition was demonstrated through public newspaper advertisements, proactive supplier outreach, and satisfactory levels of bid participation.

5.1.8 Revised project costs and financing

Key changes undertaken by the project:

Roads under BCRP: Under Sub-Component 2.1, the project was originally intended to spot-improve/repair 120 km of feeder roads and farm tracks, support the development of road maintenance plans, develop climate-proofed management plans for farm tracks, and support the education/institutionalisation of road gangs. These activities have not taken place due to insufficient funding. Moreover, the amount allocated to road works in the project design is grossly inadequate to cover their cost. Further implementation of this activity has been hampered by the absence of technical specifications for farm tracks in the country and by very limited experience in this field. For these reasons, during the supervision mission held in April 2024, it was decided to cancel work on the farm tracks and feeder roads under the project and to allocate the funds to other aspects of the project, including increasing IVS development for rice and vegetable production and project execution costs. This will increase IVS development for rice production from the targeted 1000 ha to about 1,500 ha.

The project will now focus on lowland development, which is more expensive than highland farming. To complement BCRP activities and strengthen its impact, the Government has requested geographical expansion of the linked project (TCEP II) to Bong County to conduct infrastructure road works, which has been approved by IFAD.

Project Execution Cost: Project Execution Costs (PEC) in the project design document represented only 4% of the combined total of the project costs, which was insufficient to cover salaries and related management costs. Under the Adaptation Fund, projects can access up to 9.5% of project costs to cover execution costs which were overlooked at project design. The restructuring of the project adjusted this thus bringing the total PEC to USD 651,620 to allow the project staff to have more resources to conduct adequate supervision.

Disbursement Schedule: The project start-up experienced delays, which affected the disbursement schedule. While the first disbursement was in 2021, the project started in 2022, and there was no disbursement to the project in 2023. PPR1 was submitted in late 2023 and was approved in 2024 as per the revised disbursement schedule below. The project is making significant progress in implementation, with most of the planned infrastructure scheduled for 2026; consequently, the project should be completed in 2027. Accordingly, and due to limited resources to cover recurrent costs for an additional year, the last two disbursements (year four: US\$ 1,187,580 and year five: US\$ 701,644) have been combined into a single disbursement of US\$ 1,889,224 to be made in 2026 following PPR 4 submission and clearance (see table 7).

Table 6: Project Disbursement

Original								Revised						
	Upon Agreement signature	One Year after Project Start	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total	Upon Agreement signature	One Year after Project Start	Year 2 (PPR1)	Year 3 (PPR2)	Year 4 (PPR3)	Year 5 (PPR4)	Total
	Original							Revised						
Scheduled Date	Dec 20	Dec 20	Dec 20	Dec 20	Dec 20	Dec 20		Jan 2021	Apr - 2023	Mar - 2024	Feb - 2025	Nov - 2025	Apr - 2026	
Project Funds (US\$)	1,705,278	1,565,035	2,213,869	1,542,747	1,149,929	663,771	8,840,629	1,705,278	0	1,565,035	2,213,869	1,542,747	1,813,700	8,840,629
Implementing Entity Fee (US\$)	87,314	160,100	234,005	194,510	37,651	37,873	751,453	87,314	0	160,100	234,005	194,510	75,524	751,453
Total (US\$)	1,792,592	1,725,135	2,447,874	1,737,257	1,187,580	701,644	9,592,082	1,792,592	0	1,725,135	2,447,874	1,737,257	1,889,224	9,592,082

5.1.9 Economic and financial analysis

a- Environmental benefits

The analysis of environmental benefits was hampered by insufficient rigorous data and the absence of an impact assessment. Generally, preliminary environmental benefits are emerging from the project's interventions. The rehabilitation and development of IVS have improved water management, supported more climate-resilient rice production systems, and potentially reduced pressure on upland areas. The establishment of community cocoa nurseries and the rehabilitation of cocoa farms contribute to increased tree cover and offer potential benefits for carbon sequestration and soil conservation. In addition, farmer training through FFS has strengthened awareness and adoption of improved agronomic practices that can enhance soil fertility, water management, and resilience to climate variability. While these benefits are largely indirect at this stage, they provide an important foundation for scaling climate-resilient and environmentally sustainable agricultural practices, though stronger monitoring, reporting and analysis of environmental outcomes will be required going forward.

b- Economic benefits

The project's target group consists of highly vulnerable people who are at risk of food insecurity. Still relying on the benefit assumptions and farm models used in the project development phase, BCRP generates benefits through: (i) improved availability of planting materials (ii) increased knowledge on good tree crop management practices (iii) increased availability of production support services iv) diversification of productive activities and sources of income thanks to investments in alternative value chains for vegetables.

Strengthening production systems focused on improving crop yields and reducing post-harvest losses as a means of increasing farmers' incomes. By enhancing productivity and minimizing losses along the value chain, the project aims to improve overall efficiency and ensure that farmers derive greater value from their production efforts. Support for economic diversification is designed to strengthen household resilience to climate change by expanding income-generating opportunities. This approach, which is currently being operationalized by the project, helps reduce pressure on natural resources while promoting sustainable livelihoods. In particular, the introduction of vegetable farming into existing production systems is intended to provide additional income streams and enhance household-level economic stability.

At mid-term, the expected effects and impacts of economic diversification are still non-existent. Indeed, activities designed to support communities in their income diversification strategies are only in the preparatory stages.

5.2 Conclusions of the assessment

The BCRP intervention responded to highly vulnerable target groups by supporting their efforts to address the effects of climate change and to adapt. The approach adopted for the implementation of the project is participatory, with increased collaboration with beneficiaries and implementing partners, and with consideration of priorities in national policy documents. The conclusions on the evaluation mission's findings cover both the evaluation criteria and related general issues.

5.2.1 Relevance

This is assessed through (i) its alignment with and its consistency with national policies and strategies, and (ii) its alignment with the needs of beneficiaries (measured by their level of satisfaction with the project's achievements). The MTR mission confirms that the higher-level objectives of BCRP are fully aligned with the Adaptation Fund policy; hence, the rating is **Satisfactory**. Indeed, the logical framework includes indicators that link the Project's results to those of the Adaptation Fund. The Project contributes significantly to the operationalisation of national policies and strategies on climate change adaptation and sustainable land management. Based on the resources available under the restructuring exercise, the Project should consider conducting a satisfaction survey to gather beneficiaries' views on the quality of achievements in relation to the objective of meeting their needs.

Alignment with the Adaptation Fund policy. The table below demonstrates the Project's contribution to achieving the Adaptation Fund's expected results (Outcomes):

Table 7: Project Outcomes and alignment with AF

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcome(s)
Component 1: Climate-proofed agricultural production and post-harvest combined with livelihood diversification	Outcome 1
Component 2: Climate-resilient rural transportation and water infrastructure	Outcome 2
Component 3: Institutional capacity building and policy engagement	Outcome 3

Compliance with national policies and strategies:

The National Climate Change Adaptation Plan: The BCRP directly supports Liberia's NAP by piloting practical resilience measures in vulnerable communities, strengthening institutional capacity, and providing lessons that inform the NAP's long-term strategies for climate-resilient development.

The project will contribute to the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) of Liberia and for the country to fulfil its international commitment with the Paris

Climate Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), mainly the SDG 1 (no poverty); SDG 2(zero hunger); and SDG 13 (climate action).

Alignment with the needs of direct and indirect beneficiaries: From a technical and economic perspective, BCRP's interventions focus on (i) climate change adaptation activities, and support for improving the institutional and regulatory framework for land and natural resource management at the local and regional levels; (ii) capacity building to improve knowledge of ecosystem vulnerability to climate change, ecosystem-based adaptation and climate-smart business opportunities; (iii) economic activities to adapt to climate change and measures to increase the resilience of target communities to climate change. Stakeholders involved in project implementation also emphasised the relevance of the project's intervention strategy.

Discussions with beneficiary communities and the reports consulted also indicate that the project interventions remain relevant and meet the needs of the targeted beneficiary households. Their implementation will help strengthen the resilience of communities in the counties. All the communities encountered during the MTR greatly appreciate the support and training received and continue to participate in the project's activities.

Monitoring and evaluation have begun collecting information to disaggregate beneficiaries (including information on the support they receive and on the assessment of this support's contribution to the development of their livelihoods), and this process must continue.

5.2.2 Coherence

Consistency between planned activities in the AWPBs and desired results: The activities planned in the various AWPBs are fully aligned with the Project Design Document forecasts and are consistent with the theory of change and internal logic. Coherence between the implementation team and consistency of activities: The project has a small staff and draws on the TCEP II project. The last supervision mission noted a heavy workload for the BCRP team and proposed options for strengthening the team. During the design phase, the option chosen by the government and IFAD, namely linking the BCRP project to TCEP II, was justified because its interventions were consistent with those of TCEP II in terms of theme, geographic targeting and implementation duration. Given that the planned activities are fully aligned with the project logic, and also consistent with similar ongoing projects, the project's coherence is **satisfactory (S)**.

5.2.3 Effectiveness

At mid-term, the project has carried out activities that contribute to achieving the logical framework result. Given the physical implementation level, estimated at 60% of the MTR targets, effectiveness is considered **moderately satisfactory (MS)** in view of the implementation context, which was characterised by a late start. The achievement of post-MTR outcomes will depend on the ability to mobilise financial resources in a timely manner to accelerate activities and on good coordination of interventions between the management unit and its implementing

partners. The project's progress towards the desired final results depends, among other things, on: (i) Contributing to the implementation of actions included in the revised AWPB of the BCRP; (ii) Improved knowledge/awareness of vulnerability to climate change; and (iii) Adaptation to climate change and implementation of measures to increase the resilience of targeted communities to climate change. Indeed, the effective implementation of all the mission's recommendations is likely to contribute positively to changing attitudes, practices and behaviours that can make the target beneficiaries more resilient to the adverse effects of climate change.

5.2.4 Efficiency

One measure of efficiency is the current level of output, which is about 60%. In the medium term, the assessment of the project's efficiency is based on administrative, procurement, and coordination challenges. Delays in procurement processes and approvals have slowed the implementation of several activities, which in turn have affected financial disbursement rates and overall implementation progress. The PSC is required to meet twice a year. The Steering Committee meetings have proved helpful in reviewing and revising AWPBs, resolving issues, and delivering key project targets and activities. While the project has made efforts to allocate resources strategically, the pace of implementation has reduced the efficiency with which resources have been utilised. Strengthening operational planning, streamlining administrative procedures, and improving coordination among implementing partners would help improve efficiency and ensure that project resources are used effectively during the remaining implementation period.

Value for money is rated as moderately satisfactory, as the project has made notable progress in two of its three components. Key achievements include organising FFS, training lead farmers, distributing hybrid cocoa seedlings, and establishing alternative livelihood demonstrations, as well as supporting cooperatives and enhancing their governance. Overall, average physical progress across components is approximately 60%. With a value-for-money (VfM) ratio of 0.55, the project has converted just over half of its financial resources into tangible outputs. This reflects moderate cost-effectiveness at this stage and indicates that implementation efficiency is moderate. Therefore, the project's efficiency is **moderately satisfactory** to date.

5.2.5 Impact

At the mid-term stage, it is still too early to observe significant long-term impacts. However, the project has begun to generate positive environmental, institutional, and social effects. The project has contributed to increase awareness of climate risks among stakeholders at the national and community levels. It has also strengthened collaboration among institutions responsible for climate change adaptation and environmental management, which is critical for improving the country's capacity to respond to climate change.

At the community level, early interventions to promote climate-resilient practices and improve adaptive capacity have begun to influence local approaches to climate

risk management. These initial results provide a strong basis for achieving greater impacts as project activities expand and mature. On the impact on households' living conditions, the mission noted a high level of use of the products delivered to the project, especially the farming inputs. This activity, along with the construction of water points, borehole and irrigation scheme, construction of climate-resilient rural storage and water and sanitation infrastructure could have a significant impact on the living conditions of the beneficiaries if maintained. The mission believes that the project will have medium-term effects and impacts and therefore considers this to be **moderately satisfactory**

5.2.6 Equity

The project targets 40% participation by women and 40% by youth. Results at MTR for both women and youth are remarkable (women – 45%; youth – 38%). However, additional efforts may be required to further strengthen the inclusion of women among direct beneficiaries, particularly female-headed households. Discussions with target groups and field observations indicate that, although participation levels are encouraging, the quality of participation among women, youth and people with reduced mobility still needs improvement, particularly regarding access to productive assets and decision-making roles within producer groups, given the level of physical and budgetary implementation.

The project will need to: (i) strengthen support for female heads of households to improve access to and control over productive assets, particularly land; (ii) promote women's leadership and participation in decision-making within farmer groups and cooperatives; and (iii) continue capacity-building for project staff and technical service providers on gender-sensitive business development and social inclusion. The project's performance is considered **satisfactory**.

5.2.7 Adaptive project management

The project used a participatory approach that involved host communities, decentralised local authorities and decentralised institutions in the counties.

The technical support received for deploying infrastructure and working on project components has proved highly relevant and timely, providing practical technical direction and clarification to ensure that the recommended measures are executed effectively, in line with project standards and implementation requirements. Effective site supervision and quality assurance depend on the timely recruitment and proper deployment of competent field technicians. The project demonstrated effective adaptability by identifying these gaps and mobilising additional support and an Agronomist for project implementation. The Enhanced Quality Assurance service providers, with technical oversight from project field staff, ensure better seed handling, germination conditions, and uniform growth—resulting in stronger, healthier seedlings. The focus on enhanced technical support is considered **moderately satisfactory** in the adaptive response.

5.2.8 Scalability/Extensibility

BCRP has successfully engaged communities that are highly motivated to increase their production and participate in market activities. Further support is needed to

reinforce these positive changes and bring engineering designs to the IVS and further support integrated vegetable production.

There are opportunities for the private sector to scale up the marketing of the vegetables produced and seedling production. A strategy for the private sector to upscale the marketing of vegetables and the development of cocoa seedlings has been developed. The government has also expressed its intention to scale and extend BCRP across other counties, making the project's scalability performance **satisfactory**.

5.2.9 Human and ecological sustainability security

Institution building: The project has made good progress in supporting Farmers' Business Organisations (FBOs) and Cooperatives. However, these institutions and service providers continue to exhibit limited capacity. To enhance the institutional sustainability of these structures, key actions must be taken. At the grassroots, cooperatives and FBOs should become accountable, business-oriented entities with sound governance, transparent finances, and professional management. Targeted capacity-building in leadership, financial management, aggregation, and contract negotiation are critical. A phased graduation strategy is important to guide them toward cost recovery, service-based income, and commercial partnerships, enabling them to succeed as independent rural enterprises. In synergies with other IFAD projects such as TCEP II and STAR P, and in line with the project's scope, the BCRP project contributes to strengthening the CDA, EPA, the Liberia Agriculture Commodity Regulatory Authority (LACRA), and the Seed Development and Certification Agency (SDCA) capacity to provide oversight, commodity regulation, and seed certification. In addition, implementing digital registration and compliance systems and upgrading inspection and quality assurance processes across project areas will enable FBOs and cooperatives to access fair prices for their produce. These measures will motivate continued engagement and ensure the sustainability of community-level operations.

Empowerment & social sustainability: Overall, the project demonstrates positive progress in promoting the participation of women and youth in productive activities. Women's engagement in IVS development, vegetable production and post-harvest activities contributes positively to income generation and household food security. However, the sustainability of these gains will depend on consolidating qualitative empowerment outcomes, particularly by strengthening women's leadership within cooperatives, improving structured access to financial services, and ensuring the continued application of gender-responsive approaches such as GALS. While outreach performance is satisfactory, further institutionalization of gender-responsive planning and monitoring mechanisms will be important to sustain empowerment outcomes beyond project closure.

Quality of beneficiary participation: Community participation in IVS development and vegetable production is high, particularly in land preparation and group-based activities. Women's groups demonstrated strong motivation, particularly in improving rice varieties and vegetable production. Strengthening participatory planning, governance capacities, and ownership of infrastructure investments will be essential to enhance the durability of project outcomes.

Responsiveness of service providers: Service providers and suppliers demonstrated generally satisfactory responsiveness during contract implementation/execution. Under goods procurement activities, deliveries were largely completed within the contract timelines, and no significant non-performance was observed, nor were any formal disputes recorded. The procurement of cocoa seedlings, implemented through a framework arrangement, demonstrated adequate market participation and competition. While minor documentation gaps were noted in some contract files (e.g. undated signatures and inconsistencies in submission registers), these issues did not materially affect service delivery or contract performance.

Exit strategy: The project exit and sustainability strategy has been developed with the support of National and International Consultants who have worked with the PIU and various stakeholders within the agriculture sector, including MOA, CDA, LACRA, CARI, MPW, MFDP, Cooperatives, farmers, among others. For each project component, the project has identified institutions at the community, district, and national levels as targets for partnerships and capacity building as part of the strategy to operationalise exit strategies. The project should focus on the most cost-effective sustainability activities and ensure that these are taken over by the beneficiary communities. There is a need to develop plans for intentional transfer of staff technical skills to communities and the counties, including establishing mechanisms at the project and community/county levels to monitor the disengagement process. With the government's intention to scale and extend BCRP across the counties, there is a need to engage with the Green Climate Fund, Adaptation Fund, and Global Environmental Facility country focal points, as well as relevant ministries, to update and prioritise project proposals for upcoming funding cycles.

Equally, there are obvious challenges in accessing project reports, and little attention has been paid to promoting project visibility at the national, regional, county, and even community level. There is also a need for greater availability of project documents and training materials. At the same time, mechanisms should be put in place to inform key decision-makers at the county and regional levels about the project's technical outputs. To this end, communication at all levels of the project should be strengthened. More thought is needed on how to achieve this, but the MTR would like to emphasise improvements to the project's visibility.

The project's achievements are likely to be sustainable given the clear benefits associated with them (cocoa tree plantations, water points for humans and vegetables, supplementary irrigation for gardening, water dams developments to increase agricultural productivity, etc.). However, since the objective of sustainability is to maintain the benefits and expand their scope, these achievements require much more sustained support, in particular (i) support for the bodies responsible for managing the achievements; (ii) the establishment of financial mechanisms for maintaining certain achievements; (iii) the strengthening of mechanisms for disseminating good practices, etc. Finally, it should be noted that this sustainability will be ensured by (i) the involvement in the implementation of counties and decentralised technical services of ministries, which will ultimately act as post-project structures for the assets acquired, etc.,

which remain the sovereign functions of the State, and as vectors for scaling up the knowledge acquired and good practices developed.

Ownership of results by local communities. The service providers' implementation of activities and the involvement of decentralised local institutions in project implementation facilitate ownership of results. Similarly, awareness-raising activities, the involvement of more willing communities living near the project's sites in the targeting process, the identification of support needs and their access to the completed works (such as water and sanitation facilities), as well as the distribution of seedlings, encourage the mobilisation of these local communities and their commitment to the implementation of the project. Overall, the mobilisation of local communities observed in the field demonstrates their level of commitment, participation and ownership of the project's benefits.

Overall, the project's performance is considered **satisfactory** in terms of human and ecological sustainability security.

6. Lessons learned

Lesson 1: Anchoring the BCRP Project in TCEP.

The decision by the government and IFAD to anchor the BCRP project within TCEP II was justified by the alignment of its interventions with those of TCEP II in terms of theme, geographical targeting and implementation duration. However, although these two programmes have a similar purpose in terms of mainstreaming climate change into agricultural practices, their content and scope of intervention are also different, and the advantages of sharing resources present a great opportunity for resource optimisation and adaptive opportunity in project implementation and management.

Lesson 2: Implementation and Adaptive Management

In the implementation of BCRP activities, several positive lessons emerged that enhanced project progress. Key among them was the successful community engagement, where involving local stakeholders from the outset promoted ownership and improved outcomes. Capacity building through targeted training programs significantly raised the skill levels and knowledge of local communities, preparing them for sustained climate resilience.

Establishing strong partnerships with local institutions and other stakeholders facilitated resource sharing and coordination, creating a robust support network.

Lesson 3: Changes to project design

To improve results on the ground, the project has adopted a flexible and adaptive approach by implementing several strategic changes. A key change has been leveraging the expertise of engineers from the ongoing sister project, TCEP II, to carry out various technical works. This collaboration has proven instrumental in overcoming technical challenges more effectively and in ensuring the high quality of activities now geared towards establishing irrigation systems, boreholes, flush latrines, and water towers. Additionally, the project has introduced incentives to promote the development and cultivation of IVS. This initiative is currently enhancing productivity and supporting livelihoods within local communities. These adjustments reflect a responsive approach to project implementation, designed to maximize impact, improve sustainability, and better address on-the-ground needs.

Lesson 4: Environmental and social safeguard measures

The environmental and social safeguard measures implemented as part of the BCRP activities have been effective in minimising and avoiding unwanted negative impacts. The project incorporated comprehensive environmental assessments and stakeholder consultations to identify potential risks and develop appropriate mitigation strategies. For example, precautions have been put in place to establish irrigation systems, boreholes, and water infrastructure to prevent environmental degradation and protect local ecosystems. Social safeguards, including community engagement and inclusive planning, helped ensure that the benefits of the projects reached all relevant groups and that adverse social impacts were avoided or minimized. These safeguard measures, if sustained, will contribute to sustainable project outcomes by protecting the environment and promoting social equity.

Lesson 5: Gender Consideration

During the reporting period, gender considerations have been actively integrated into the project to promote inclusivity and enhance overall performance. Notably, the project has prioritised the inclusion of women, with 40% of households led by women and 40% youth participation in various activities. These measures have ensured equitable access to resources, decision-making processes at both household and community levels, and participation in project activities.

Capacity-building efforts, such as FFS and training programs, have emphasised gender equality by encouraging equal representation and participation from men and women, thereby empowering women as key actors in climate change adaptation. The promotion of intercropping of food crops such as plantain, watermelon, and eddoes, along with the equitable distribution of tools and equipment for vegetable, rice, and cocoa production, has further supported women's active involvement. These measures have demonstrated that inclusive approaches foster greater engagement among women, enhancing their role as innovative agents of climate resilience.

Lessons learned indicate that integrating gender considerations leads to more sustainable and impactful outcomes, as women often serve as primary custodians

of agricultural knowledge and catalysts for community-wide adaptation efforts. Promoting gender equality not only improves project effectiveness but also strengthens social cohesion, livelihoods, and resilience at the household and community levels. Exposure to new practices and technologies among both women and men has also increased women's confidence and capacity, positioning them as vital contributors to climate change adaptation strategies.

Lesson 6: Procurement planning, technical readiness and coordination

Implementation experience under BCRP has shown that procurement effectiveness depends not only on compliance with procedures but also on the maturity of technical preparation and the quality of coordination among the technical, procurement and finance functions. Delays affecting some planned works activities highlighted the importance of completing feasibility assessments, hydro-geophysical investigations, technical specifications and cost estimates before inclusion in the AWPB and the launch of procurement. Where technical documentation was more mature, procurement processes moved more efficiently, and contract award was more predictable. The project also demonstrated that stronger coordination between procurement and technical teams, supported by the use of OPEN for planning and monitoring, improves transparency and activity sequencing. A key lesson is that early technical validation, realistic procurement planning, and timely updates to contract-monitoring information are essential for reducing delays, strengthening competition, and improving contract implementation.

6. Evaluation Recommendations¹

Table 8: Lists of Recommendations

Recommendation	Justification	Responsibility	Priority	Timeframe
E&S compliance				
Procurement of weather stations should begin with a sustainability and exit plan, including SOPs and land-use agreements to ensure their security, maintenance, and operation beyond project closure.	Delays and lack of sustainability planning for weather infrastructure risk non-functionality post-project	PIU/EPA/MOA/LHS/LMS	High	04/2026
Nutrition				
Integrate nutrition-sensitive indicators and behaviour change messages into FFS and vegetable interventions.	Nutrition outcomes are not systematically embedded despite food security objectives	IFAD/PIU	Medium	12/2026
Development of Rice Value Chains – Inland Valley Swamps (IVS)				
Train cooperatives on seed renewal and facilitate exchange visits or learning workshops to share good practices from well-performing cooperatives.	Cooperatives have limited technical and managerial capacity, affecting sustainability	PIU	Medium	05/2026
Facilitate structured linkages between cooperatives and certified input suppliers to secure sustainable access to seed and fertilizers beyond project support.	Sustainability risk due to dependency on project inputs; weak market linkages identified	PIU	Medium	07/ 2026
Groundwater availability for Vegetable Gardens				
Develop standard engineering designs and technical guidelines for IVS development, including layout, bunding, drainage structures, and water control systems	Delays, re-tendering, and technical inconsistencies indicate weak design standardization	PIU/ Engineers	High	12/2026
Financial Management				
Revise the PIM according to the new IFAD template	PIM outdated; alignment needed for compliance and effective implementation	PIU	Medium	03/2026
Provide adequate documentation to address issues raised in relation to good receipt notes from end-beneficiaries and EPA unjustified advances to prevent possible ineligibility	Unjustified advances and missing documentation risk ineligible expenditures and fiduciary issues	PIU	High	03/2026

¹ Corresponds to the Actions recommended for each section in IFAD template

Recommendation	Justification	Responsibility	Priority	Timeframe
Find a mechanism to value lands and labour as beneficiary contributions through simulations based on existing lease agreements in a particular community	Lack of clear valuation undermines tracking of beneficiary contributions and co-financing	PIU	Medium	03/2026
Follow up verification of IVS land preparation activities visited in Bong and Nimba counties and suspend further payments to service providers involved until verification is complete.	Risk of fraud, misreporting, and non-delivery of services identified	PIU	High	03/2026
Procurement				
Standardize RFQ bidding templates to systematically include: (i) NOITA issuance and filing; (ii) standstill and protest provisions where applicable; (iii) clarification procedures; and (iv) late delivery penalty clauses for NS-RFQ PO/Contracts	Standardization improves consistency, transparency, auditability, and fairness across procurements	PIU	Medium	03/2026
Establish secure storage and phased digital archiving of procurement files	Monitoring/reporting gaps partly due to poor document management	PIU	Medium	06/2026
Introduce late delivery penalty provisions in RFQ-based purchase orders/contracts (e.g. 2% per week up to a maximum of 5% of the contract value) to strengthen contract enforcement.	This creates a clear deterrent against delays, strengthens supplier accountability,	PIU	High	04/2026
Introduce a simple SECAP compliance checklist linked to acceptance and payment	This helps ensure that environmental, social, health, and safety requirements are verified before goods, works, or services are accepted	PIU	High	04/2026
Strengthen contract milestone monitoring by ensuring timely recording of actual signature, delivery, acceptance and payment dates, with monthly review of slippages and follow-up actions	This improves contract tracking and early identification of delays, supports timely corrective action, and strengthens accountability	PIU	Medium	04/2026
M&E and Knowledge Management				
Develop a central digital storage facility for project data and knowledge products	Data availability and reporting delays hinder evaluation and decision-making	PIU	Medium	06/2026
Deploy visibility signboards to project sites	Low awareness of project among communities noted	PIU	Low	06/2026

BCRP Result
Tracker.xlsxOfficial Use Only

DATE: 03 February 2026

TO: Seydou Washington Traore, Project Technical Lead
Emerson Zhou, Mission Lead and Agribusiness Specialist
Olumide Akinsola (BCRP MTR Technical Lead)
Rose Harushimana, Gender Specialist
Boris Kouassi, Agronomist Specialist
Davis Atugonza, Financial and Economic analysis Specialist
Edmund Akoto-Danso, Climate and Environment Specialist
Ndiongue Khadidiatou, Financial Management Specialist
Amer Syagha, Procurement Specialist,
Johnson Kolubah, Country Programme Analyst,
Lorenzo Nimley, Agri-business specialist; and
Anwar Maqsood, Rural Infrastructure specialist

FROM: Mrs. Pascaline Barankeba
Country Director of Liberia and Sierra Leone, WCA

SUBJECT: Terms of Reference: Building Climate Resilience in Liberia's Rice and Cocoa Sector Project (BCRP) Midterm Review, February 16 – 27, 2026.

Background

BCRP MTR

1. The Building Climate resilience in Liberia's Rice and Cocoa sector (BCRP) is financed by the Adaptation Fund (AF) and executed by IFAD. This US\$ 9 million project is implemented in Nimba, Lofa and Bong counties. The project became effective for disbursement in September 2019, and its current completion date is 30 September 2027, and closing date is 31 March 2028. The project is tagged to the Tree Crop Extension Project-II and managed by the same PIU. With delayed implementation of the project, it was recommended in 2024 to extend the project by 24 months from 2025 to 2027 and restructure components of the project which have been completed under IFAD. The restructuring request is currently AF review and approval under process.

2. The BCRP project proposes the implementation of a set of concrete adaptation options in targeted and profitable agricultural value chains for Liberia: rice, cocoa and horticulture. Enabling actions designed to strengthen national capacities and institutions are interlinked which will lead to building the resilience of the cocoa and rice value chains in the most vulnerable areas to climate change in Liberia. Concrete adaptation measures include the direct application of integrated climate resilient production, post-harvest and marketing systems. New technologies and best knowledge aim at promoting the paradigm shift and behavioral change in the rice and cocoa production and linkages to markets (IVS development for rice production with water management in combination with fish farming, shaded cocoa plantation with associated crops supporting income generation and soil fertility, drying and storage facilities, model farms supporting farmer field schools).

3. Reflecting the key development challenges and adaptation needs, BCRP has been designed and is implemented in close connection with the IFAD-supported

project "Tree Crop Extension Projects (TCEP-I&II)" (single Project Implementation Unit (executing entity), co-funded activities). The project is structured around three components:

- Component 1: Climate-proofed agricultural production and post-harvest combined with livelihood diversification.
- Component 2: Climate resilient rural infrastructures; and
- Component 3: Institutional capacity building and policy engagement

Mission Objective

4. The BCRP MTR will: (i) review the Project overall progress in physical and financial implementation; (ii) assess readiness to absorb the approved financing (iii) assess the effectiveness of Project's approach and strategy; (iv) assess the level of project implementation against outputs and outcomes MTR targets; (v) set the basis to refocus priorities, if necessary, to achieve Project's objectives; (vi) re-examine the basic assumptions and the risk factors identified during the design of the Project, and if necessary, make the necessary readjustments; (v) propose modifications to the original design where appropriate to enable more efficient and effective implementation of the programme; (vii) assess the various achievements in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability; (viii) assess any need for project extension; (ix) analyze constraints and lessons learned and make recommendations the achievement the Project results at the end of implementation.

5. In accordance with the funded Activity Agreement between IFAD and the AF, IFAD is required to deliver to the AF Secretariat an independent mid-term review report. The Mid-Term Review (MTR) has two purposes. First, it will provide accountability to the AF and to the national government of Liberia. Second, it will have a critical learning purpose, since in the process of assessing progress towards the results and contribution to the objectives set by the project to date, The MTR will also assess to what extent the BCRP project is consistent with the Gender and Environmental and Social Policies of the Adaptation Fund. The MTR will focus on the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project term.

6. The evaluation will be led by an independent consultant supported by the technical specialists who will assess if the implementation of the Project (including its progress, performance, overall management, contribution to and achievement of expected results, behavioral changes, etc.) is aligned with the project's obligations (agreement between AF and IFAD) and IFAD's (being the Implementing Entity for the project) project document. The evaluation will be guided by the AF Evaluation criteria in accordance with following criteria: impartiality, objectivity, independence, relevance, utility, credibility, measurability, transparency, ethics, and partnerships.

7. The Lead Consultant will work closely with the IFAD Project Delivery Team (PDT) of TCEP-II, which will conduct a scale-up PCN mission from February 16 to 27, 2026, in which the consultant is invited to participate. The Project Implementation Unit (PIU), considered as the Executing Entity of BCRP, will provide key project documentation prior to field work and assist the consultant in developing a detailed mission programme to facilitate consultations with key stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Deliverables

8. BCRP lead Consultant will work with the team to produce the following outputs:
- a) Inception report on proposed MTR methodology, work plan, stakeholder engagement list, and proposed structure of the MTR report.
 - b) MTR mission findings, to be presented and discussed at mission wrap-up meeting with IFAD (PDT) and the Government.

- c) Draft MTR report to be submitted for PDT's, MOA/PIU, and AF NDA/EPA review.
- d) Lead a validation meeting of the MTR report, once comments received have been addressed.
- e) Final MTR report to be submitted, including a 2-3-page executive summary, a set of limited and strategic recommendations, and response addressing issues raised during presentation of draft. The suggested template for the report will be provided.

Mission Organization and calendar

9. The TCEP-II scale-up (additional finance) design mission and the BCRP MTR will take place in Liberia from **February 16 – 28, 2026**. The documents finalization will be done after the mission in the country and based on IGAF guidelines. The mission calendar is the following including the schedule for processing the scale-up design:

Mission composition and responsibilities

The responsibilities of the mission team members are as below:

10. **Mrs. Pascaline Barankeba (Country Director, WCA)**, Mission Leader, will assume the overall coordination of the mission and will act as the focal point for discussions with the Mission Team, the partners and the Government. More specifically she will:

- Ensure (in close collaboration with the Project Technical Lead - PTL) that the mission ToRs are fully met in a professional and timely manner.
- Coordinate and lead top-level meetings/discussions with governmental counterparts, and other stakeholders.
- Address any additional comments or suggestions that may arise after the missions.
- Coordinate and provide overall guidance to the mission team for the design and MTR work and finalize the two Aide Memoire in collaboration with the Technical Lead Consultant with inputs from team members.
- Submit the additional financing proposal and MTR report to the review processes.

11. **Seydou Washington Traore, Project Technical Lead:** the PTL will co-lead the mission and will provide the overall technical guidance to the process when ensuring the quality of the documentation produced. Specifically, he will ensure that lessons from implementation and technical aspects, particularly on road and infrastructure activities envisaged for the scale-up are addressed.

He will undertake following specific responsibilities:

- Work with the mission Technical Lead and the Country Director to prepare for the mission and ensure work is completed following the TOR, and deliverables are produced and submitted timely.
- Support the technical mission leader in ensuring that the TCEP-II Project scale-up design is consistent with Government policies and relevant IFAD policies/strategies and incorporate lessons learnt from implementation to date.
- In line with the original TCEP-II design, ensure that the scale-up design is simple to implement, institutionally clear and complementary to other government and development partners projects.
- Review the documents produced for technical quality assurance, identifying and discussing fiduciary challenges (FM and Procurement) that could affect particularly technical aspects of the project.

- Work closely and in coordination with other team members to refine the project's theory of change and main interventions, guide their implementation approach.
- Support the review and submission of the draft scale-up design report and the MTR report integrating inputs from reviewers.
- Provide technical content to technical sections of the scaling up design report and ensure the overall consistency and quality of draft scale-up design documents.

12. **Olumide Akinsola (BCRP MTR Technical Lead Consultant)** will be responsible for the overall technical aspects of the deliverables of the mission in coordination with the Country Director and the Country Team. Specific tasks will include:

- Collect and verify primary and secondary data to assess project progress, performance and quality of implementation in line with the defined objectives, and legal and financial agreement.
- Identify barriers, challenges and bottlenecks during implementation of the project.
- Identify potential solutions, strategies and action plans to address challenges and speed up project implementation.
- Review and suggest revisions as necessary to the current implementation plans, logframe, AWPBs and procurement plans.
- Undertake interviews, surveys, community consultations, transect walks, and focus group discussions with relevant stakeholders, beneficiaries, Executing Entity, possibly national and or local Governments, and where relevant other development partners to capture varying perspectives and to evaluate the project's relevance, efficiency and effectiveness.
- Collect data as needed (government data/records, field observation visits, public expenditure reporting, GIS data, etc.) to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to assessment of TOC, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred).
- Liaise with key implementing partners and stakeholders, which include IFAD (as IE), AF, MOA, NDA/EPA, etc.
- Liaise with and coordinate input from other mission members who will participate in the MTR mission.
- Lead the discussions on the MTR report and mission findings with PDT, MOA and AF NDA/EPA to validate the findings of the evaluation, and address any comments received, as well as lead a validation meeting for the MTR final report.
- Identify actual and potential/emerging operational problems and propose solutions for corrective measures or improvements to be made.
- Prepare the MTR mission report and Aide Mémoire (including their annexes) with the contribution of the mission team members.
- Present the results of the mission to the wrap-up meeting with the national counterparts.

13. **Kouassi, Boris: Agronomist Specialist:** He will cover all agronomist aspects for the scaling up. Specifically, he will,

- Assess progress against targets since inception of BCRP, particularly for all activities related to crop production and post-harvest management.
- Assess the FFS approach in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and relevance.
- Assess nature and quality of support provided by the PIU to farmers across the value chains, specifically on agronomic practices.
- Pay particular attention to the establishment of farms and to the quality of training provided.

- Assess the level of and the effectiveness of the practices adopted or with potential of adoption in the project lifespan.
- Assess the current capacities of service provision under the project
- Assess the level of maturity of the cooperatives supported by the project and propose solutions for an increased sustainability.
- Assess the efficiency in the management of the productive assets developed and their sustainability, providing recommendations if needed.
- Provide input for the MTR report, and any technical annex that may be required.

14. **Lorenzo Nimley, Consultant Agri-business specialist** will support the overall scaling-up process and specifically perform the following.

- Support the mission lead and members in all agribusiness aspects
- Support the team to engage the relevant partners.
- Support the Mission Lead and team members in consolidating input from stakeholders and the relevant project documents for the scaling-up.
- Work with the Targeting and Social Inclusion Consultant/Specialist on the targeting strategy.
- Work with the Agronomist in accessing the agronomic aspects of the Project.
- Make contributions to the Project MTR and annexes as may be needed.

15. **Johnson Kolubah, Country Programme Analyst**, will work closely with the Country Director and provide technical support for the organization, conduct, reporting and follow-up action of the design exercise. He will also work with the Lead Consultant to provide the necessary guidance on IFAD procedures. He will focus on institutional and monitoring and evaluation aspects of the design. Specifically, he will perform the following tasks.

- Assess the targeting strategy, in consultation and collaboration with the social inclusion expert.
- Conduct an overall assessment of the M&E systems for the Project, including reviewing the clarity and logic of M&E arrangements and responsibilities.
- Review the implementation and utilization by all relevant stakeholders of the tools for M&E.
- Assess physical progress measured against the Logframe.
- Coordination of in-country mission activities/meetings with stakeholders supporting the Country Director, PTL and the Mission Technical Lead.
- Provide inputs to the MTR report.

16. **Davis Atugonza Consultant, Financial and Economic analysis Specialist**, will be responsible for the fiduciary aspects of the design, the financial and economic analysis of the project, and providing the rationale of the design from a financial and economic viability point of view. Working closely with other team members, s/he will capture the costs of the proposed additional activities, estimate benefits, undertake financial and economic analysis of the investment, and define the financial management and procurement procedures to be followed for the proposed activities. Specific tasks include the following:

- Capturing the required data and updating the cost tables to reflect the proposed programme activities and the relative costs, under the relevant components/sub-components, and present them in accordance with IFAD's requirements.
- Reassess the completeness and realistic costing of all activities or new activities introduced, ensuring all relevant activities are full costed while guaranteeing value for money.
- preparing detailed budget implications due to the implementation of the additional activities. Ensure that adequate additional resources for programme

planning, monitoring and evaluation, project supervision, project completion are allocated in the costs.

- Quantify expected benefits, using economic and financial analysis.
- Estimating the value of expected benefits to be generated by the investment, using analysis of chain models of representative commodities and the estimation of incremental income generated for target groups.
- Analyzing the financial and economic viability of the programme investment, focusing attention on developing realistic, typical and relevant models of youth business enterprises; and for the whole programme, including financing for operating costs.
- Recalculate the overall financial and economic analysis of the project, with the additional investment, following IFAD guidelines.
- Support and coordinate with the Procurement Specialist prepare a tentative 12-month procurement plan for the proposed activities, in line with the new IFAD Procurement guidelines.
- following the lending procedures, draw up detailed disbursement and procurement schedules.
- update the financial management (FM) risk assessment due to the proposed investment.
- Suggest staff requirements to the PIU due to the additional investment.
- Indicate updates required to the finance & administration manuals.
- Prepare a draft schedule II for the loan agreement and define the expenditure categories.
- Provide sections with the additional financing proposal, as well as contribution to its annexes (updated EFA and updated Costab).
- Perform any other duties as assigned by the Team Leader Consultant or the Country Director.
- Provide inputs to the design documents and annexes

17. Ms. Rose Harushimana, Gender specialist: She will cover the Gender, Targeting and Social Inclusion aspects. In particular, s/he will perform the following duties:

- Review the overall projects targeting approach and particularly the inclusion of women and youth in Project activities.
- Assess the relevance and completeness of the targeting and gender strategy, and suggest revision, if needed.
- Ensure that the targeting approach is well reflected in the results framework for the remainder of the Project lifespan.
- Participate in meetings with project beneficiaries to assess affective participation of women and youth to project activities.
- Assess the benefits produced on these groups of beneficiaries through the project in terms of human capital development to date.
- Determine the extent to which social inclusion related SECAP requirements identified during the project design and supervision missions are being applied during project implementation.
- Access the accrued social benefits and opportunities and reduce any potential adverse impacts on local communities.
- Provide inputs to the MTR report.

18. Akoto-Danso Edmund, Climate and Environment Specialist will be responsible for the climate and environment aspects of the scale-up design and will specifically perform the following:

- Review BCRP climate change adaptation measures in implementation, insofar as supporting reduced vulnerability of households, agro-ecosystems and natural systems to the current and expected impacts of climate change.

- Assess any changes that take place in the natural resources base because of project interventions, and the extent to which the Project contributes to a reduction of harmful agricultural practices.
- Examine AF funded investments in terms of quality and compliance with eligibility for AF funding.
- Assess capacity of project staff to promote climate change mainstreaming and review the quality of services delivered by providers.
- Determine the extent to which SECAP requirements identified during the project design and subsequent supervision missions are being applied during project implementation and the extent to which the investment has benefitted from SECAP in enhancing social, environmental and climate opportunities and reducing any potential adverse impacts on local communities.
- Identify implementation challenges from inception to mid-term, with respect to mainstreaming climate change resilience and provide clear recommendations on how to address them.
- Identify lessons learned and best practices in the Project implementation, if any.
- Provide draft sections to the MTR and required annexes.

19. **Anwar Maqsood, Rural Infrastructure specialist**, will provide technical guidance on project scale-up with focus on construction, rehabilitation and maintenance of infrastructure (road, warehouses, IVS and irrigation system, etc.). Particularly s/he will perform the following.

- Assess progress against Project targets since inception of the BCRP relative infrastructure and engineering works including IVS development.
- Review the technical specifications of planned productive structures.
- Review and analyze synergies between infrastructure investments and the agricultural activities under the Project.
- Assess the final infrastructure targets of the Project, and, according to available resources and time for implementation, propose its revision, if needed.
- Assess the progress of the infrastructure works, and the mechanisms in place for their sustainability.
- Review the ongoing activities to refurbish warehouses and other productive investments in the cooperatives.
- Contribute to the analysis of cost of infrastructure activities from past implementation to end of project.
- Provide inputs to the MTR, and any technical annex that may be required.

20. **Amer Syagha Procurement Specialist** will be responsible for the procurement aspects of the scale-up design and will specifically perform the following:

- Assess if any capacity building may be needed for the procurement team and provide details on the modalities and budget required.
- Update the PIM in line with the new project requirements and situation assessed.
- Contribute to identifying any bottlenecks in procurement procedures that may require adjustments within the scaling-up.
- Assess if the additional activities proposed for the scaling-up require adjustments in procurement activities and prepare a 12-month procurement plan aligned with the AWPB.
- Review the current Procurement Risk Matrix (PRM) and determine whether the new activities may modify the risk categories and propose update to the PAL accordingly.

- In close consultation with the TCEP-II team, ascertain the procurement needs and use that to develop a procurement plan for the first year of implementation.
- Provide sections with the additional financing proposal.
- Provide inputs to the design documents and annexes

23. Ndiongue Khadidiatou: Financial Management Specialist, will be responsible for ensuring the scale-up design meets adequate financial management standards and will particularly perform the following responsibilities:

- Perform Financial Management Performance Assessment, guided by the FMAQ template, to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the project's financial management system. This will include the review of documents and reports indicated in the FMAQ questionnaire.
- Consider changes in project design or implementation arrangements that have been implemented or are being considered by Project Delivery Team. Assess the impact of these on financial management arrangements and if any changes in the FM arrangements are required.
- Review the project's performance since inception and describe major bottlenecks in the FM system as well as good practices and lessons learnt.
- Perform the variance analysis by components and subcomponents and highlight the major activities that have not been implemented as planned and those activities whose cost has been higher than planned. Get a clear explanation from the PMU for the reason of the variance.
- Summarize the reasons for significant variances between expected and actual disbursement rates. Identify actual or potential problems and bottlenecks.
- Review the recurrent costs incurred since project's inception and highlight any current or estimated divergency with IFAD requirements² and the initial costabs allocation.
- Review the project performance by cost categories and highlight potential need for reallocation.
- Provide support to the economist during the preparation of the costabs (as needed), based on the results of the variance analysis and actual costs incurred by the project.
- Reassess the overall country context and the Inherent Risk Rating, and whether there have been changes since design.

Reference Documents

21. Reference documents for the mission will be saved on a shared drive accessible via a google link. Saved documents will include the following:

- Procedures and Guidelines for Additional Financing
- Other IFAD Guidelines (Procurement, audit, general conditions, PCR, etc.)
- BCRP Design Reports
- BCRP Financing Agreements
- 2026 AWPBs and Procurement Plans
- Supervision Mission reports
- 2024 Audit Reports and Management Letters
- BCRP Implementation Manual (PIM)
- BCRP Project Logframes
- Other project relevant reports for reference

² At design, recurrent costs should not be higher than 15% of the total financing.

Annex 3: Additional methodological information

Annex 3.1: Evaluation questions

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation questions
1. Relevance	Does the intervention do "the right thing" to promote climate change adaptation and assist vulnerable populations? Do different stakeholder groups consider the intervention desirable and beneficial? Is the intervention designed and implemented to address the needs and priorities of the most vulnerable and potentially marginalised groups (including those based on gender, age, disability and socio-cultural differences)? Has the intervention taken into account the unique contextual realities that may influence the achievement of its objectives, including those related to socio-economic, cultural, power and political dimensions, and capacity? To what extent are the intervention design and expected results (objectives) relevant and realistic in relation to the broader context? Did the initial objectives of the intervention (expected outcomes) remain relevant throughout its implementation? Were they revised and adapted based on lessons learned or contextual changes? If so, to what extent do the revised objectives remain relevant today? What are the recommendations to ensure that this intervention or future interventions are most relevant?
2. Consistency	INTERNAL COHERENCE To what extent is the intervention consistent with and supportive of the Fund's policies, principles and priorities, i.e. the Fund's strategic results? Framework, environmental and social policy, and gender policy? Has this alignment been made explicit in the design and implementation of interventions? To what extent is the intervention designed and implemented taking into account potential synergies and complementarities with other mandates, missions, initiatives and work areas of the Fund, implementing institutions, strategic partners, beneficiary programmes and other relevant stakeholder groups? Are mechanisms such as steering committees and advisory groups used to help coordinate and harmonise different but related areas of work? Do programme teams or organisational departments work together to complement each other, increase overall effectiveness and leverage potential synergies, or are they siloed, each pursuing their own agenda? Do synergies between different interventions and lines of work produce emerging results that are greater than those that could be expected from separate activities? EXTERNAL COHERENCE

	Is the intervention coherent and does it contribute to relevant international initiatives and priorities for sustainable development, such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and more specifically, is it consistent with climate change adaptation work, such as the Paris Agreement's global goal on adaptation? To what extent is the intervention consistent with the policies and programmes of other partners operating in the same context? Does the intervention complement or compete with the priorities of local, national and global public and civic actors? Does it add value while avoiding unnecessary duplication of efforts with other organisations? Are mechanisms such as coordination meetings or steering committees used to help harmonise and complement different but related areas of work with other actors in the operational context? What recommendations can be made to ensure that this intervention and future interventions are more consistent internally and externally?
3. Effectiveness	What are the expected results of the intervention and to what extent have they been achieved or are they likely to be achieved? Is the intervention doing what it needs to do to be on track to achieve the expected results? If the expected results have not been achieved or are unlikely to be achieved within the time frame, what are the reasons for this, and can these results be achieved over a longer period? What factors contributed to or hindered the achievement of the desired results? To what extent is achievement, or lack of achievement, attributable to the intervention rather than to external factors? What recommendations are there to make this intervention or future interventions more effective?
4. Efficiency	Were resources and people's time used efficiently? Were the expected or achieved results attained or are they likely to be attained within the planned budget and timeframe? Does the schedule of planned activities lead to the selected outcomes and contribute to the desired results, in line with the planned objectives? To what extent are resources being used effectively? Were the resources for the intervention used economically? Were measures taken during planning and implementation to ensure this efficiency? Could more have been achieved with the same resources, or could the same have been achieved with fewer resources? Have appropriate technologies and other cost-saving measures been used to reduce costs? Were donor inputs provided on time as planned? Were the inputs/resources available (funds, expertise, equipment) sufficient and provided in a timely manner to achieve the desired results? To what extent were resources allocated in a manner that took into account gender equality and served vulnerable and potentially marginalised

	population groups? What are the recommendations for making this intervention or future interventions more efficient?
5. Impact	What difference has the intervention made or is it expected to make? What have been the effects of the intervention on people's lives? To what extent has the intervention achieved or is it expected to achieve its objectives in terms of long-term impact? Given the long-term nature of climate change, what are the prospects or trajectories for the impact of the adaptation years (a decade) later? What has contributed to or will hinder this? Did the interventions have any unintended consequences or outcomes, and if so, were they positive or negative and why? Did any aspect of the intervention have a greater impact than another, and if so, why? Were there any spillover effects on relevant institutions, organisations and other actors? Was the impact of the intervention the same for different genders and vulnerable and potentially marginalised population groups, and if so, why? What recommendations can be made to ensure that this intervention or future interventions have a greater positive impact?
6. Equity	Where are the benefits of the intervention distributed equitably among different population groups and geographical areas? Did one group benefit more from the intervention than another, and if so, why? Did the intervention reduce vulnerability impacts across different population groups? Did the intervention reduce or contribute to reducing inequalities? Did the design of the intervention sufficiently integrate equity considerations or monitoring and evaluation systems that track and report on equity issues/concerns? Are feedback and grievance mechanisms in place to support monitoring and reporting on equitable implementation and any gaps? To what extent have equity concerns, including gender, guided the implementation of the intervention? Have adjustments been made to better focus the intervention on equity? Do partner organisations have sufficient capacity to address equity concerns in their role in the intervention? Has sufficient funding been allocated to the intervention to address equity issues? What are the recommendations for making this intervention or future interventions more equitable?
7. Adaptive management	Has the intervention demonstrated flexibility in response to changing circumstances? Were adjustments made to the intervention design (e.g., theory of change or logic model), intended targets, processes, techniques, and tools based on lessons learned or in response to changing circumstances?

	To what extent did the intervention make mid-course corrections based on changing circumstances or new evidence or knowledge from evaluation? Were decisions made during the intervention based on a mechanism for feeding back lessons learned (e.g., monitoring data, reflection workshop, evaluation, etc.)? Does the design and implementation of the intervention recognise and respond to the complexity of the systems? Are assumptions identified, monitored during implementation, and responded to? Does the intervention prioritise a 'learning culture'? Are intervention managers and funders receptive to changes in the design and implementation of the intervention based on emerging lessons and feedback during implementation? Are managers explicitly encouraged to use an adaptive management approach? Are they motivated by learning by doing rather than by strict adherence to the principle of “plan the work and work to the plan”? Is it permissible and possible to make 'risk-free' mistakes and errors in the search for what works and what does not work? Are mechanisms used to identify unintended consequences and contextual changes, supporting emerging learning and course correction during implementation of the intervention? Does the intervention use dedicated reflection workshops, reference, steering or advisory groups, feedback and complaint mechanisms, implementation reviews or any other process dedicated to evaluating and adapting implementation? Does the intervention monitor unintended consequences (positive or negative) during implementation and provide responses? Is it forward-looking and does it anticipate not only the immediate results of the intervention's implementation, but also its long-term effects? How has the intervention responded to various unexpected pressures and challenges? Did the intervention use, develop or promote an innovation to adapt and accelerate adaptation to climate change? If so, how did it accelerate this work, and in what contexts does the innovation work best and for whom?
8. Scalability	To what extent did the intervention contribute to creating conditions that promote and advance climate change adaptation at a larger scale and with greater impact? Did the intervention increase the scale of benefits over time, space, and among people? Vertical scalability — Did the intervention affect or contribute to trajectories aimed at bringing about policy or institutional changes or reforms to increase the impact of climate change adaptation? (Vertical scalability)

	Horizontal scalability — Did the intervention chart or contribute to trajectories to continue at a larger scale the reach and impact on different people and/or geographic areas due to the replication of adaptation measures? (Horizontal scalability) Can others adopt the intervention design on a larger scale? Will a similar intervention work in different contexts? Functional scalability — Did the intervention increase the scope, pace, or scale of climate change adaptation through multiple adaptations and improvements to its initial design and approach? (Functional scalability)
9. Human and ecological sustainability and safety	To what extent did the intervention take into account human and ecological sustainability? Did the intervention assess possible measures to avoid potential direct, indirect, transboundary and cumulative effects and risks that could result from the proposed project/programme? Did the intervention cause any negative or unexpected damage to the environment or human systems, in particular gender inequality or indigenous practices related to good environmental stewardship? Does the intervention contribute to the livelihoods of communities and the health or well- being of the ecosystems on which they depend? Were environmental and social risks identified and assessed as early as possible in the design of the intervention? Has the intervention adopted measures to avoid or, where avoidance is not possible, minimise or mitigate environmental and social risks during implementation? Does the intervention monitor and report on the measures taken and the status of environmental and social risks during and at the end of implementation? Does the intervention have a functioning grievance mechanism that provides stakeholders with an accessible, transparent, fair and effective process for receiving and addressing complaints about environmental or social harm caused by it?

Annex 3.2: Level of satisfaction

Level of satisfaction	Assessment criteria
1.Highly satisfactory (HS)	The project actions/activities planned for the current reference period are progressing as planned or exceeding expectations to achieve all the main results/outputs for the given reference period, with no major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice".
2. Satisfactory (S)	The project actions/activities planned for the current reporting period are progressing as planned to achieve most of the main results/outputs, with only minor shortcomings.
3. Moderately satisfactory (MS)	The project actions/activities planned for the current reporting period are progressing as planned to achieve most of the relevant main results/outputs, but with significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance.
4. unsatisfactory (MU)	The project actions/activities planned for the current reporting period are not on track to achieve the main results/outputs and have major shortcomings or are expected to achieve only some of the main objectives/outputs.
5. Unsatisfactory (U)	The project actions/activities planned for the current reporting period are not on track to achieve most of the main results/outputs
6. Highly unsatisfactory (HU)	The project actions/activities planned for the current reporting period are not on track and are not expected to achieve any of the expected results/outputs

Annex 3.3: Mission Field Itinerary

BCRP MTR Mission Field Itinerary - February 16 - 27 2026					
Date	County	Activities details	County	Location	Value Chain
16-Feb-26	Montserado	Mission launch meeting with GOL	Montserado	MOA Conference Room	
		Technical and field planning	Montserado	MOA Conference Room	
17-Feb-26	Nimba	Travel from Monrovia to Nimba		Beeplay	Cocoa
		Seed Garden	Nimba	Ganta	Processing
		Sleep over in Ganta			
18-Feb-26	Nimba	Visit LICC chocolate processing facility	Nimba		
		Visit cooperative in Karnwee	Nimba	Karnwee	Cooperative (Rice)
		Visit IVS and rice mill in Garwonpa	Nimba	Garwonpa	Rice & Rice Mill
		Travel Grand Gedeh			

19- Feb-26		Visit IVS farmers and rice mill in Naama	Bong	Naama	Rice
		Visit cocoa beneficiaries in Belemue/Shankpowoa	Bong	Belemue/Shak powoa	Cocoa
		Visit IVS sites in Zowienta	Bong	Zoweinta	Rice
		Visit cocoa beneficiaries in Laworta	Bong	Laworta	Cocoa
20- Feb-26	Lofa	Departure from Margibi to Lofa			
		Visit to IVS beneficiaries in Wainsue	Bong	Wainsue	Rice
		Visit to Alternative Livelihood vegetable beneficiaries in Zorzor	Lofa	Zorzor	Vegetable
		Visit road rehabilitation: Voinjama highway to Sekemai and visit cocoa nursery supplied by NCSG	Lofa	Sekemai	Road
		Retire in Bong/Gbarnga	Lofa	Voinjama	
21- Feb-26		Meeting with CARI and IITA authorities			
		Debriefing			
		Sleep over in Bong			
Travel from Bong to Monrovia					
23 – 27 Feb	Bong & Montse rrado	Meeting with CARI, IITA, EPA, LMS	Bong	CARI	Meeting

Annex 3.4 Stakeholders Visited in the Field

County	District	Community / Town	Group Name	Total Beneficiaries	Male	Female	Youth	Comments
Nimba	Saclepea-Mah	Karnwee	Kwakerseh Multi-Purpose Cooperative	30	19	11	16	Kwakerseh multipurpose cooperative is part of the cooperative that first benefited from the TCEP project. The group besides the swamp project has a total membership of 1,360, including 85 shareholders. Under the BCRP, the group received rice mill sets, power tillers, a tricycle, assorted tools for IVS development and fertilizer. It has benefited from the incentive program and has brushed and cleared 12.6 ha with 3 ha cultivated.
Garwonpa	Saclepea-Mah	Garwonpa		100	65	35	43	This group was first supported under the TCEP intervention with two FFS groups initially organized as cocoa farmers. The group joined BCRP during the 2022-2023 farming season. With 16 ha initially cultivated. In the 2025 farming season, it cultivated 55 ha. This is a result of the project incentive program. As part of the group's success, they built a four-bedroom house in Sacelpea city for them to stay while in school. The group was also able to purchase a vehicle (PICKUP) to support transportation which also serves as a means of improving their livelihood.
Bong	Jorquelleh		Future Farmers	25	8	17	28	This is a vegetable group identified and supported in 2025. The group received assorted tools, fertilizer, improved seeds, a power tiller and other implements. The group has a total land size of 10 hectares and is currently cultivating 4.7 ha. The group received incentives for brushing, de-stumping and clearing of the field. The project tractors also ploughed 4.7 ha to support the development of vegetable farms. The group is part of the vegetable groups that benefited from the model garden (two greenhouses, an irrigation system and a model market for the sale of vegetable produce.

County	District	Community / Town	Group Name	Total Beneficiaries	Male	Female	Youth	Comments
Bong	Jorquelleh	Wainsue	Geweilee & Mandoe Farmers Organization	60	25	35	42	This group is a 2025 BCRP group supported through the incentive program for IVS development. The project also provided a range of tools for IVS development and improved rice seeds.
Bong	Zota	Naama	Naama Integrated Community-Based Organization Inc.	30	18	12	14	This group was identified and supported in the 2022 / 2023 farming season. The group received rice mill set, power tillers and implements, tricycle, fertilizer and assorted tools for development of their IVS. The group has started developing 8 ha of IVS, with brushing completed, and de-stumping and field layout are ongoing. In 2025, the group cultivated 3 ha.
Bong	Panta	Shankpowoa		70	42	28	36	The Farmers here consist of two FFS groups, each with 35 members. BCRP identified these groups in 2022. The group received tools, a fertilizer spraying can and seedlings for their farms. This group realized about 87% germination. Currently, the farmer's cocoa farms are now flowering

Annex 4: Logframe

Project Objective(s)	Project Objective Indicator (s)	Baseline	End Target	Cumulative
Overall objective: Enhancing smallholder farmers and rural population's resilience to climate change				
Enhancing smallholder farmers and rural population's resilience to climate	AF Core indicator: Number of beneficiaries (direct and indirect)-Outreach		25000	14698
	Males - Adults		5000	5095
	Females - Adults		10000	4054
	Male- Youths		6000	2974
	Female- Youths		4000	2575
	Direct and Indirect		147500	102886
	AF Core indicator: Number of smallholder farmers reporting improvements in their living conditions		25 000	
	Males - Adults		5000	
	Females - Adults		10000	
	Male- Youths		6000	
	Female- Youths		4000	
Project Outcome(s)	Project Outcome Indicator(s)			
Component 1: Climate-proofed agricultural production and post-harvest combined with livelihood diversification				
The cocoa and rice value-chains are resilient to future climate change impacts and smallholders' incomes are diversified	Outcome Indicator: 1. Number of farmers reporting more diverse income sources.			
	Males - Adults		60%	
	Females - Adults		60%	
	Male- Youths		60%	
	Female- Youths		60%	
	Outcome Indicator: 2. Number of farmers reporting an increase in cocoa productivity.			
	Males - Adults		85%	
	Females - Adults		85%	
	Male- Youths		85%	
	Female- Youths		85%	
	Outcome Indicator: 3. Number of farmers reporting an increase in rice productivity			
	Males - Adults		85%	

	Females - Adults		85%	
	Male- Youths		85%	
	Female- Youths		85%	
	Outcome Indicators: 4. Number of farmers adopting climateresilient farming practices			
	Males - Adults		60%	
	Females - Adults		60%	
	Male- Youths		60%	
	Female- Youths		60%	
	Output Indicator: 5. Number of cocoa and improved rice nurseries established			
	Number of improved cocoa nurseries established		100	70
	Number of improved rice nurseries established		100	
	Output Indicator: 6. Number of cocoa and improved rice seeds distributed			
	Quantity improved cocoa seeds		100	
	Quantity improved Seeds		100	
	Number of earth dams constructed			
	Number earth dams		40	
	Number of hectare cultivate		240	
Component 2: Climate resilient rural transportation and water infrastructure				
Climateproofed rural transportation , water and storage infrastructure	1. Number of farming households having access to a potable water supply		4 000	
	2. Number of kilometers or rural roads and feed roads climate proofed		120km	
	3. Number of hectares of land irrigated from earth dams		1000ha	
	4. Number of warehouses rehabilitated		100	
	5. Number of water user groups adopting sustainable irrigation practices		60%	
Component 3: Institutional capacity development and policy engagement				

Supported meteorological institutions provide improved climate services to smallholder farmers and rural populations	Number of staff of the EPA/MOA and meteorological department trained.		Two technicians trained by PY1. Two meteorologists trained by PY3. 24 staff completed the training (12 by PY 1 and 12 by PY3).	
	Number of meteorological stations installed			
	Number of staff of the EPA and meteorological institute trained			
	Number of sectoral policies integrating climate change risks (thanks to the training provided by the project)		<u>At least 1</u>	

Annex 5: Revised Results' Framework with Comparison to the Original

Type of Indicator	Indicator	ORIGINAL Target for Project End	REVISED Target for Project End	Comments
Overall objective: Enhancing smallholder farmers and rural population's resilience to climate change	Number of beneficiaries (direct and indirect)	25,000 direct beneficiaries, including 40 per cent women and 40 per cent youth 150, 000 indirect beneficiaries		
	Number of smallholder farmers reporting improvements in their living conditions	25,000		
Outcome 1.1 Climate-proofed agricultural production and post-harvest combined with livelihood diversification				
Output 1.1.1: The cocoa and rice value-chains are resilient to future climate change impacts and smallholders' incomes are diversified	Number Percentage of farmers reporting more diverse income sources.	60 per cent of farming households (in project area)		"Number" changed to "Percentage"
	Number Percentage of farmers reporting an increase in cocoa productivity.	85 per cent of farming households (in project area)		"Number" changed to "Percentage"
	Number Percentage of farmers reporting an increase in rice productivity.	85 per cent of farming households (in project area)		"Number" changed to "Percentage"
	Number Percentage of farmers adopting climate-resilient farming practices	60 per cent of farming households (in project area)		"Number" changed to "Percentage"
	Number of cocoa and improved rice nurseries established	100		
	NEW: Number of improved cocoa seedlings distributed	NA	5,074,363 ha	Total beneficiaries of 10,000 with each farmer receiving seedlings for 0.5 hectares of 507 seedlings each. The indicator was already tracked even though not in the original indicator list.
	NEW: Number of hectares under climate resilient practices for cocoa production	NA	4,567 ha	Each beneficiary is expected to have average 0.5 hectares of cocoa under climate resilient production. The indicator was already tracked even though not in the original indicator list.
	Number of cocoa and improved rice seeds distributed Quantity (kg) of improved rice seeds distributed	100	37,500	
	NEW: Number of hectares under climate resilient practices for rice production (with and without earth dam)	NA	1,500 ha	The 1,500 ha target is based on the original 1,000 ha under earth dam and additional 500 hectare following the repurposing of funds from the roads to the rice production.

	Number of earth dams constructed	40		
Outcome 1.2. Climate resilient rural transportation and water infrastructure.				
Output 1.2.1: Climate-proofed rural transportation, water and storage infrastructure.	Number of farming households having access to a potable water supply	4,000		
	Number of kilometers of rural roads and feed roads climate-proofed	120		Activity cancelled. Based on experience from STCRSP, TCEP, and TCEP II, the budget under BCRP was inadequate to rehabilitate 120 km of roads. Therefore, the road component was cancelled, and funds repurposed, with TCEP II's expansion to Bong covering the road works instead.
	Number of hectares of land irrigated from earth dams	1,000 ha		
	Number of warehouses constructed	100	5	Although warehouse construction was included in the logframe, it was not originally budgeted for. During the reallocation process, the available funds were assessed to determine how many warehouses could be realistically built. As a result, a target of five (5) warehouses was set, aligning with the revised budget.
	Number of Percentage of water user groups adopting sustainable irrigation practices	60 per cent of farming households (in project area)		"Number" changed to "Percentage"
Outcome 2.1 Institutional capacity development and policy engagement				
Output 2.1.1 Supported meteorological institutions provide improved climate services to smallholder farmers and rural populations	Number of staff of the EPA/MOA and meteorological department trained.	Two technicians trained by PY1. Two meteorologists trained by PY3. 24 staff completed the training (12 by PY 1 and 12 by PY3).		
	Number of sectoral policies integrating climate change risks (thanks to the training provided by the project)	At least 1		

Annex 6: Summary of budget data

	Approved budget allocation (USD)	Revised Item/activity	Expenditure as at 30 June, 2025 (USD)	Amount Committed (USD)	Planned to spend (USD)	Revised (USD) Spent+Committed+planned to spend	Difference (USD)	Material changes of project costs at output level (%)*	Comment /Justification
Component 1: Climate proofing agricultural production and post-harvest combine with livelihood diversification									
Output 1.1: Climate-Proof agriculture production and post-harvest handling									
1.1.1 Support to MAF to run Farmer Field Schools	1 530 901		551 572	300 515	154 334	1 006 421	524480		This adjustment is requested to support sustainable intensification of rice production, because rice production is one of the Government major priorities.
1.1.2 Development of Cocoa Farms	898 546		360 622	401 971	135 953	898 546	0		
1.1.3 Bore hole irrigation scheme	315 674			130 800	184 874	315 674	0		
1.1.4 strengthening early warning system through installation of agrometeorological station in 10 districts	500 000			-	500 000	500 000	0		
1.1.5Development of Rice Valve chain	1 495 000		606 713	536 768	875 999	2 019 480	-524480		This amount is taken from activity 1.1.1 to activity 1.1.5 to support sustainable intensification of rice

									production, because rice production is one of the Government major priorities.
Sub-total 1.1	4 740 121		1 518 907	1 370 054	1 851 160	4 740 121	0	0.00%	
Output 1.2: Promotion of income-generating activities as livelihood diversification measures						-	0		
1.2.1 Construction of Earth Dam and Community integrated vegetable	259 847		317 997	38 731	60 181	416 909	-157062		Based on the lessons learned on the first poultry piloted, and considering sustainability issues, a decision was reached to discontinue the poultry component and repurpose the fund to intensification of vegetable production.
1.2.2 Establishment of fish farms	173 299		46 517	45 779	81 003	173 299	0		
1.2.3 Establishment of poultry farms	157 769	Cancelled	7 707	-	-	7 707	150062		After piloting one poultry facility, it was determined that poultry farming is less sustainable due to difficulties in accessing feeds, birds, medication including vaccines, etc.
Sub-total 1.2	590 915		372 221	84 510	141 184	597 915	-7000	0.09%	
Total cost for component 1	5 331 036		1 891 128	1 454 565	1 992 344	5 338 036	-7000		
Component 2: Climate resilient rural Transport Storage and Water Infrastructure									

Output 2.1: Climate Resilient rural transportation and storage infrastructure									
2.1.1. Establishment of fish farm	203 657	Cancelled				-	203657		
2.1.2. Establishment of Poultry Farm	228 290	Cancelled				-	228290		It is determined that poultry farming is less sustainable due to difficulties in accessing feeds, birds, medication including vaccines, etc.
2.1.3 Climate proofing of 120 feed roads	314 057	Cancelled	5 618	-	-	5 618	308439		Based on experience from the STCRSP, TCEP and TCEP II road rehabilitation (cost per kilometer), the amount budgeted for road works under the BCRP was very inadequate to rehabilitate 120 km. Hence, a decision was reached to cancel the road component and repurpose the fund, while TCEP II expansion to Bong will support road rehabilitation work.
Studies and survey for rehabilitation	54 087	Cancelled	5 618	-	-	5 618	48469		
Rehabilitation work	90 284	Cancelled				-	90284		
Construction of bridges (for rehabilitation)	110 194	Cancelled				-	110194		
Routine Maintenance	28 024	Cancelled				-	28024		
Periodic Maintenance	31 468	Cancelled				-	31468		
						-	0		
2.1.4. Climate Proofing of farm tracks: Studies and Surveys for Construction	28 000	Cancelled				-	28000		
2.1.5 Support to districts for development of Feeder Road Maintenance plan	27 263	Cancelled				-	27263		
2.1.6 Support to FBOs	32 600	Cancelled	-	-	-	-	32600		

Road gangs formation (distribution of maintenance tools)	16 700	Cancelled		-	-	-	16700		
Development of farm tracks maintenance Plan	15 900	Cancelled		-	-	-	15900		
2.1.7 Support for smart weather radars and information dissemination	150 000		112 723	-	37 277	150 000	0		
2.1.8 Construction of warehouses (NEW)	-	Added	-	120 000	171 520	291 520	-291520		203657
Sub-total 2.1	983 867		118 341	120 000	208 797	447 138	536729	-6.60%	
Output 2.2 Climate - resilient Water supply and sanitation infrastructure						-	0		
2.2.1 Climate proofing water supply and sanitation infrastructure	881 251		4 414	183 587	693 251	881 251	0		
2.2.2 Capacity building for portable water Management	88 749		1 910	1 995	84 844	88 749	0		
Sub-total 2.2	970 000	-	6 324	185 582	778 095	970 000	0	0.00%	
Total cost for component 2	1 953 867		124 665	305 582	986 892	1 417 138	536729		
Component 3: Institutional Capacity development and policy engagement						-	0		
Output 3.1: Strengthening of governmental capacities for climate change adaptation						-	0		
3.1.1 Strengthening of EPACARI/MOA	763 956	-	58 882	127 982	577 092	763 956	0		
Capacity Building through enhancement	110 542		8 251	12 452	89 839	110 542	0		
Training to enhance institutional capacity	57 414		41 835	1 530	14 049	57 414	0		
Exchange visit for EPA staff	74 000		8 796	14 000	51 204	74 000	0		

Strengthening the capacity of 10 decentralized EPA technical service and local government agents with equipment, tools and training for climate risk management and Monitoring of the changes in the status of natural resources	522 000			100 000	422 000	522 000	0		
3.1.2 Development MRV system of climate response programs	55 000		-	-	55 000	55 000	0		
3.1.3 Strengthening of Meteorological Department	149 666		6 760	33 917	108 989	149 666	0		
Capacity Building through technological enhancement	75 839		5 760	17 420	52 659	75 839	0		
Training to enhance institutional capacity	73 827		1 000	16 497	56 330	73 827	0		
3.1.4 Technical Assistance for improved policy Frameworks	36 510	-	-	-	36 510	36 510	0		
TA to mainstream Climate risk into Sectorial Strategy	36 510		-	-	36 510	36 510	0		
Sub-total 3.1	1 005 132	-	65 642	161 899	777 591	1 005 132	0	0.00%	
Output 3.2: Monitoring and evaluation and coordination of adaptation activities						-	0		
3.2.1 Monitoring and Evaluation and Knowledge management	53 000	-	73 576	21 856	98 888	194 320	-141320		As indicated below, the cost of terminal or endline survey is usually high so it is critical to increase the allocation for this activity.
Baseline Survey	7 000	Cancelled				-	7000		Baseline was not conducted because the budgeted amount was inadequate

Terminal Survey cost	11 000		-	-	83 000	83 000	-72000		Considering the experience of previous studies, the initial 11,000 budgeted was insufficient to conduct the project terminal or endline survey, so a decision was reached to increase the amount to 83,000 with some fund from the road component. The project endline survey measure the project achievements against planned target.
Case Study and Knowledge management	35 000		10 162	8 950	15 888	35 000	0		
Monitoring and evaluation (NEW)			63 415	12 906	-	76 320	-76320		Considering that M&E is key to the project implementation, the Ministry requested this amount to support the cost of hiring an M&E Officer to support project activities
3.2.3 Personnel	125 000		34 362	30 475	117 063	181 900	-56900		
Adaptation Specialist (transveral) Gendeer Specialist	50 000		26 500	15 000	65 400	106 900	-56900		
Staff training -Adaptation Issue	75 000		7 862	15 475	51 663	75 000	0		
Sub-total 3.2	178 000		107 939	52 331	215 951	376 220	-198220	2.44%	
Total cost for component 3	1 183 132		173 580	214 230	993 542	1 381 352	-198220		
TOTAL	8 468 035		2 189 373	1 974 376	3 972 778	8 136 526	331509		

Project Execution Cost	372 594		478 677	62 262	163 164	704 103	-331509		This cost supports the cost of project accountant and driver, as well as operating cost and equipment and logistics, including vehicles, laptops, printers, etc.
Recruitment of local staff	162 594		196 788	20 000	74 787	291 575	-128981		
Travels (Operations)	90 000		142 920	35 122	61 957	240 000	-150000		
Equipment	120 000		115 259		4 741	120 000	0		
External Audit (NEW)			23 710	7 140	21 678	52 528	-52528		This amount will support the project external audit by the General Auditing Commission which was not earlier envisaged under the project design.
Project Cycle Management Cost	751 453								
Total Project Cost	9 592 082	-	2 668 050	2 036 637	4 135 942	9 592 082	0		

3

³ Financial data as at MTR mission period was not available

Annex 7: Stakeholder or landscape analysis/ mapping

Annex 7.1: BCRP Stakeholders and Roles

Stakeholder	Role in the Project
Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), Liberia	Lead executing entity; overall project coordination, implementation oversight, and integration with national agricultural policies. (adaptation-fund.org)
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	Accredited entity; project design, supervision, fiduciary oversight, and technical support to ensure compliance with Adaptation Fund requirements. (adaptation-fund.org)
Adaptation Fund (AF)	Financing institution providing climate adaptation funding and ensuring compliance with environmental and social policies. (adaptation-fund.org)
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Liberia	Environmental oversight, safeguards compliance, and endorsement of project activities to ensure alignment with national environmental regulations. (adaptation-fund.org)
Meteorological Department (Liberia)	Provision of climate data, weather information, and technical inputs for climate risk analysis and adaptation planning. (adaptation-fund.org)
Central Agricultural Research Institute (CARI)	Agricultural research support, technology development, and advisory services for climate-resilient practices. (adaptation-fund.org)
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)	Implementation support, community mobilization, capacity building, and facilitation of local-level interventions. (adaptation-fund.org)
Farmer-Based Organizations (FBOs) / Cooperatives	Primary beneficiaries and implementation partners; adoption of climate-resilient practices and participation in value chain activities. (adaptation-fund.org)
Smallholder Farmers (including women and youth)	Main target group; adoption of improved agricultural practices and direct beneficiaries of project interventions. (adaptation-fund.org)
Service Providers (extension, technical, private sector actors)	Delivery of technical services, inputs, and capacity building to farmers and cooperatives. (adaptation-fund.org)
Development Partners (e.g., UNDP, UN Women)	Technical collaboration, policy support, and complementary interventions (especially on gender and climate resilience). (adaptation-fund.org)
Local Authorities & Traditional Leaders (e.g., Paramount Chiefs)	Facilitation of land access, community engagement, and support for local governance and conflict resolution. (adaptation-fund.org)
Project Beneficiary Communities (including women groups)	Participation in consultations, identification of needs, and engagement in implementation and feedback processes. (adaptation-fund.org)

Annex 7.2: Stakeholders Visited in the Field

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA
BRIGHT BUILDING, MAMBA POINT
DEPARTMENT OF COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT

DATE: FEB 23, 2026 **TIME:** 2:00pm **BRIEF PURPOSE OF THE MEETING:**

#	NAME	POSITION	ENTITY/DEP.	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
1.	Z. Elijah Wilapoe	Nat'l Coord	NCCS/Excl.	0886524657	ewilapoe@epa.gov
2.	Gregory N. Morris	C&E	EPA	08864704	g.morris@epa.gov
3.	R. Baiyezenah W. Brown	TG	EPA/C&E	0886536831	rbrown@epa.gov
4.	Edward G. Wingbak	Advisor/Consultant	EPA/C&E	0886576150	edwardgwingbak@epa.gov
5.	Stephen S. Gongehin	Asst. Director	EPA/C&E	0770210989	ssgongehin@epa.gov
6.	James Leviticus Kollie	Asst. Dir. Eng.	MOT/MEI	0777285950	leviticuskollie@gmail.com
7.	Albert M. Sherman	Dir/LMS	LMS/MOT	0886568078	albertmsherman@epa.gov
8.	SIMPSON D.C.L. SNOH	CONSULTANT	NCCS	0777529064	snoh.sdc@epa.gov
9.	Louise M. D. SOKO	Asst. Supervisor	EPA	0775940952	lmdsoko@epa.gov
10.	James Kollie	Instruments Tech.	MDS	0779372755	jkollie@epa.gov
11.	Tinatua Calvin Kollie	Consultant	EPA	0777510627	tkollie@gmail.com
12.	SAMUEL SANKO JAHOSON	INFRASTRUCTURE/IRIGATION ETC.	BCRP-IFAD/MOA	088650008 0775592254	sjahoson@moa.gov
13.	Abdul Daniehs	M&E Officer	BCRP	0888931373	adaniehs@moa.gov
14.	WOLORAH M. SUMO	Tree Crops Officer	BCRP	0776058098	WSumo@moa.gov
15.	Ghemekere N. Keculah	Technical Lead	BCRP/IFAD	0770151691	nkeculah@moa.gov
16.	OLUMIDE AKINSOLA	IFAD-Consultant	IFAD		olumide@moa.gov

17.	Edmund Akoto Danso	Consultant	IFAD		
18.	John K. Jallah Jr	Director	EPA	0888 12 1715	e.akoto-danso@ifad
19.	Desmond T. Thompson	Project Liaison	EPA	0886596220	jallah@epa.gov
20.	Freeman E. Blackie	CATU/Agro	CATU	0866883442	dthompson@epa.gov
21.	Baccus Sayeepeh	Research Officer	EPA/NCCS	0778403141	freemanblackie
22.					baccussayeepeh@epa.gov
23.					
24.					
25.					

Annex 8: Summary of performance data to date (*IFAD requirement for MTR*)⁴

	RATING ON IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS			
Project components/ outcomes	Alignment with AF outcome(s)	Progress to Date at MTR	Expected End	Rating
Component 1: Climate-proofed agricultural production and post-harvest combined with livelihood diversification	Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats	Ontrack: 1. The project has engaged 9,136 beneficiaries, which accounts for 37% of the project's target of 25,000 participants. These beneficiaries have been integrated into various value chains, primarily focusing on cocoa, rice, and vegetables, to diversify their income sources. 2. Specifically, 3,226 individuals, representing 32% of the 10,000 targeted beneficiaries under the cocoa value chain, have been engaged and supplied with production inputs. An additional 1,282 participants are awaiting the distribution of hybrid cocoa seedlings to enhance their production. 3. Within the rice value chain, 4,120 beneficiaries—or 41% of the targeted group—have been engaged. These individuals have been trained and supplied with improved rice seeds to boost their productivity, with ongoing efforts to engage more participants. 4. Overall, 9,136 beneficiaries have been reached with project support to adopt climate-resilient farming practices. 5. A total of 117 cocoa nurseries have been established. Of these, 70 nurseries have already distributed seedlings to farmers, while the remaining 47 nurseries are poised to distribute their seedlings shortly. 6. To further support agricultural production, the project has distributed 1,360,490 improved hybrid cocoa seeds and 8,875 kilograms of improved rice seeds. 7. The project engineering team has successfully assessed four potential sites for developing 40 hectares of integrated vegetable production with solar irrigation systems. 8. In collaboration with the Ministry of Public Works and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a joint assessment was conducted to identify and qualify suitable sites	(1) 60% of farming households in project areas reporting more diversified income sources. (2) 85% farming households in project areas reporting increase in cocoa productivity. (3) 85% of farming households in project areas reporting an increase in rice productivity. (4) 60% of farming households in project areas adopting climate resilient farming practices. (5) 100 rice and cocoa nurseries established. (6) 100 improved cocoa and rice seeds distributed. (7) 40 earth dams constructed.	Satisfactory (S)

⁴ Refer to performance and part I. Logical Framework of IFAD template

		and communities for constructing six community latrines. The assessment also included potential sites for solar irrigation schemes. 9. Additionally, BCRP project engineers, alongside public works and EPA, conducted a joint assessment to identify and verify suitable sites and communities for borehole irrigation systems to serve seven integrated vegetable production sites. 10. To support land development and preparation, the project procured one tractor with implements, including stump removers and grinders, as well as three chainsaws. 11. Successfully procured and distributed 20 sets of rice parboilers (two pieces per set) to 20 BCRP rice mill operators. This initiative is expected to enhance rice production levels and improve livelihoods. 12. The project has distributed 60 power tillers and 25 rice mills to BCRP beneficiaries. The power tillers were allocated to rice and vegetable farmers to enhance their production, while 25 rice milling assets were provided to rice farming groups. Additionally, 120 technicians were trained on the maintenance and usage of the rice mills and power tillers. 13. An assessment for the rehabilitation or construction of six mini warehouses has been completed. 14. Successfully procured and distributed 20 tricycles. 15. Six fish farms have been established across five communities, with the construction and setup of fish production sites including materials and technical support. 16. A total of 36,618 fingerlings have been distributed to the six fish farms, along with 16,917.62 kilograms of feed intended to last for six months. 17. A poultry farm has been established for women affected by war. Initial supplies, including feed, feeders, and medication, have been provided along with 500 birds.		
Component 2: Climate-resilient rural transportation and water infrastructure	Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socioeconomic and environmental losses	Ontrack: (1) In collaboration with the Ministry of Public Works and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), a joint assessment was carried out to identify and qualify suitable sites and communities for the development of water supply and sanitation infrastructure. This initiative includes the construction of four solar-powered water supply irrigation systems in four farming communities, aimed at providing access to safe drinking water. Additionally, an assessment was also carried for six flush community latrines which will be constructed in six farming communities to ensure access to safe and hygienic sanitation facilities.	(1) The project is targeting 4000 farming households to have access to a portable water supply. (2) 120 km of feeder roads to be climate proofed through critical spots improvement. (3) 1,000 ha. of land irrigated with earth dams. (4) 100 warehouses rehabilitated. (5) 60% of farming households in project areas adopting sustainable irrigation practices	Marginally Satisfactory (MS)

Component 3: Institutional capacity building and policy engagement	Outcome 3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of climate risk adaptation and reduction processes at the local level	Ontrack: Component 3 focuses on enhancing institutional capacities and engaging in policy development for climate adaptation. Despite administrative challenges that delayed many planned activities, significant progress was made in Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E). The M&E team effectively developed data collection tools, strengthening the project's capacity to track progress and evaluate impacts. These efforts have ensured consistent evaluation of adaptation activities, enabling timely adjustments. Although initiatives to strengthen the Meteorological Department and improve policy frameworks were hindered, the advancements in M&E have laid a strong foundation for future implementation and adaptation efforts.	(1) 2 technicians of EPA/ MOA trained by PY1, 2 meteorologist trained by PY3, 24 staff trained (12 by PY1 and 12 by PY3). (2) At least 1 sectorial policy integrating climate change risk.	Unsatisfactory (U)
---	--	--	---	---------------------------

Annex 9: ESP and GP Compliance

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL POLICY COMPLIANCE				
SECTION 1: IDENTIFIED ESP RISKS MANAGEMENT				
Was the ESP risks identification complete at the time of funding approval? [1]		☒ Yes, all project/programme activities had been formulated to the level where effective risks identification is possible ☐ No, the project/programme includes Unidentified Sub-Projects (USPs) (also complete Section 5)		
ESP principle [2]	Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (ILL for REG) of the proposal? [3]	During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/ILL.) [4]	List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/ILL.)	List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity. [5]
1 - Compliance with the law	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No		
2 - Access and equity	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	Elite capture and Biasness in allocating project benefits; Lack of interest to participate in project activities.	By design, the project has focused on the most vulnerable group of populations to climate change mainly youth, women. This in itself is a mitigation measure. Furthermore, beneficiaries have been disaggregated by gender during the design through IFAD targeting approach. The profile intends to produce socio, economic profile, which will assist in identifying the households towards which project activities support should be prioritized within the poor and vulnerable communities. Households and individuals will be sensitized towards the approach of prioritizing project support to most vulnerable households while ensuring benefits trickle down to all
3 - Marginalized and vulnerable Groups	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No		
4 - Human rights	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No		
5 - Gender equality and women's empowerment	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	Inequitable representation of women in decision making process; identification, planning and implementation of activities. Lack of confidence of women to participate in project activities.	Gender focus activities will also include creating awareness in the community at large to acknowledge women for their contribution as an income generating individual in the household to create their value in the community and promote equitable. Fair and equitable selection of beneficiaries will be done for capacity building along the selected value chains. A list of all the participants will be maintained and gender ratio will be monitored by the PMU on a quarterly basis.
6 - Core labour rights	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No		
7 - Indigenous peoples	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No		
8 - Involuntary resettlement	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No		
9 - Protection of natural habitats	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	Eco entrepreneurs may implement initiatives such as ecotourism, rural alternative energy (biogas plants, solar) in agroforestry, NTFP and livestock value chain development, which may cause negative impacts on the biophysical environment, including natural habitats, i.e. spread of diseases, overexploitation of NTFP.	The project promotes sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of natural habitats as part of the requirements for funding. This includes shifting from unsustainable practices including traditional slash-and burn agriculture practices, and deforestation, and promotion of water-saving irrigation techniques to limit runoff and soil erosion in the project area. Through a risk screening system, the grant mechanism will ensure that funded subprojects (USPs) do not include activities with medium to high risks of deteriorating the integrity of semi- or all-natural habitats. For subprojects with an identified low risk, proper advice and capacity building support will be provided on areas such as sustainable exploitation of forest and low land productions.
10 - Conservation of biological diversity	☒ Yes ☒ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	Fire, in areas of the project which are not under including virgin forest	Capacity building activities and the early warning systems to be put in place under components 2 and 3 will help minimize those risks.
11 - Climate change	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	CO2 emissions and unsustainable agriculture	The project itself promotes adaptation and mitigation practices. All interventions proposed aim at building climate resilience while promoting low emission agriculture (cocoa, rice).
12 - Pollution prevention and resource efficiency	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	Polluting of the cocoa and rice production	Capacity building and Community will be sensitized for disposal of pesticides and any pollutant used in the two value chains
13 - Public health	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	Water borne diseases and dust particles from road construction	Capacity building and Community will be sensitized on health and safety standards with the promotion of personal protective equipment (PPE)
14 - Physical and cultural heritage	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	Loss and Disturbance of Cultural Resources such as sacred forest and archeological site	Projects located in or around sacred forests, community groves and archaeological sites will not be approved
15 - Lands and soil conservation	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	Deforestation and upland crop production might affect soil quality and conservation, as well as flooding, water logging, soil salinization and alkalization. .	Strongly discourage new and cocoa plantation in and around virgin forest and forest regrowth areas Strong emphasis to be placed on rehabilitation of existing and abandoned cocoa plantations Limit approval cocoa plantations to already degraded land/degraded secondary bush areas or deforested areas Strengthen participation in the processing and marketing value chains to create more jobs especially for women Strengthen partnership with the forestry department to train farmers in sustainable agroforestry Carry out regular mapping of plot sites and monitoring of land use and forest cover by third party contractors. Discourage opening of new virgin forests and coastal mangrove wetland.

GENDER POLICY COMPLIANCE					
SECTION 1: QUALITY AT ENTRY <i>[to be completed only at PPR1]</i>					
Was an initial gender assessment conducted during the preparation of the project/programme's first submission as a full proposal?			YES		
Does the results framework include gender-responsive indicators broken down at the different levels (objective, outcome, output)?			YES		
List the gender-responsive elements that were incorporated in the project/programme results framework					
Gender-responsive element [1]	Level [2]	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Rated result for the reporting period (poor, satisfactory, good)
Equal benefits for All	Output	Number of Female Household headed beneficiaries that has access to project resources	0	10 000.00	Satisfactory The project achieved approximately 40.7% of the target, reaching 4,069 female beneficiaries. While progress is evident, additional efforts are required to meet the target by project completion.
SECTION 2: QUALITY DURING IMPLEMENTATION AND AT EXIT <i>[to be completed at final PPR]</i>					
List gender equality and women's empowerment issues encountered during implementation of the project/programme. For each gender equality and women's empowerment issue describe the progress that was made as well as the results. [3]					
Gender equality and women's empowerment issues [4]			Rated result for the reporting period (poor, satisfactory, good)		
Women's participation in project activities has improved significantly (around 45% of beneficiaries), with increased access to training, climate-resilient practices, and livelihood support, contributing to enhanced skills, confidence, and engagement in productive and community activities. However, despite this progress, there are significant gaps in monitoring and reporting of gender outcomes, including limited use of gender-disaggregated data and insufficient evidence on women's empowerment, equitable benefit distribution, and long-term gender impacts.			Satisfactory		
SECTION 3: IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS					
What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP			The Gender Unit of the PIU supported the Ministry of Agriculture by providing training to some of its field staff. Through the Farmer Field School (FFS), 94 lead farmers received sensitization training on basic gender concepts and principles, an introduction to the tools used in the Gender Action Learning System (GALS), child labor issues, and land rights. These trained farmers are expected to cascade the knowledge to at least four additional farmers and conduct follow-up visits. The Gender Unit at the Project Implementation Unit is responsible for implementing all gender-related policies, including the Gender Action Plan, GALS, and others. It is staffed by a Gender Officer dedicated to overseeing the implementation and mainstreaming of gender activities. Additionally, the Gender Unit made follow-up visits to four farmers who had previously undergone a Training of Trainers (TOT) session on the introduction to basic GALS tools to assess their level of engagement with members of the Kuu group. Additionally, during the reporting period, the Gender Unit of the PIU conducted a review of the implementation targeting and social inclusion strategy; an effort intended to ensure the implementation of meets required targets in the PDR. An analysis of the targets reached thus far in the lifespan of the BCRP indicates that the target of 25,000 will very likely not be reached by the end of the project lifespan. At this time the enrollment stands at 37%, so we could project that working very hard the best reach of the BCRP could be 55% to 60% by the end of the project. Quality service delivery which is a function of targeting to the eight (8) project districts by four (4) dedicated field staff, when compared to other projects that have up to nine (9) staff have the potential of compromising the quality of services being delivered because the staff are overstretched with no field assistants like young professionals as it is in other MOA/IFAD supported projects; and there seems like no possible solution in sight.		
Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period?			YES		
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP? [5]			The gender strategies have been developed with strong action plans aligned to components which have been rolled-out and follow-up actions is done regularly by the gender and targeting unit and community GALS champions. The gender compliance was instituted in the grant manual developed by the PIU as one of the key requirements by partners and beneficiaries to access grant. Additionally, gender has been incorporated as a component of the FFS training syllabus. The project has put in place tracking system to be able to capture how and to what extent targeted groups are participating and benefiting. Project uses sex and age disaggregated indicators to find out the participation of different categories of people in project activities. The executing entity has set a minimum gender representation to settle for 40% versus 60% of either sex. Further, during the reporting period, the Gender unit conducted field visits to project sites and interacted with beneficiaries to assess gender and social inclusion in the implementation of project activities.		
Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period? [5]			Yes. Because of the development and implementation of the aforementioned framework		
Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?			NO		
SECTION 4: GRIEVANCES					
Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to gender equality and women's empowerment? <i>[to be completed at PPR1]</i>			☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially		
List all grievances received through the grievance mechanism during the reporting period regarding gender-related matters of project/programme activities [6]			For each grievance, provide information on the grievance redress process used and the status/outcome		
NO GRIEVANCE RECEIVED SO FAR					
No staff, beneficiary (both direct and indirect) or service provided complained in anyway of gender related issues.			A Grievance Redress Mechanism is being strengthened to ensure increased reach and accessibility for all stakeholders across sectors. This time hotlines and designated phone and email contacts are being incorporated for circulation		

1. Background and Sustainability Concern

Mid-term field discussions with rice farmers revealed a structural sustainability gap within rehabilitated IVS schemes. While NERICA 19 is an open-pollinated variety (OPV) that can be replanted for 2–3 seasons under farmer conditions, periodic renewal with certified seed remains necessary to preserve yield potential and varietal integrity. Currently, no structured seed renewal mechanism exists at cooperative level. In addition, farmers are not formally linked to certified seed producers or accredited input suppliers, and no revolving fund or market-based financing arrangement is in place to ensure sustained access to quality seed and agricultural inputs. Without corrective measures, this institutional and financial gap could progressively erode productivity gains achieved through IVS rehabilitation and compromise the long-term economic return on infrastructure investments.

2. Economic Justification and Impact

The economic viability of IVS rehabilitation under BCRP is based on sustained yield increases and stable input use. Empirical evidence from AfricaRice and FAO seed system guidance indicates that uncontrolled recycling of OPVs beyond three seasons can lead to significant yield reductions per cycle due to genetic degeneration and quality loss. Even a conservative 10% yield decline across rehabilitated areas would reduce marketed surplus, weaken cooperative capital formation, and negatively affect the project's Economic Rate of Return (ERR). Given that infrastructure costs are front-loaded while benefits accrue over time, maintaining productivity through structured seed and input renewal is essential to safeguard the projected ERR and protect the long-term development impact of the investment.

3. Proposed Institutional Adjustment Framework

The MTR recommends institutionalizing the following measures:

- Cooperative-level seed renewal planning (2–3 season renewal cycle).
- Establishment of Rice Seed and Input Revolving Funds.
- Formalized market-based linkages with certified seed and input suppliers.
- Gradual transition away from subsidy-dependent input distribution.

4. Rice Seed and Input Reconstitution Mechanism

Each supported cooperative should establish a Rice Seed and Input Revolving Fund financed through structured deductions from collective paddy marketing, margins from Quality Declared Seed (QDS) sales, and membership contributions. The fund would finance annual certified seed procurement, bulk fertilizer purchases, and minor infrastructure maintenance. The PIU should facilitate structured agreements between cooperatives and certified seed producers and agro-dealers, including seasonal demand forecasting, aggregated procurement, and framework contracts. Peer-learning workshops and exchange visits should be organized to disseminate good practices from high-performing cooperatives.

4. Rice Seed and Input Renewal Mechanism

It is important for each supported cooperative to establish a Rice Seed and Input Revolving Fund financed through structured deductions from collective paddy marketing, margins from QDS sales, and membership contributions. The fund would finance annual certified seed procurement, bulk fertilizer purchases, and minor infrastructure maintenance. The PIU must facilitate structured agreements between cooperatives and certified seed producers and agro-dealers, including seasonal demand forecasting, aggregated procurement, and framework contracts. Peer-learning workshops and exchange visits should be organized to disseminate good practices from high-performing cooperatives.

5. Implementation Roadmap (Remaining 24 Months)

Phase 1 – Institutional Structuring (Months 1–6)

The first phase will focus on establishing the institutional, technical and financial foundations required to operationalize a sustainable seed and input renewal mechanism at cooperative level.

Training Cooperatives on Seed Renewal Cycles and Financial Planning:

this activity aims at strengthening cooperative capacity to plan and manage periodic seed renewal and input financing beyond project support. The training sessions will be organized at cluster level for cooperative leaders, extension agents and lead farmers. Each cooperative will nominate 3 or 4 representatives (chairperson, treasurer, lead farmer, and marketing officer).

The training modules will cover:

- Agronomic principles of seed renewal for OPV rice varieties (NERICA 19 renewal every 2–3 seasons).
- Risks associated with uncontrolled seed recycling (yield decline, varietal contamination).
- Estimation of seed requirements per hectare.
- Basic cooperative financial management principles.
- Introduction to revolving fund mechanisms.
- Calculation of seed and input financing needs based on production levels.
- Collective marketing models that allow structured fund capitalization.

Development of Cooperative-Level Seed Renewal Plans: The objective is to establish clear and predictable seed renewal schedules for each cooperative.

Following the training sessions, each cooperative will prepare a three-year seed renewal plan with technical support from extension agents.

The plan will include:

- Total IVS area cultivated by cooperative members.
- Seed requirement per hectare.
- Estimated certified seed demand for renewal years.
- Planned financing sources (revolving fund, member contributions, partial project support).
- Procurement timeline aligned with the cropping calendar.

A standardized Seed Renewal Planning Template will be developed by the PIU and used across all cooperatives to ensure consistency.

Mapping Certified Seed Suppliers and Agro-Dealers: The objective is to ensure that cooperatives have reliable access to certified seed and agricultural inputs through existing market actors. The PIU will conduct a rapid mapping exercise to identify the certified seed producers (including national seed institutions and private seed enterprises), the agro-dealers supplying fertilizer, pesticides and basic crop protection inputs, the existing distribution networks operating within or near project counties.

During this mapping the, the PIU will assess the supply capacity and the reliability of the agro-dealers, the distance from IVS production areas, the seasonal availability of inputs and the price structures and payment conditions. The results will be compiled into a Supplier Directory accessible to cooperatives and extension services.

4. Development of Revolving Fund Operational Guidelines: Provide cooperatives with a clear governance framework for managing seed and input financing mechanisms.

The PIU will develop simplified operational guidelines for the Rice Seed and Input Revolving Fund.

The guidelines will define:

- Sources of fund capitalization (marketing deductions, member contributions).
- Recommended deduction rates from collective sales.
- Financial management procedures.
- Transparency and accountability mechanisms.
- Rules for seed and input procurement using the fund.
- Annual reporting requirements.

The guidelines will be discussed and validated during cooperative assemblies to ensure ownership.

Expected results of phase 1:

At the end of the first six months:

- Cooperatives will understand the agronomic necessity of seed renewal. Seed demand will be forecasted through formal planning tools. Market linkages with suppliers will be identified. Governance rules for revolving funds will be established. These institutional foundations will enable the effective implementation of the financial and operational mechanisms planned for Phase 2.

Phase 2 – Financial Mechanism Activation (Months 7–15)

Following the institutional groundwork established in Phase 1, Phase 2 will focus on operationalizing the seed and input sustainability mechanism through the establishment of cooperative revolving funds, structured supplier partnerships, and the first cycle of partially self-financed seed procurement.

1. Establishment of Rice Seed and Input Revolving Funds: it aims at operationalizing cooperative-level financial mechanisms to ensure sustained access to certified seed and agricultural inputs beyond project support. Each cooperative will establish a Rice Seed and Input Revolving Fund managed under the governance framework developed during Phase 1.

The fund will be capitalized through:

- A structured deduction from collective paddy marketing.
- Initial seed capital where applicable (project facilitation or cooperative contributions).
- Margins generated from group-based input procurement.

Funds will be deposited in cooperative bank or mobile money accounts under transparent governance arrangements requiring at least two signatories.

The revolving fund will finance the procurement of certified seed during renewal seasons, the

bulk purchase of fertilizers and crop protection inputs.

2. Introduction of Structured Marketing Deduction Mechanism: it aims at ensuring predictable and sustainable capitalization of cooperative revolving funds. A fixed percentage deduction will be applied during cooperative-managed rice marketing operations. The deduction will occur at the point of sale before final payment to members.

An example of structure: 5–7% deduction from gross sales and funds transferred automatically to the revolving fund account.

Cooperatives will receive technical support to:

- Establish transparent accounting systems.
- Record deductions and fund allocations.
- Report financial status to members during regular meetings.

3. Establishment of Supplier Framework Agreements: Secure reliable and timely access to certified seed and agricultural inputs. The PIU will facilitate structured partnerships between cooperatives and certified suppliers identified during Phase 1.

Framework agreements will define:

- Expected annual seed demand.
- Supply volumes and delivery schedules.
- Quality certification requirements.
- Price conditions for bulk procurement.
- Payment modalities (advance or deferred where feasible).

The agreements will reduce market uncertainty for both cooperatives and suppliers.

In addition, agro dealers will be encouraged to operate seasonal distribution points near IVS production zones during planting periods.

4. Pilot of Partially Self-Financed Seed Procurement Cycle: Test the functionality of the revolving fund mechanism before the project exit phase. During this phase, cooperatives will finance a portion of certified seed procurement

using accumulated revolving funds, while the project may still provide partial support depending on available resources.

The pilot will involve:

- Selection of cooperatives with sufficient fund capitalization.
- Procurement of certified seed using revolving fund resources.
- Distribution of seed to cooperative members according to the renewal plans developed in Phase 1.

The PIU will monitor the fund utilization, the procurement efficiency and member satisfaction and compliance with seed renewal plans.

Expected Results of Phase 2

- Functional revolving funds operational within cooperatives.
- Structured marketing deductions generating sustainable capitalization.
- Formal linkages established between cooperatives and certified suppliers.
- First cycle of partially self-financed seed procurement successfully implemented.

These outcomes will lay the foundation for the final transition phase toward full cooperative financial autonomy.

Phase 3 – System Consolidation and Subsidy Transition (Months 16–24)

The final phase will focus on consolidating the operational sustainability of the seed and input system while progressively transitioning cooperatives toward financial autonomy. This phase will also reinforce governance mechanisms, peer learning, and monitoring systems to ensure that seed renewal and input procurement mechanisms remain functional after project completion.

2. Monitoring Compliance with Seed Renewal Protocols: Ensure that cooperatives respect agreed seed renewal cycles and maintain varietal purity. The PIU, in collaboration with extension services, will establish a simple monitoring system to track compliance with seed renewal plans.

Key monitoring indicators will include:

- Area cultivated with certified seed.
- Frequency of varietal renewal.
- Seed procurement volumes through certified suppliers.
- Cooperative fund utilization for seed purchases.

Field verification visits will be conducted during planting periods to confirm compliance.

Monitoring results will be discussed during cooperative meetings and used to adjust technical support where needed.

3. Peer Learning and Exchange Visits: Promote knowledge transfer and strengthen cooperative capacity through experience sharing. Exchange visits and learning workshops will be organized among cooperatives to share practical experiences on revolving fund management, seed renewal planning, Input procurement strategies and collective marketing mechanisms.

High-performing cooperatives demonstrating strong financial management and effective seed renewal practices will serve as learning hubs. These peer-learning

platforms have proven effective in strengthening institutional sustainability in similar IFAD-supported projects.

4. Governance Strengthening and Financial Transparency: Ensure long-term sustainability of cooperative financial mechanisms. The PIU will introduce light governance reinforcement measures including training on cooperative financial management and reporting, Standardized record-keeping templates for revolving fund management and Periodic internal financial reviews during cooperative assemblies.

Where feasible, simplified annual financial reviews will be conducted with the support of extension agents or partner institutions.

The Transparency mechanisms will include the Public presentation of revolving fund balances.

Documentation of seed and input procurement transactions.

Expected Results of Phase 3

By the end of Month 24:

- Cooperatives finance the majority of certified seed procurement.
- Structured supplier relationships remain functional.
- Seed renewal protocols are institutionalized.
- Governance and financial transparency mechanisms are in place.

These outcomes will enable the rice seed and input system to continue functioning sustainably beyond project completion.

Conclusion

The MTR confirms that while BCRP has achieved significant productivity gains through IVS rehabilitation, their sustainability remains at risk in the absence of structured seed renewal and input financing mechanisms. Without corrective measures, yield decline could undermine both farmer incomes and the economic returns of the investment. The proposed approach combining cooperative-level seed renewal planning, revolving fund mechanisms, and market-based input linkages offers a financially viable and operationally feasible solution. This transition is critical to sustain productivity, reduce dependency on subsidies, and protect the project's ERR over time.

References

- **AfricaRice.** Manuals and field guides. Available at: <https://www.africarice.org/manuals-field-guide>
- **AGRA / FAO.** *FAO Seed Toolkit*. Available at: <https://cessa.agra.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/FAO-Seed-Toolkit.pdf>
- **FAO.** *Seeds Toolkit – Module 3*. Available at: <https://openknowledge.fao.org/handle/20.500.14283/ca1492en>
- **FAO.** *Sustainable seed systems*. Available at: <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/cb74534a-059e-4255-8810-a815060cd1b6/content>
- **FAO.** *Seed production and handling manual for community-based seed producers and inspectors*. Available at: <https://openknowledge.fao.org/bitstreams/a7580101-ce19-428e-977d-b3ad2b2477e0/download>

Annex 10: Bibliography /Reference list

1. AF-TERG, [2022]. Draft guidance note, Mid-Term Review Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund -AFTERG-AFB/EFC.31/8/Add.8. Adaptation Fund Technical Evaluation Reference Group (AFTERG), Washington, DC.
 2. Liberia Tree Crop Extension Project (TCEP-II) Building Climate Resilience in the Rice and Cocoa Sector project (BCRP) Supervision report - Mission dates: October 06– 17, 2025
-

Annex 11: Pictures (selected) from the mission

