

Economic and financial analysis (EFA)

Table of contents

1. Overview of the Economic and Financial analysis	3
2. EFA Assumptions and results	3
2.1. Introduction	3
2.2. Results by investment type	6
3. Sensitivity Analysis	7
3.1. Sensitivity analysis on costs and benefits	7
4. Climate mitigation assessment	9
Annex I: Description of the investments analyzed, and assumptions.	10
Annex II: Numerical assumptions for the economic and financial analysis	20
Bibliography	31

List of tables

Table 1: Summary of results – overall economic analysis	4
Table 2: Summary of results – Results per investment type	6
Table 3: Result of the overall sensitivity analysis	8
Table 4: Climate mitigation potential of selected ITs in 20 years	9
Table 6: IT1 Improved drainage network – Summary of benefits	21
Table 7: IT2 Construct irrigation schemes using improved technologies - – Summary of benefits	22
Table 8: IT3 Installation of de-silting systems - – Summary of benefits	23
Table 9: IT4 Landscape restoration and reforestation (anti erosion) - – Summary of benefits	24
Table 10: IT5 Water tanks for micro irrigation - – Summary of benefits	25
Table 11: IT6 Rehabilitation of irrigation perimeters - – Summary of benefits	26
Table 12: IT7 Construction of ridge ditches for improved drainage - – Summary of benefits	27
Table 13: IT8 Runoff water collection - – Summary of benefits	28
Table 14: IT9 Paving or encroachment - – Summary of benefits	29
Table 15: IT10 Storage infrastructure for road construction and rehabilitation - – Summary of benefits	30

Glossary

BCR	Benefits cost ratio
CBA	Cost-Benefit Analysis
CO2	Carbon dioxide
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GHG	Greenhouse gas
Ha	Hectare
IRR	Internal rate of return
IT	Investment
Kg	Kilogram
Km	Kilometer
L	Liter
m3	Cubic meter
NPV	Net present value
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
SCC	Social cost of Carbon
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
tCO2eq	Tons of CO2 equivalent
USD	United States dollar

1. Overview of the Economic and Financial analysis

The economic and financial analysis (EFA) of ten investments (called ITs) has been carried by pursuing a Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) modeling.

Whenever justified, the CBA was pursued in financial and economic terms.¹ The CBA's *financial part* shows whether the investment is financially profitable over an assumed time frame and chosen discount rate of 8.5%. The *economic part* of the CBA shows if proposed interventions are economically sustainable and beneficial for the entire economy and a society. The economic analysis in all cases was pursued over the same timeframe of 20 years, using an economic discount rate of 6% (this value has been retrieved from the World Bank (2019)).

The ten interventions also known as investments that were analyzed are: (IT1) improved drainage networks, (IT2) irrigation schemes, (IT3) de-silting systems, (IT4) landscape restoration, (IT5) water tanks, (IT6) irrigation parameters, (IT7) ridge ditches, (IT8) runoff collection, (IT9) road improved drainage and reinforcement during the rehabilitation, (IT10) road storage infrastructure.

While the economic analysis was performed for all investments, the financial analysis was pursued for six investments only. This is because four investments (IT7, IT8, IT9 and IT10) do not generate financial inflows for intended beneficiaries.

Finally, concerning GHG co-benefits, IT2 considers avoided emissions from motor pumps, while investments IT3, IT4, IT5 and IT6 consider carbon sequestration from improved agricultural practices. The economic valuation of GHG emissions was performed using a shadow price retrieved from the World Bank. The main text of the report presents results that use the low estimate, while section 3.2 also presents the economic results when using the higher shadow price.

The main assumption for the climate models is the RCP 4.5 emissions scenario. Further details are provided in Annex 2.b of the Funding Proposal.

2. EFA Assumptions and results

2.1. Introduction

The following assumptions were used in the modeling process:

- The discount rate of 8.5% has been adopted for the financial analysis, and 6% for the economic analysis.
- The estimation of investment costs for each investment type is as follows:
 - Each investment typology has been aligned to the project budget to reflect the exact amount allocated to that will be spent on different investments. The project implementation will cover 6 years; however, some project activities like construction will take 5 years. The annual spread of the physical targets in the EFA is also in line with the project budget plan. The total budget for the entire project is then included in the overall economic analysis for the 10 investment types to assess the overall economic performance indicators.
 - While including the total project costs in the overall assessment, costs already included in each investment typology have been deducted to avoid double counting of costs.

¹If proposed intervention was income generating, the financial analysis was pursued and was followed by the economic analysis. For non-income generating interventions, only economic analysis was carried forward as there were no financial inflows or outflows to justify the financial part.

- We assume that the proposed project covers the capital cost of the investments analyzed, for the 6 years of implementation. Additional investment is required for operation and maintenance, and for the years of lifetime of the investment, past the 6-year duration of the project.

The implementation time of the investment is 6 years, but the lifetime of the investment stretches beyond the implementation time of the project.

The results of the economic and financial analyses consider the following crops: Vanilla, Maize, Rice, Onion and Cassava. The crop models have been considered in all ITs from IT1 to IT10 with the exception of IT9 (road resurfacing or encroachment). Maize, rice and cassava are all food security crops at the household level. Yield improvements are anticipated for all crops as a result of increased dissemination and adoption of drought tolerant (early maturing) varieties as well improved agricultural practices.

Methods used in crop models: It is worth noting that the analysis has used crop models to derive benefits expected from the project investment. The method is based on the activity and individual household models which simulate the implementation of farming practices for crops grown in the target area. The activity models simulate the financial budget and estimate the performance indicators namely; net present value (NPV) and economic rate of return (ERR) that are the instruments for assessing the impact of project intervention on economic activities.

Without Project (WOP) and With Project (WP) Scenarios in crop models: The WOP models are representative of the current situation where farmers do not have access to suitable technologies, improved agricultural practices & inputs, and yields are below the potential. The WP scenario simulates the impact of the project investments. In such scenario, beneficiaries will adopt improved agricultural practices, including irrigation, and improved inputs such as fertilizers, basic seeds, and other materials (plough, cultivators, weeders etc.). Therefore, the incremental benefits used to assess the project effectiveness have been computed as a difference between the with-project (WP) and the without project gross margins.

Data Source: The secondary data used in the models i.e., yields were adopted from a credible source (FAO2) a UN agency which provides access to food and agricultural statistics.

Overall, the results show that the investments are economically viable, when considering both the economic and financial performance of the investment. It is also worth noting that the size of the positive externalities generated (and included in the economic assessment) is at times larger than the revenues generated by the project. This highlights the importance of considering the societal outcomes of the investment in addition to the direct economic benefits it generates (i.e., comparing the economic and financial performance of the investment).

Specifically, the total investment available for the project and considered for the overall economic and financial analysis is USD 150.8 million. When considering the overall project investment costs and agricultural/farm operating costs, the project generates a baseline Economic Internal Rate of Return (E-IRR) of 24%, and Economic Net Present Value (E-NPV) of USD 255.5 million. The Financial Internal Rate of Return (F-IRR) for the whole project investment is estimated at 19% with a Financial Net Present Value (F-NPV) of USD 31.07 million.

Table 1: Summary of results – overall economic analysis

² <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL>

Overall Economic Incremental Benefits (IT1-IT10)		2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028+
<i>Costs in US\$ '000</i>							
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 1	USD	\$ (3,279)	\$ (3,082)	\$ (1,727)	\$ 3,622	\$ 4,771	\$ 5,747
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 2	USD	\$ (4,455)	\$ (3,982)	\$ (1,800)	\$ 6,275	\$ 8,153	\$ 9,394
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 3	USD	\$ (853)	\$ (803)	\$ (271)	\$ 1,116	\$ 1,439	\$ 1,613
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 4	USD	\$ (4,022)	\$ (3,868)	\$ (2,177)	\$ 4,819	\$ 6,238	\$ 7,094
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 5	USD	\$ (114)	\$ (958)	\$ (1,386)	\$ (497)	\$ 459	\$ 459
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 6	USD	\$ (7,482)	\$ (7,133)	\$ (3,695)	\$ 10,396	\$ 13,286	\$ 14,450
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 7	USD	\$ (366)	\$ (230)	\$ 55	\$ 605	\$ 825	\$ 1,100
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 8	USD	\$ (27)	\$ (21)	\$ (8)	\$ 31	\$ 43	\$ 43
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 9	USD	\$ 1,132	\$ 2,401	\$ 3,686	\$ 4,972	\$ 6,258	\$ 6,429
Net Incremental Benefits - IT 10	USD	\$ (267)	\$ (194)	\$ (86)	\$ 139	\$ 241	\$ 342
Total Incremental Benefits		\$ (19,733)	\$ (17,871)	\$ (7,408)	\$ 31,478	\$ 41,713	\$ 46,673
Project Costs							
GCF	USD	\$ 3,961	\$ 12,285	\$ 12,665	\$ 10,744	\$ 8,317	\$ 5,889
IFAD	USD	\$ 16,333	\$ 17,131	\$ 16,850	\$ 16,270	\$ 16,814	\$ 13,588
Total Project Costs	USD	\$ 20,295	\$ 29,416	\$ 29,515	\$ 27,015	\$ 25,131	\$ 19,476
Costs already included in the models to avoid double counting	USD	\$ 3,612	\$ 8,455	\$ 8,635	\$ 7,360	\$ 5,772	\$ 1,591
Net project costs after deducting costs included in models	USD	\$ 16,683	\$ 20,961	\$ 20,880	\$ 19,655	\$ 19,359	\$ 17,885
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ (36,416)	\$ (38,832)	\$ (28,288)	\$ 11,823	\$ 22,354	\$ 28,788
Discount Rate		6%					
ENPV		255,526					
ERR		24%					
EMIRR		11%					

Overall, the analysis shows positive economic and financial outcomes from investments in water and road management with the goal to improve climate resilience.

It is worth noting that the only investments for which we did not calculate financial indicators are IT7, IT8, IT9 and IT10 (road-related investments), since they do not generate direct cash inflows. However, these investments generate considerable economic value (i.e., positive externalities). Specifically, these are investments in improved climate resilience for existing roads. They improve access to markets for farmers. On the other hand, since these are not toll roads, there is no direct benefit generated for the investor, hence the focus on the economic rather than on the financial analysis.

2.2. Results by investment type

Table 2: Summary of results – Results per investment type

	Total investment	Revenues generated	Value of externalities	ENPV	FNPV	EIRR	FIRR	E-Benefit to cost ratio	F-Benefit to cost ratio	E-Payback Period (Years)	F-Payback Period (Years)	Debt Service Coverage Ratio
IT1	\$ 4,880,000	\$ 488,919,105	\$ 15,042,600	\$ 40,859,197	\$ 24,250,903	40%	33%	1.2	1.17	4.95	5.44	8.90
IT2	\$ 6,201,000	\$ 727,772,089	\$ 28,610,033	\$ 69,979,425	\$ 38,564,851	47%	36%	1.2	1.18	5.55	5.19	8.88
IT3	\$ 872,500	\$ 137,472,857	\$ 4,303,171	\$ 11,921,717	\$ 6,263,986	44%	33%	1.2	1.15	4.92	5.90	1.21
IT4	\$ 4,283,615	\$ 630,517,226	\$ 1,271,376	\$ 50,901,433	\$ 25,179,757	40%	29%	1.2	1.14	4.97	5.96	8.52
IT5	\$ 3,460,551	\$ 27,232,269	\$ 106,962	\$ 1,157,864	\$ 138,251	11%	9%	1.2	1.15	6.93	11.33	9.54
IT6	\$ 5,821,596	\$ 1,274,774,600	\$ 10,844,972	\$ 106,522,557	\$ 56,344,122	44%	33%	1.2	1.15	4.63	5.36	7.94
IT7	\$ 1,377,500	\$ 53,587,041	\$ 12,361,981	\$ 8,577,576	Not Calculated	64%	Not Calculated	1.5	Not Calculated	5.24	Not Calculated	Not Calculated
IT8	\$ 80,000	\$ 3,768,330	\$ 483,918	\$ 442,702	Not Calculated	46%	Not Calculated	1.3	Not Calculated	4.95	Not Calculated	Not Calculated
IT9	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 123,782,634	\$ 123,406,720	\$ 63,466,963	Not Calculated	-	Not Calculated	50.2	Not Calculated	2.13	Not Calculated	Not Calculated
IT10	\$ 1,607,800	\$ 23,752,840	\$ 7,503,067	\$ 4,542,077	Not Calculated	40%	Not Calculated	1.6	Not Calculated	6.32	Not Calculated	Not Calculated

3. Sensitivity Analysis

The sensitivity analysis for the entire project investment is presented in this section. The sensitivity analysis is carried out to test the robustness of the overall project investment and measure variations due to unforeseen factors and relevant risks.

Sensitivity analysis has also been carried out around the carbon pricing using both low and high shadow prices.

3.1. Sensitivity analysis on costs and benefits

The sensitivity analysis presented in this section takes into account 3 scenarios; (i) change in benefits, (ii) change in costs and (iii) delayed implementation.

A change in project benefits by 20 per cent increase in costs and decrease in benefits using the same proportion yields an ERR of 22 per cent and 21 per cent with a positive NPV of US\$235.4 million and US\$184.3 million respectively. An increase in project benefits by 10 per cent or 20 per cent yields a higher of 26 percent & 27 per cent respectively both with positive NPV. A delay in project benefits by 1 & 2 years still yields positive results as it yields 21 per cent and 19 per cent both scenarios posting positive net present values. Results of the sensitivity analysis indicate that the project remains economically viable under the various assumptions considered. The summary of the sensitivity analysis is presented in the table below.

Table 3: Result of the overall sensitivity analysis

Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-20.
Incremental Benefits	\$ (19,733)	\$ (17,871)	\$ (7,408)	\$ 31,478	\$ 41,713	\$ 46,673	\$ 46,957	\$ 46,957	\$ 46,957	\$ 46,957	\$ 46,957
benefits +10%	\$ (21,707)	\$ (19,658)	\$ (8,149)	\$ 34,626	\$ 45,884	\$ 51,340	\$ 51,652	\$ 51,652	\$ 51,652	\$ 51,652	\$ 51,652
benefits +20%	\$ (23,680)	\$ (21,445)	\$ (8,889)	\$ 37,773	\$ 50,055	\$ 56,007	\$ 56,348	\$ 56,348	\$ 56,348	\$ 56,348	\$ 56,348
Mild scenario	\$ (17,760)	\$ (16,084)	\$ (6,667)	\$ 28,330	\$ 37,541	\$ 42,006	\$ 42,261	\$ 42,261	\$ 42,261	\$ 42,261	\$ 42,261
Medium scenario	\$ (15,787)	\$ (14,297)	\$ (5,926)	\$ 25,182	\$ 33,370	\$ 37,338	\$ 37,565	\$ 37,565	\$ 37,565	\$ 37,565	\$ 37,565
High scenario	\$ (13,813)	\$ (12,510)	\$ (5,185)	\$ 22,034	\$ 29,199	\$ 32,671	\$ 32,870	\$ 32,870	\$ 32,870	\$ 32,870	\$ 32,870
Project Costs	\$ 16,683	\$ 20,961	\$ 20,880	\$ 19,655	\$ 19,359	\$ 17,885	\$ 894	\$ 894	\$ 894	\$ 894	\$ 894
costs +10%	\$ 18,351	\$ 23,057	\$ 22,968	\$ 21,620	\$ 21,295	\$ 19,674	\$ 984	\$ 984	\$ 984	\$ 984	\$ 984
costs +20%	\$ 20,019	\$ 25,153	\$ 25,056	\$ 23,586	\$ 23,231	\$ 21,462	\$ 1,073	\$ 1,073	\$ 1,073	\$ 1,073	\$ 1,073
costs +30%	\$ 25,024	\$ 31,441	\$ 31,320	\$ 29,482	\$ 29,038	\$ 23,251	\$ 1,163	\$ 1,163	\$ 1,163	\$ 1,163	\$ 1,163
Net cash flow											
base scenario	\$ (36,416)	\$ (38,832)	\$ (28,288)	\$ 11,823	\$ 22,354	\$ 28,788	\$ 46,063	\$ 46,063	\$ 46,063	\$ 46,063	\$ 46,063
costs +10%	\$ (38,085)	\$ (40,928)	\$ (30,376)	\$ 9,858	\$ 20,418	\$ 26,999	\$ 45,973	\$ 45,973	\$ 45,973	\$ 45,973	\$ 45,973
costs +20%	\$ (39,753)	\$ (43,024)	\$ (32,464)	\$ 7,892	\$ 18,482	\$ 25,211	\$ 45,884	\$ 45,884	\$ 45,884	\$ 45,884	\$ 45,884
costs +30%	\$ (44,758)	\$ (49,312)	\$ (38,728)	\$ 1,996	\$ 12,674	\$ 23,422	\$ 45,794	\$ 45,794	\$ 45,794	\$ 45,794	\$ 45,794
benefits +10%	\$ (38,390)	\$ (40,619)	\$ (29,029)	\$ 14,971	\$ 26,525	\$ 33,455	\$ 50,758	\$ 50,758	\$ 50,758	\$ 50,758	\$ 50,758
benefits +20%	\$ (40,363)	\$ (42,406)	\$ (29,770)	\$ 18,119	\$ 30,696	\$ 38,122	\$ 55,454	\$ 55,454	\$ 55,454	\$ 55,454	\$ 55,454
benefits -10%	\$ (34,443)	\$ (37,045)	\$ (27,547)	\$ 8,675	\$ 18,183	\$ 24,120	\$ 41,367	\$ 41,367	\$ 41,367	\$ 41,367	\$ 41,367
benefits -20%	\$ (32,470)	\$ (35,258)	\$ (26,806)	\$ 5,527	\$ 14,011	\$ 19,453	\$ 36,671	\$ 36,671	\$ 36,671	\$ 36,671	\$ 36,671
benefits -30%	\$ (30,496)	\$ (33,471)	\$ (26,066)	\$ 2,380	\$ 9,840	\$ 14,786	\$ 31,975	\$ 31,975	\$ 31,975	\$ 31,975	\$ 31,975
benefits delayed 1 year	\$ (16,683)	\$ (40,694)	\$ (38,751)	\$ (27,063)	\$ 12,119	\$ 23,828	\$ 45,779	\$ 46,063	\$ 46,063	\$ 46,063	\$ 46,063
benefits delayed 2 years	\$ (16,683)	\$ (20,961)	\$ (40,614)	\$ (37,526)	\$ (26,767)	\$ 13,593	\$ 40,818	\$ 45,779	\$ 46,063	\$ 46,063	\$ 46,063
Discount rate	6%										
Sensitivity Analysis	Base case	Costs Increase			Benefits Increase		Decrease of Benefits			Delay of Benefits	
		+10%	+20%	+50%	+10%	+20%	-10%	-20%	- 30%	1 year	2 years
IRR (%)	24%	23%	22%	18%	26%	27%	23%	21.0%	19%	21%	19%
NPV (USD 000)	255,526	245,483	235,440	209,006	291,121	326,717	219,931	184,335	148,740	221,565	189,526

4. Climate mitigation assessment

According to the EX-ACT analysis (Annex 17), investments in agriculture for the Madagascar DEFIS+ project shows a potential for mitigation around 1 962 224 tCO₂-eq during the lifetime of the project (20 years).

When considering the investments in water and road management, IT2 has the potential of reducing CO₂ emissions by replacing motor pumps with solar pumps, while IT3, IT4, IT5, and IT6 consider carbon sequestration from increased crop productivity. During the lifetime of these investments (20 years) our analysis forecasts a reduction of 338,419 tCO₂eq, increasing the climate mitigation potential of the DEFIS+ project to 2,601,977 tCO₂eq.

ITs	Total tCO ₂ eq
IT2	3,762
IT3	54,987
IT4	238,429
IT5	13,747
IT6	27,493
Total	338,419

Table 4: Climate mitigation potential of selected ITs in 20 years

Annex I: Description of the investments analyzed, and assumptions.

IT 1 Improved drainage network

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	Annex 4 DEFIS+ Detailed Budget
Professional/ Contractual Services	We assumed that the annual O&M costs amount to 10% of the capital costs
AVOIDED COSTS	
Avoided costs of flood	The annual value of avoided flood events by ha was retrieved from a publication of the Ministry of Natural Resources – Rwanda (2014)
REVENUES	
Increased land productivity	<p>Baseline productivity values of Vanilla have been retrieved from retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021), while for the other crops we used the values found in the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001”.</p> <p>We multiplied the baseline productivity values of the crops by 15%, which represents the recorded crop decline due to recent flooding in East Africa (Crop Monitor , 2020). In this way, we found the number of kg of crops (kg/ha) that would not be lost thanks to the investment. Next, we multiplied this value by the crop price, retrieved from SelinaWamucii(Selina Wamucii, 2021) in the case of Vanilla, and from the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001” in the case of the other crops.</p>

IT 2 Construct irrigation schemes using improved technologies (drip irrigation, solar pumps)

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	Reference obtained from AVSF (2013)
Professional/ Contractual Services	We assumed that the annual O&M costs amount to 10% of the capital costs
AVOIDED COSTS	
Avoided costs of electricity (if motorpumps are replaced)	<p>This value was calculated by multiplying the following data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gas prices in Madagascar (Ar/L) (NUMBEO, 2022) - Ar to USD: 0.00026 - Fuel required to pump 1m³ of water (l fuel*m³ water) (Burney, Woltering, Burke, Naylor, & Pasternak, 2010) - m³ of water extracted daily by a Solar Pump kit (AVSF, 2013) - 110, average days in a year when irrigation is required
Avoided CO ₂ emissions (if motorpumps are replaced)	<p>To begin with, we calculated the annual Kg of CO₂ emitted by one motorpump. To do so, we multiplied the Carbon Dioxide emitted by burning 1l of Diesel (2.6 kg) (University of Calgary, 2015), by the following data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fuel required to pump 1m³ of water (l fuel*m³ water) (Burney, Woltering, Burke, Naylor, & Pasternak, 2010) - m³ of water extracted daily by a Solar Pump kit (AVSF, 2013) - 110, average days in a year when irrigation is required <p>In this way, we calculated the annual Kg of CO₂ emitted by one motorpump. Next, we multiplied that value by the cost per ton of CO₂(retrieved from the World Bank).</p>
REVENUES	
Increased land productivity	<p>Baseline productivity values of Vanilla have been retrieved from retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021), while for the other crops we used the values found in the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001”.</p> <p>We multiplied the baseline productivity value of the crops (retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021)) by 13.6%, which represents the recorded increase in the value of crop production per capita in Madagascar due to a project focused on irrigation (3ie, 2018). In this way, we found the number of kg of crops (kg/ha) that would not be lost thanks to the investment. Next, we multiplied this value by the crop price, retrieved from SelinaWamucii(Selina Wamucii, 2021) in the case of Vanilla, and from the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001” in the case of the other crops.</p>

IT 3 Installation of de-silting systems

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	Annex 4 DEFIS+ Detailed Budget
Professional/ Contractual Services	We assumed that the annual O&M costs amount to 10% of the capital costs
AVOIDED COSTS	
Avoided costs of flood	The annual value of avoided flood events by ha was retrieved from a publication of the Ministry of Natural Resources – Rwanda (2014)
Increased CO ₂ sequestration	Grewer et al (2018) reported the annual GHG impacts per hectare from changes in agricultural practices (in this case Improved water management). We multiplied that value by the cost per ton of CO ₂ (retrieved from the World Bank).
REVENUES	
Increased land productivity	<p>Baseline productivity values of Vanilla have been retrieved from retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021), while for the other crops we used the values found in the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001”.</p> <p>We multiplied the baseline productivity value of the crops (retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021)) by 20%, which represents the assumed value of “avoided impact of reduced water flow”. In this way, we found the number of kg of crops (kg/ha) that would not be lost thanks to the investment. Next, we multiplied this value by the crop price, retrieved from SelinaWamucii(Selina Wamucii, 2021) in the case of Vanilla, and from the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001” in the case of the other crops.</p>

IT 4 Landscape restoration and reforestation (anti erosion)

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	Annex 4 DEFIS+ Detailed Budget
Professional/ Contractual Services	Annex 4 DEFIS+ Detailed Budget March 2021) GCF comments AE responses Aug2021
AVOIDED COSTS	
Avoided water pollution	Value retrieved from Curtis (2004)
Increased CO ₂ sequestration	Grewer et al (2018) reported the annual GHG impacts per hectare from changes in agricultural practices (in this case “Increased biomass through agroforestry”). We multiplied that value by the cost per ton of CO ₂ (retrieved from the World Bank).
REVENUES	
Increased land productivity	<p>Baseline productivity values of Vanilla have been retrieved from retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021), while for the other crops we used the values found in the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001”.</p> <p>To calculate the added revenues from crops, we multiplied the baseline productivity values by the following values (summed up and then divided by 3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 28%, which represents the mean value of avoided drought-induced stress thanks to agroforestry (Reyes, Gosme, Wolz, Lecomte, & Dupraz, 2021) - 139%, which represents the mean value of yield increase in Rwanda thanks to a project that aimed to reduce erosion (Delgado, Wolosin, & Purvis, 2015) - 28%, which represents the yield increase thanks to the windbreaking effect of trees (Thevs, Aliev, & Lleshi, 2021) <p>In this way, we found the number of kg of crops (kg/ha) that would not be lost thanks to the investment. Next, we multiplied this value by the crop price, retrieved from SelinaWamucii(Selina Wamucii, 2021) in the case of Vanilla, and from the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001” in the case of the other crops.</p>

IT 5 Water tanks for micro irrigation

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	Assumed
Professional/ Contractual Services	We assumed that the annual O&M costs amount to 10% of the capital costs
AVOIDED COSTS	
Reduced nutrient concentration (higher N uptake)	We multiplied the price of Urea in Madagascar (JICA, 2020) by the simulated application of urea in farms in Madagascar (Alvarez, et al., 2014), and by 20%, which is the assumed savings of fertilizers thanks to water tanks.
Increased CO ₂ sequestration	Grewer et al (2018) reported the annual GHG impacts per hectare from changes in agricultural practices (in this case “Improved water management”). We multiplied that value by the cost per ton of CO ₂ (retrieved from the World Bank).
REVENUES	
Increased land productivity	<p>Baseline productivity values of Vanilla have been retrieved from retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021), while for the other crops we used the values found in the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001”.</p> <p>We multiplied the baseline productivity value of the crops (retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021)) by 13.6%, which represents the recorded increase in the value of crop production per capita in Madagascar due to a project focused on irrigation (3ie, 2018). In this way, we found the number of kg of crops (kg/ha) that would not be lost thanks to the investment. Next, we multiplied this value by the crop price, retrieved from SelinaWamucii(Selina Wamucii, 2021) in the case of Vanilla, and from the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001” in the case of the other crops</p>

IT 6 Rehabilitation of irrigation perimeters

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	Assumed
Professional/ Contractual Services	We assumed that the annual O&M costs amount to 10% of the capital costs
AVOIDED COSTS	
Reduced nutrient concentration (higher N uptake)	We multiplied the price of Urea in Madagascar (JICA, 2020) by the simulated application of urea in farms in Madagascar (Alvarez, et al., 2014), and by 37.5%, which is the average savings of fertilizers that can be achieved through drip irrigation (Debnath & Mohiuddin, 2020).
Increased CO ₂ sequestration	Grewer et al (2018) reported the annual GHG impacts per hectare from changes in agricultural practices (in this case “Improved water management”). We multiplied that value by the cost per ton of CO ₂ (retrieved from the World Bank).
REVENUES	
Increased land productivity	<p>Baseline productivity values of Vanilla have been retrieved from retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021), while for the other crops we used the values found in the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001”.</p> <p>We multiplied the baseline productivity value of the crops (retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021)) by 13.6%, which represents the recorded increase in the value of crop production per capita in Madagascar due to a project focused on irrigation (3ie, 2018). In this way, we found the number of kg of crops (kg/ha) that would not be lost thanks to the investment. Next, we multiplied this value by the crop price, retrieved from SelinaWamucii(Selina Wamucii, 2021) in the case of Vanilla, and from the excel file “DEFIS+ EFA_3001” in the case of the other crops</p>

IT 7 Construction of ridge ditches for improved drainage

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	1,800 USD/km (van Steenberg, et al., 2021)
O&M costs	We assumed that the annual O&M costs amount to USD 700 per year
AVOIDED COSTS	
Reduced damages	The values of erosion, flooding, sedimentation, and climate change, as well as the reduced costs of less time of roads, have been retrieved from table 1.3 shown in World Bank report (van Steenberg, et al., 2021)
Avoided costs of travel interruption in one year	<p>For this avoided cost we considered primary, secondary, and tertiary roads. Please note that only primary roads have been considered in the assessment. However, a potential user may want to use the values for secondary or tertiary roads. We assumed that tertiary roads are unpaved. From the World Bank we retrieved the estimated traffic volumes (vehicle/day) on paved and unpaved roads in Madagascar (Cervigni, Losos, Neumann, & Chinowsky, 2016). The same reference indicates the estimate of the value of a day of disruption per vehicle (paved roads), while we made an assumption for unpaved roads. These values have been then multiplied by the disruption days due to flooding in SSA divided by the length of the road network in SSA obtaining the disruption days per km (we made low and high assumptions on disruption based on which road we considered). In this way, we calculated the avoided costs of travel interruption in one year for each road.</p> <p>Disruption days due to flooding have been calculated as follows: Disruption days due to flooding in the PIDA+ network divided by 35 (number of years from 2015 to 2050) - (van Steenberg, et al., 2021). The same reference indicates the length of the road network in SSA.</p>
REVENUES	
Improved market access	<p>Baseline productivity values of Vanilla have been retrieved from retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021), while for the other crops we used the values found in the excel file "DEFIS+ EFA_3001".</p> <p>We assumed a fixed price increase due to market access. To calculate the productivity increase, we multiplied the baseline productivity value by the % of avoided disrupted days due to flooding in a year divided by 365 (we assumed that a disruption event occurs every year) and that if 1km is disrupted, then the whole road is impassible. Next, we multiplied this value by the crop price, retrieved from SelinaWamucii(Selina Wamucii, 2021) in the case of Vanilla, and from the excel file "DEFIS+ EFA_3001" in the case of the other crops</p>

IT 8 Runoff water collection

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	1,800 USD/km (van Steenberg, et al., 2021)
O&M costs	We assumed that the annual O&M costs amount to USD 700 per year
AVOIDED COSTS	
Reduced damages	The values of erosion, flooding, sedimentation, and climate change, as well as the reduced costs of less time of roads, have been retrieved from table 1.3 shown in World Bank report (van Steenberg, et al., 2021)
Avoided costs of travel interruption in one year	<p>For this avoided cost we considered primary, secondary, and tertiary roads. Please note that only primary roads have been considered in the assessment. However, a potential user may want to use the values for secondary or tertiary roads. We assumed that tertiary roads are unpaved. From the World Bank we retrieved the estimated traffic volumes (vehicle/day) on paved and unpaved roads in Madagascar (Cervigni, Losos, Neumann, & Chinowsky, 2016). The same reference indicates the estimate of the value of a day of disruption per vehicle (paved roads), while we made an assumption for unpaved roads. These values have been then multiplied by the disruption days due to flooding in SSA divided by the length of the road network in SSA obtaining the disruption days per km (we made low and high assumptions on disruption based on which road we considered). In this way, we calculated the avoided costs of travel interruption in one year for each road.</p> <p>Disruption days due to flooding have been calculated as follows: Disruption days due to flooding in the PIDA+ network divided by 35 (number of years from 2015 to 2050) - (van Steenberg, et al., 2021). The same reference indicates the length of the road network in SSA.</p>
REVENUES	
Improved market access	<p>Baseline productivity values of Vanilla have been retrieved from retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021), while for the other crops we used the values found in the excel file "DEFIS+ EFA_3001".</p> <p>We assumed a fixed price increase due to market access. To calculate the productivity increase, we multiplied the baseline productivity value by the % of avoided disrupted days due to flooding in a year divided by 365 (we assumed that a disruption event occurs every year) and that if 1km is disrupted, then the whole road is impassibleNext, we multiplied this value by the crop price, retrieved from SelinaWamucii(Selina Wamucii, 2021) in the case of Vanilla, and from the excel file "DEFIS+ EFA_3001" in the case of the other crops.</p>

IT 9 Road improved drainage and reinforcement during the rehabilitation

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	Capital costs (USD/km) have been calculated as the sum of labor cost (suggested by MetaMeta) and the cost of 1km of asphalt (Tadamun, 2015) (exchange EGP to USD: 0.0064). These costs appeared to be too high for asphalt. Therefore, we applied them to a pavement made of rubble masonry.
O&M costs	We assumed that the annual O&M costs amount to 10% of the capital costs
AVOIDED COSTS	
Avoided costs of travel interruption in one year	<p>For this avoided cost we considered primary, secondary, and tertiary roads. Please note that only primary roads have been considered in the assessment. However, a potential user may want to use the values for secondary or tertiary roads. We assumed that tertiary roads are unpaved.</p> <p>From the World Bank we retrieved the estimated traffic volumes (vehicle/day) on paved and unpaved roads in Madagascar (Cervigni, Losos, Neumann, & Chinowsky, 2016). The same reference indicates the estimate of the value of a day of disruption per vehicle (paved roads), while we made an assumption for unpaved roads. These values have been then multiplied by the disruption days due to flooding, temperature, and precipitation in SSA divided by the length of the road network in SSA obtaining the disruption days per km (we made low and high assumptions on disruption based on which road we considered). In this way, we calculated the avoided costs of travel interruption in one year for each road.</p> <p>Disruption days due to flooding have been calculated as follows: Disruption days due to flooding, precipitation, and temperature in the PIDA+ network divided by 35 (number of years from 2015 to 2050) - (van Steenberg, et al., 2021). The same reference indicates the length of the road network in SSA.</p>
REVENUES	
Jobs and income creation	We assumed that the total benefits of jobs and income creation amount to 30% of the labor capital costs

IT 10 Storage infrastructure for road construction and rehabilitation (to allow faster actions)

INVESTMENTS	
Capital costs	(Roadsforwater, 2014)
O&M costs	We assumed that the annual O&M costs amount to 10% of the capital costs
AVOIDED COSTS	
Avoided costs of travel interruption in one year	<p>For this avoided cost we considered primary, secondary, and tertiary roads. Please note that only primary roads have been considered in the assessment. However, a potential user may want to use the values for secondary or tertiary roads. We assumed that tertiary roads are unpaved.</p> <p>From the World Bank we retrieved the estimated traffic volumes (vehicle/day) on paved and unpaved roads in Madagascar (Cervigni, Losos, Neumann, & Chinowsky, 2016). The same reference indicates the estimate of the value of a day of disruption per vehicle (paved roads), while we made an assumption for unpaved roads. These values have been then multiplied by the disruption days due to flooding, temperature, and precipitation in SSA divided by the length of the road network in SSA obtaining the disruption days per km (we made low and high assumptions on disruption based on which road we considered). In this way, we calculated the avoided costs of travel interruption in one year for each road.</p> <p>Disruption days due to flooding have been calculated as follows: Disruption days due to flooding, precipitation, and temperature in the PIDA+ network divided by 35 (number of years from 2015 to 2050) - (van Steenberg, et al., 2021). The same reference indicates the length of the road network in SSA.</p>
REVENUES	
Improved market access	<p>Baseline productivity values of Vanilla have been retrieved from retrieved from FAOSTAT (FAO, 2021), while for the other crops we used the values found in the excel file "DEFIS+ EFA_3001".</p> <p>We assumed a fixed price increase due to market access. To calculate the productivity increase, we multiplied the baseline productivity value by the % of avoided disrupted days due to flooding in a year divided by 365 (we assumed that a disruption event occurs every year) and that if 1km is disrupted, then the whole road is impassibleNext, we multiplied this value by the crop price, retrieved from SelinaWamucii(Selina Wamucii, 2021) in the case of Vanilla, and from the excel file "DEFIS+ EFA_3001" in the case of the other crops.</p>

Annex II: Numerical assumptions for the economic and financial analysis

Data for calculating the costs, benefits, and avoided costs of the different investment types (ITs) were retrieved from peer-reviewed studies and grey literature.

The full description of the sources can be found in Annex I

Tables from *Table 5* to *Table 14* present the monetary costs, benefits, and avoided costs of each IT. The lifetime of the investment was assumed to be 20 years for each IT.

The following notes should be considered when reviewing assumptions and results of the analysis.

- We assumed that the financial discount rate of all investments is 8.5%
- We assumed that the social discount rate of all investments is 6.0%
- Values highlighted in grey have not been used.
- We prepared different CBAs considering the Revenues of only Vanilla, Maize, Rice, Onion, and Cassava. The prices and productivity values of all crops have been retrieved from the “DEFIS+ EFA_3001” project, except for Vanilla, whose values have been retrieved from FAOSTAT. Please note that the baseline productivity values retrieved from the “DEFIS+ EFA_3001” project already consider the increased yields from that project; therefore, we assume that there is a synergy with the ITs here considered. These crops have been considered in all the investments except IT9.
- Unless noted otherwise, we consider that each crop contributes by 20% to the total Revenues.
- The values of “Increased CO₂ sequestration”, where indicated in the tables below “See Carbon and SCC”, have been calculated by multiplying the annual CO₂ sequestration of specific investments by the economic value of carbon and by an annual rate of change. More information on the sources can be found in Annex I, while the values can be visualized in the spreadsheet models.
- When the investments related to road management considered the benefits from “improved market access” we made a conservative assumption where 1km of road serves 50ha of agricultural land.
- The “programme” analyses consider the total new items (ha or km) that can be supported by the project. We considered that the project covers only the capital cost, while the O&M costs are covered by the recipient throughout the lifetime of the investment.

IT 1: Improved drainage network

Table 5: IT1 Improved drainage network – Summary of benefits

	Units										
		2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042
Farm Benefits - Investment Type 1 (Amount in US\$ '000)											
Vanilla	USD	\$ 426	\$ 1,540	\$ 2,310	\$ 4,457	\$ 5,572	\$ 5,572	\$ 5,572	\$ 5,572	\$ 5,572	\$ 5,572
Maize	USD	\$ 96	\$ 300	\$ 1,266	\$ 2,123	\$ 2,653	\$ 2,653	\$ 2,653	\$ 2,653	\$ 2,653	\$ 2,653
Rice	USD	\$ 152	\$ 714	\$ 1,380	\$ 3,074	\$ 3,843	\$ 3,843	\$ 3,843	\$ 3,843	\$ 3,843	\$ 3,843
Onion	USD	\$ 110	\$ 1,090	\$ 2,288	\$ 3,920	\$ 4,900	\$ 4,900	\$ 4,900	\$ 4,900	\$ 4,900	\$ 4,900
Cassava	USD	\$ 1,164	\$ 2,749	\$ 4,755	\$ 8,022	\$ 10,028	\$ 10,028	\$ 10,028	\$ 10,028	\$ 10,028	\$ 10,028
Avoided Costs of Flood	USD	\$ 167	\$ 334	\$ 501	\$ 669	\$ 836	\$ 836	\$ 836	\$ 836	\$ 836	\$ 836
Total Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ 2,114	\$ 6,728	\$ 12,500	\$ 22,266	\$ 27,832	\$ 27,832	\$ 27,832	\$ 27,832	\$ 27,832	\$ 27,832
Costs											
Capital Expenditure	USD	\$ 976	\$ 976	\$ 976	\$ 976	\$ 976					
Vanilla	USD	\$ 863	\$ 1,726	\$ 2,589	\$ 3,452	\$ 4,316	\$ 4,316	\$ 4,316	\$ 4,316	\$ 4,316	\$ 4,316
Maize	USD	\$ 384	\$ 769	\$ 1,153	\$ 1,538	\$ 1,922	\$ 1,922	\$ 1,922	\$ 1,922	\$ 1,922	\$ 1,922
Rice	USD	\$ 520	\$ 1,040	\$ 1,561	\$ 2,081	\$ 2,601	\$ 2,601	\$ 2,601	\$ 2,601	\$ 2,601	\$ 2,601
Onion	USD	\$ 766	\$ 1,533	\$ 2,299	\$ 3,066	\$ 3,832	\$ 3,832	\$ 3,832	\$ 3,832	\$ 3,832	\$ 3,832
Cassava	USD	\$ 1,883	\$ 3,766	\$ 5,648	\$ 7,531	\$ 9,414	\$ 9,414	\$ 9,414	\$ 9,414	\$ 9,414	\$ 9,414
Total COSTS (USD)	USD	\$ 5,393	\$ 9,810	\$ 14,227	\$ 18,644	\$ 23,061	\$ 22,085	\$ 22,085	\$ 22,085	\$ 22,085	\$ 22,085
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ (3,279)	\$ (3,082)	\$ (1,727)	\$ 3,622	\$ 4,771	\$ 5,747	\$ 5,747	\$ 5,747	\$ 5,747	\$ 5,747
Economic Sustainability Metrics - Without Emissions											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	40,859	USD									
ERR	40%	%									
EMIRR	17%	%									
B/C Ratio	1.21										

IT 2 Construct irrigation schemes using improved technologies (drip irrigation, solar pumps)

Table 6: IT2 Construct irrigation schemes using improved technologies -- Summary of benefits

	Units	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042
Incremental Benefits - Investment Type 2											
Vanilla	USD	\$ 628	\$ 2,272	\$ 3,409	\$ 6,577	\$ 8,221	\$ 8,221	\$ 8,221	\$ 8,221	\$ 8,221	\$ 8,221
Maize	USD	\$ 141	\$ 443	\$ 1,867	\$ 3,132	\$ 3,915	\$ 3,915	\$ 3,915	\$ 3,915	\$ 3,915	\$ 3,915
Rice	USD	\$ 224	\$ 1,054	\$ 2,036	\$ 4,536	\$ 5,670	\$ 5,670	\$ 5,670	\$ 5,670	\$ 5,670	\$ 5,670
Onion	USD	\$ 162	\$ 1,608	\$ 3,375	\$ 5,784	\$ 7,230	\$ 7,230	\$ 7,230	\$ 7,230	\$ 7,230	\$ 7,230
Cassava	USD	\$ 1,718	\$ 4,056	\$ 7,015	\$ 11,836	\$ 14,796	\$ 14,796	\$ 14,796	\$ 14,796	\$ 14,796	\$ 14,796
Benefits from avoidable costs of electricity	USD	\$ 318	\$ 636	\$ 954	\$ 1,272	\$ 1,589	\$ 1,589	\$ 1,589	\$ 1,589	\$ 1,589	\$ 1,589
Total Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ 3,190	\$ 10,069	\$ 18,656	\$ 33,136	\$ 41,420	\$ 41,420	\$ 41,420	\$ 41,420	\$ 41,420	\$ 41,420
Costs											
Capital Investment	USD	\$ 1,240	\$ 1,240	\$ 1,240	\$ 1,240	\$ 1,240					
Vanilla	USD	\$ 1,273	\$ 2,547	\$ 3,820	\$ 5,094	\$ 6,367	\$ 6,367	\$ 6,367	\$ 6,367	\$ 6,367	\$ 6,367
Maize	USD	\$ 586	\$ 1,171	\$ 1,757	\$ 2,343	\$ 2,929	\$ 2,929	\$ 2,929	\$ 2,929	\$ 2,929	\$ 2,929
Rice	USD	\$ 768	\$ 1,535	\$ 2,303	\$ 3,070	\$ 3,838	\$ 3,838	\$ 3,838	\$ 3,838	\$ 3,838	\$ 3,838
Onion	USD	\$ 1,102	\$ 2,204	\$ 3,306	\$ 4,407	\$ 5,509	\$ 5,509	\$ 5,509	\$ 5,509	\$ 5,509	\$ 5,509
Cassava	USD	\$ 2,677	\$ 5,353	\$ 8,030	\$ 10,707	\$ 13,384	\$ 13,384	\$ 13,384	\$ 13,384	\$ 13,384	\$ 13,384
Total COSTS (USD)	USD	\$ 7,645	\$ 14,051	\$ 20,456	\$ 26,861	\$ 33,267	\$ 32,026	\$ 32,026	\$ 32,026	\$ 32,026	\$ 32,026
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ (4,455)	\$ (3,982)	\$ (1,800)	\$ 6,275	\$ 8,153	\$ 9,394	\$ 9,394	\$ 9,394	\$ 9,394	\$ 9,394
Net Value Emmision (low Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 99	\$ 204	\$ 313	\$ 427	\$ 545	\$ 558	\$ 570	\$ 582	\$ 594	\$ 606
Net Value Emmision (high Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 199	\$ 407	\$ 625	\$ 844	\$ 1,079	\$ 1,103	\$ 1,139	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,188	\$ 1,212
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with low Carbon Price/ton(Cash flow)		\$ (4,356)	\$ (3,778)	\$ (1,487)	\$ 6,701	\$ 8,699	\$ 9,951	\$ 9,963	\$ 9,975	\$ 9,988	\$ 10,000
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with high Carbon Price/ton (Cash flow)		\$ (4,256)	\$ (3,575)	\$ (1,175)	\$ 7,118	\$ 9,232	\$ 10,497	\$ 10,533	\$ 10,557	\$ 10,581	\$ 10,606
Economic Sustainability Metrics - Without Emissions											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	\$ 69,979	USD									
ERR	47%	%									
EMIRR	19%	%									
B/C Ratio	1.249										
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With Low Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	75,878	USD									
ERR	50%	%									
EMIRR	19%	%									
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With High Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	81,758	USD									
ERR	54%	%									
EMIRR	20%	%									

IT 3 Installation of de-silting systems

Table 7: IT3 Installation of de-silting systems – Summary of benefits

	Units	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042
Incremental Benefits - Investment Type 3 (Amount in US\$ '000)											
Vanilla	USD	\$ 80	\$ 371	\$ 715	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,455	\$ 1,455	\$ 1,455	\$ 1,455	\$ 1,455	\$ 1,455
Maize	USD	\$ 27	\$ 86	\$ 362	\$ 607	\$ 759	\$ 759	\$ 759	\$ 759	\$ 759	\$ 759
Rice	USD	\$ 43	\$ 204	\$ 395	\$ 879	\$ 1,099	\$ 1,099	\$ 1,099	\$ 1,099	\$ 1,099	\$ 1,099
Onion	USD	\$ 31	\$ 312	\$ 654	\$ 1,121	\$ 1,402	\$ 1,402	\$ 1,402	\$ 1,402	\$ 1,402	\$ 1,402
Cassava	USD	\$ 333	\$ 786	\$ 1,360	\$ 2,295	\$ 2,869	\$ 2,869	\$ 2,869	\$ 2,869	\$ 2,869	\$ 2,869
Benefits from avoidable costs of flooding	USD	\$ 48	\$ 96	\$ 143	\$ 191	\$ 239	\$ 239	\$ 239	\$ 239	\$ 239	\$ 239
Total Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ 563	\$ 1,855	\$ 3,630	\$ 6,258	\$ 7,823	\$ 7,823	\$ 7,823	\$ 7,823	\$ 7,823	\$ 7,823
Costs											
Capital Investment	USD	\$ 175	\$ 175	\$ 175	\$ 175	\$ 175					
Vanilla	USD	\$ 247	\$ 494	\$ 741	\$ 988	\$ 1,234	\$ 1,234	\$ 1,234	\$ 1,234	\$ 1,234	\$ 1,234
Maize	USD	\$ 114	\$ 227	\$ 341	\$ 454	\$ 568	\$ 568	\$ 568	\$ 568	\$ 568	\$ 568
Rice	USD	\$ 149	\$ 298	\$ 446	\$ 595	\$ 744	\$ 744	\$ 744	\$ 744	\$ 744	\$ 744
Onion	USD	\$ 214	\$ 427	\$ 641	\$ 855	\$ 1,068	\$ 1,068	\$ 1,068	\$ 1,068	\$ 1,068	\$ 1,068
Cassava	USD	\$ 519	\$ 1,038	\$ 1,557	\$ 2,076	\$ 2,595	\$ 2,595	\$ 2,595	\$ 2,595	\$ 2,595	\$ 2,595
Total COSTS (USD)	USD	\$ 1,416	\$ 2,658	\$ 3,900	\$ 5,142	\$ 6,384	\$ 6,210	\$ 6,210	\$ 6,210	\$ 6,210	\$ 6,210
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ (853)	\$ (803)	\$ (271)	\$ 1,116	\$ 1,439	\$ 1,613	\$ 1,613	\$ 1,613	\$ 1,613	\$ 1,613
Net Value Emmision (low Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 19	\$ 39	\$ 61	\$ 83	\$ 106	\$ 108	\$ 110	\$ 113	\$ 115	\$ 118
Net Value Emmision (high Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 39	\$ 79	\$ 121	\$ 164	\$ 209	\$ 214	\$ 221	\$ 226	\$ 230	\$ 235
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with low Carbon Price/ton(Cash flow)		\$ (834)	\$ (764)	\$ (210)	\$ 1,199	\$ 1,545	\$ 1,722	\$ 1,724	\$ 1,726	\$ 1,729	\$ 1,731
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with high Carbon Price/ton (Cash flow)		\$ (815)	\$ (724)	\$ (149)	\$ 1,280	\$ 1,648	\$ 1,827	\$ 1,834	\$ 1,839	\$ 1,844	\$ 1,848
Economic Sustainability Metrics - Without Emissions											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	11,922 USD										
ERR	44% %										
EMIRR	18% %										
B/C Ratio	1.22										
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With Low Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	13,065 USD										
ERR	48% %										
EMIRR	19% %										
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With High Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	14,205 USD										
ERR	51% %										
EMIRR	20% %										

IT 4 Landscape restoration and reforestation (anti erosion)

Table 8: IT4 Landscape restoration and reforestation (anti erosion) – Summary of benefits

	Unit	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042
Incremental Benefits - Investment Type 4 (Amount in US\$ '000)											
Vanilla	USD	\$ 565	\$ 2,045	\$ 3,068	\$ 5,919	\$ 7,399	\$ 7,399	\$ 7,399	\$ 7,399	\$ 7,399	\$ 7,399
Maize	USD	\$ 127	\$ 398	\$ 1,681	\$ 2,819	\$ 3,523	\$ 3,523	\$ 3,523	\$ 3,523	\$ 3,523	\$ 3,523
Rice	USD	\$ 201	\$ 949	\$ 1,833	\$ 4,082	\$ 5,103	\$ 5,103	\$ 5,103	\$ 5,103	\$ 5,103	\$ 5,103
Onion	USD	\$ 146	\$ 1,447	\$ 3,038	\$ 5,206	\$ 6,507	\$ 6,507	\$ 6,507	\$ 6,507	\$ 6,507	\$ 6,507
Cassava	USD	\$ 1,546	\$ 3,650	\$ 6,313	\$ 10,653	\$ 13,316	\$ 13,316	\$ 13,316	\$ 13,316	\$ 13,316	\$ 13,316
Benefits from Reduced nutrient concentration (higher N uptake)	USD	\$ 14	\$ 28	\$ 42	\$ 57	\$ 71	\$ 71	\$ 71	\$ 71	\$ 71	\$ 71
Total Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ 2,599	\$ 8,518	\$15,974	\$ 28,735	\$ 35,918	\$ 35,918	\$ 35,918	\$ 35,918	\$ 35,918	\$ 35,918
Costs											
Capital Expenditure	USD	\$ 857	\$ 857	\$ 857	\$ 857	\$ 857					
Vanilla	USD	\$ 1,146	\$ 2,292	\$ 3,438	\$ 4,584	\$ 5,731	\$ 5,731	\$ 5,731	\$ 5,731	\$ 5,731	\$ 5,731
Maize	USD	\$ 527	\$ 1,054	\$ 1,581	\$ 2,109	\$ 2,636	\$ 2,636	\$ 2,636	\$ 2,636	\$ 2,636	\$ 2,636
Rice	USD	\$ 691	\$ 1,382	\$ 2,072	\$ 2,763	\$ 3,454	\$ 3,454	\$ 3,454	\$ 3,454	\$ 3,454	\$ 3,454
Onion	USD	\$ 992	\$ 1,983	\$ 2,975	\$ 3,967	\$ 4,958	\$ 4,958	\$ 4,958	\$ 4,958	\$ 4,958	\$ 4,958
Cassava	USD	\$ 2,409	\$ 4,818	\$ 7,227	\$ 9,636	\$ 12,045	\$ 12,045	\$ 12,045	\$ 12,045	\$ 12,045	\$ 12,045
Total COSTS (USD)	USD	\$ 6,621	\$12,386	\$18,151	\$ 23,916	\$ 29,681	\$ 28,824	\$ 28,824	\$ 28,824	\$ 28,824	\$ 28,824
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ (4,022)	\$ (3,868)	\$ (2,177)	\$ 4,819	\$ 6,238	\$ 7,094	\$ 7,094	\$ 7,094	\$ 7,094	\$ 7,094
Net Value Emmission (low Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 89	\$ 183	\$ 281	\$ 384	\$ 491	\$ 502	\$ 513	\$ 524	\$ 535	\$ 545
Net Value Emmission (high Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 179	\$ 367	\$ 563	\$ 759	\$ 971	\$ 993	\$ 1,025	\$ 1,047	\$ 1,069	\$ 1,091
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with low Carbon Price/ton(C	USD	\$ (3,933)	\$ (3,685)	\$ (1,895)	\$ 5,203	\$ 6,729	\$ 7,596	\$ 7,607	\$ 7,618	\$ 7,629	\$ 7,640
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with high Carbon Price/ton (C	USD	\$ (3,843)	\$ (3,502)	\$ (1,614)	\$ 5,578	\$ 7,209	\$ 8,087	\$ 8,120	\$ 8,142	\$ 8,163	\$ 8,185
Economic Sustainability Metrics - Without Emissions											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	50,901	USD									
ERR	40%	%									
EMIRR	17%	%									
B/C Ratio	1.21										
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With Low Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	56,210	USD									
ERR	44%	%									
EMIRR	18%	%									
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With High Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	61,502	USD									
ERR	47%	%									
EMIRR	19%	%									

IT 5 Water tanks for micro irrigation

Table 9: IT5 Water tanks for micro irrigation – Summary of benefits

	Unit	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042.
Incremental Benefits - Ivestment Type 5 (Amount in US\$ '000)											
Vanilla	USD	\$ 3	\$ 57	\$ 137	\$ 274	\$ 274	\$ 274	\$ 274	\$ 274	\$ 274	\$ 274
Maize	USD	\$ 1	\$ 11	\$ 75	\$ 130	\$ 130	\$ 130	\$ 130	\$ 130	\$ 130	\$ 130
Rice	USD	\$ 1	\$ 26	\$ 82	\$ 189	\$ 189	\$ 189	\$ 189	\$ 189	\$ 189	\$ 189
Onion	USD	\$ 1	\$ 40	\$ 136	\$ 241	\$ 241	\$ 241	\$ 241	\$ 241	\$ 241	\$ 241
Cassava	USD	\$ 14	\$ 161	\$ 426	\$ 692	\$ 692	\$ 692	\$ 692	\$ 692	\$ 692	\$ 692
Reduced nutrient concentration (higher N uptake)	USD	\$ 0	\$ 2	\$ 4	\$ 6	\$ 6	\$ 6	\$ 6	\$ 6	\$ 6	\$ 6
Total Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ 20	\$ 297	\$ 860	\$ 1,533	\$ 1,533	\$ 1,533	\$ 1,533	\$ 1,533	\$ 1,533	\$ 1,533
Costs											
Capital Expenditure	USD	\$ 102	\$ 933	\$ 1,469	\$ 956						
Vanilla	USD	\$ 6	\$ 64	\$ 154	\$ 212	\$ 212	\$ 212	\$ 212	\$ 212	\$ 212	\$ 212
Maize	USD	\$ 3	\$ 29	\$ 71	\$ 98	\$ 98	\$ 98	\$ 98	\$ 98	\$ 98	\$ 98
Rice	USD	\$ 4	\$ 38	\$ 93	\$ 128	\$ 128	\$ 128	\$ 128	\$ 128	\$ 128	\$ 128
Onion	USD	\$ 6	\$ 56	\$ 136	\$ 188	\$ 188	\$ 188	\$ 188	\$ 188	\$ 188	\$ 188
Cassava	USD	\$ 13	\$ 134	\$ 324	\$ 447	\$ 447	\$ 447	\$ 447	\$ 447	\$ 447	\$ 447
Total COSTS (USD)	USD	\$ 134	\$ 1,255	\$ 2,246	\$ 2,029	\$ 1,074	\$ 1,074	\$ 1,074	\$ 1,074	\$ 1,074	\$ 1,074
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ (114)	\$ (958)	\$ (1,386)	\$ (497)	\$ 459	\$ 459	\$ 459	\$ 459	\$ 459	\$ 459
Net Value Emmision (low Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 0.49	\$ 5.08	\$ 12.58	\$ 17.78	\$ 18.18	\$ 18.59	\$ 18.99	\$ 19.39	\$ 19.80	\$ 20.20
Net Value Emmision (high Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 0.98	\$ 10.16	\$ 25.15	\$ 35.15	\$ 35.96	\$ 36.77	\$ 37.98	\$ 38.79	\$ 39.60	\$ 40.40
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with low Carbon Price/ton(Cash flow)		\$ (114)	\$ (953)	\$ (1,373)	\$ (479)	\$ 477	\$ 478	\$ 478	\$ 478	\$ 479	\$ 479
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with high Carbon Price/ton (Cash flow)		\$ (113)	\$ (948)	\$ (1,361)	\$ (462)	\$ 495	\$ 496	\$ 497	\$ 498	\$ 499	\$ 500
Economic Sustainability Metrics - Without Emissions											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	1,158	USD									
ERR	11%	%									
EMIRR	8%	%									
	1.19										
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With Low Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	1,355	USD									
ERR	12%	%									
EMIRR	8%	%									
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With High Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	1,551	USD									
ERR	13%	%									
EMIRR	9%	%									

IT 6 Rehabilitation of irrigation perimeters

Table 10: IT6 Rehabilitation of irrigation perimeters – Summary of benefits

	Units	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042.
Incremental Benefits - Investment Type 6 (Amount in US\$ '000)											
Vanilla	USD	\$ 1,136	\$ 4,108	\$ 6,162	\$ 11,889	\$ 14,861	\$ 14,861	\$ 14,861	\$ 14,861	\$ 14,861	\$ 14,861
Maize	USD	\$ 255	\$ 800	\$ 3,376	\$ 5,662	\$ 7,077	\$ 7,077	\$ 7,077	\$ 7,077	\$ 7,077	\$ 7,077
Rice	USD	\$ 404	\$ 1,906	\$ 3,681	\$ 8,200	\$ 10,250	\$ 10,250	\$ 10,250	\$ 10,250	\$ 10,250	\$ 10,250
Onion	USD	\$ 293	\$ 2,907	\$ 6,101	\$ 10,456	\$ 13,070	\$ 13,070	\$ 13,070	\$ 13,070	\$ 13,070	\$ 13,070
Cassava	USD	\$ 3,105	\$ 7,332	\$ 12,681	\$ 21,398	\$ 26,747	\$ 26,747	\$ 26,747	\$ 26,747	\$ 26,747	\$ 26,747
Reduced nutrient concentration (higher N uptake)	USD	\$ 120	\$ 241	\$ 361	\$ 482	\$ 602	\$ 602	\$ 602	\$ 602	\$ 602	\$ 602
Total Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ 5,313	\$ 17,294	\$ 32,363	\$ 58,086	\$ 72,607	\$ 72,607	\$ 72,607	\$ 72,607	\$ 72,607	\$ 72,607
Costs											
Capital Investment	USD	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,164					
Vanilla	USD	\$ 2,302	\$ 4,604	\$ 6,906	\$ 9,208	\$ 11,511	\$ 11,511	\$ 11,511	\$ 11,511	\$ 11,511	\$ 11,511
Maize	USD	\$ 1,059	\$ 2,118	\$ 3,177	\$ 4,235	\$ 5,294	\$ 5,294	\$ 5,294	\$ 5,294	\$ 5,294	\$ 5,294
Rice	USD	\$ 1,388	\$ 2,775	\$ 4,163	\$ 5,550	\$ 6,938	\$ 6,938	\$ 6,938	\$ 6,938	\$ 6,938	\$ 6,938
Onion	USD	\$ 2,044	\$ 4,088	\$ 6,132	\$ 8,176	\$ 10,220	\$ 10,220	\$ 10,220	\$ 10,220	\$ 10,220	\$ 10,220
Cassava	USD	\$ 4,839	\$ 9,678	\$ 14,517	\$ 19,356	\$ 24,194	\$ 24,194	\$ 24,194	\$ 24,194	\$ 24,194	\$ 24,194
Total COSTS (USD)	USD	\$ 12,796	\$ 24,427	\$ 36,059	\$ 47,690	\$ 59,322	\$ 58,157	\$ 58,157	\$ 58,157	\$ 58,157	\$ 58,157
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ (7,482)	\$ (7,133)	\$ (3,695)	\$ 10,396	\$ 13,286	\$ 14,450	\$ 14,450	\$ 14,450	\$ 14,450	\$ 14,450
Net Value Emmission (low Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 180	\$ 368	\$ 565	\$ 771	\$ 986	\$ 1,008	\$ 1,030	\$ 1,052	\$ 1,074	\$ 1,096
Net Value Emmission (high Carbon Price/ton) Million US\$	USD	\$ 359	\$ 736	\$ 1,131	\$ 1,525	\$ 1,950	\$ 1,994	\$ 2,060	\$ 2,104	\$ 2,147	\$ 2,191
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with low Carbon Price/ton(Cash flow)		\$ (7,303)	\$ (6,765)	\$ (3,130)	\$ 11,167	\$ 14,272	\$ 15,458	\$ 15,480	\$ 15,502	\$ 15,524	\$ 15,545
Incremental Net benefit from Project in \$ with high Carbon Price/ton (Cash flow)		\$ (7,123)	\$ (6,397)	\$ (2,565)	\$ 11,921	\$ 15,236	\$ 16,444	\$ 16,510	\$ 16,553	\$ 16,597	\$ 16,641
Economic Sustainability Metrics - Without Emissions											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	106,523	USD									
ERR	44%	%									
EMIRR	18%	%									
B/C Ratio	1.21	%									
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With Low Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	117,186	USD									
ERR	48%	%									
EMIRR	19%	%									
Economic Sustainability Metrics - With High Carbon Emission											
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	127,816	USD									
ERR	51%	%									
EMIRR	20%	%									

IT 7 Construction of ridge ditches for improved drainage

Table 11: IT7 Construction of ridge ditches for improved drainage – Summary of benefits

	Unit	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042
Incremental Benefits - Investment Type 7 (Amount in US\$ '000)											
Vanilla	USD	\$ 25	\$ 115	\$ 221	\$ 360	\$ 450	\$ 450	\$ 450	\$ 450	\$ 450	\$ 450
Maize	USD	\$ 8	\$ 27	\$ 112	\$ 188	\$ 235	\$ 235	\$ 235	\$ 235	\$ 235	\$ 235
Rice	USD	\$ 13	\$ 63	\$ 122	\$ 272	\$ 340	\$ 340	\$ 340	\$ 340	\$ 340	\$ 340
Onion	USD	\$ 10	\$ 97	\$ 203	\$ 347	\$ 434	\$ 434	\$ 434	\$ 434	\$ 434	\$ 434
Cassava	USD	\$ 103	\$ 243	\$ 421	\$ 710	\$ 888	\$ 888	\$ 888	\$ 888	\$ 888	\$ 888
Avoided costs of travel interruption in one year - primary road	USD	\$ 137	\$ 275	\$ 412	\$ 549	\$ 687	\$ 687	\$ 687	\$ 687	\$ 687	\$ 687
Total Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ 297	\$ 819	\$ 1,491	\$ 2,428	\$ 3,034	\$ 3,034	\$ 3,034	\$ 3,034	\$ 3,034	\$ 3,034
Costs											
Capital Expenditure	USD	\$ 276	\$ 276	\$ 276	\$ 276	\$ 276					
Vanilla	USD	\$ 77	\$ 154	\$ 231	\$ 308	\$ 385	\$ 385	\$ 385	\$ 385	\$ 385	\$ 385
Maize	USD	\$ 35	\$ 70	\$ 105	\$ 141	\$ 176	\$ 176	\$ 176	\$ 176	\$ 176	\$ 176
Rice	USD	\$ 46	\$ 92	\$ 138	\$ 184	\$ 230	\$ 230	\$ 230	\$ 230	\$ 230	\$ 230
Onion	USD	\$ 68	\$ 136	\$ 204	\$ 271	\$ 339	\$ 339	\$ 339	\$ 339	\$ 339	\$ 339
Cassava	USD	\$ 161	\$ 321	\$ 482	\$ 643	\$ 803	\$ 803	\$ 803	\$ 803	\$ 803	\$ 803
Total COSTS (USD)	USD	\$ 662	\$ 1,049	\$ 1,436	\$ 1,823	\$ 2,210	\$ 1,934	\$ 1,934	\$ 1,934	\$ 1,934	\$ 1,934
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ (366)	\$ (230)	\$ 55	\$ 605	\$ 825	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100
Economic Sustainability Metrics - Without Emissions		<div>USD</div> <div>%</div> <div>%</div>									
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	8,578										
ERR	64%										
EMIRR	23%										
B/C Ratio	1.5										

IT 8 Runoff water collection

Table 12: IT8 Runoff water collection – Summary of benefits

	Unit	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042.
Incremental Benefits - InvestmentType 8 (Amount in USD)											
Vanilla	USD	\$ 2,792	\$ 10,099	\$ 15,149	\$ 29,229	\$ 36,536	\$ 36,536	\$ 36,536	\$ 36,536	\$ 36,536	\$ 36,536
Maize	USD	\$ 627	\$ 1,967	\$ 8,300	\$ 13,919	\$ 17,399	\$ 17,399	\$ 17,399	\$ 17,399	\$ 17,399	\$ 17,399
Rice	USD	\$ 994	\$ 4,685	\$ 9,050	\$ 20,159	\$ 25,199	\$ 25,199	\$ 25,199	\$ 25,199	\$ 25,199	\$ 25,199
Onion	USD	\$ 721	\$ 7,147	\$ 15,000	\$ 25,706	\$ 32,133	\$ 32,133	\$ 32,133	\$ 32,133	\$ 32,133	\$ 32,133
Cassava	USD	\$ 7,633	\$ 18,026	\$ 31,178	\$ 52,606	\$ 65,758	\$ 65,758	\$ 65,758	\$ 65,758	\$ 65,758	\$ 65,758
Avoided costs of travel interruption in one year - primary road	USD	\$ 5,094	\$ 10,188	\$ 15,282	\$ 20,376	\$ 25,469	\$ 25,469	\$ 25,469	\$ 25,469	\$ 25,469	\$ 25,469
Total Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ 17,861	\$ 52,112	\$ 93,959	\$ 161,995	\$ 202,494	\$ 202,494	\$ 202,494	\$ 202,494	\$ 202,494	\$ 202,494
Costs											
Capital Expenditure	USD	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000				
Vanilla	USD	\$ 5,709	\$ 11,417	\$ 17,126	\$ 22,835	\$ 28,544	\$ 28,544	\$ 28,544	\$ 28,544	\$ 28,544	\$ 28,544
Maize	USD	\$ 2,603	\$ 5,206	\$ 7,810	\$ 10,413	\$ 13,016	\$ 13,016	\$ 13,016	\$ 13,016	\$ 13,016	\$ 13,016
Rice	USD	\$ 3,411	\$ 6,823	\$ 10,234	\$ 13,645	\$ 17,056	\$ 17,056	\$ 17,056	\$ 17,056	\$ 17,056	\$ 17,056
Onion	USD	\$ 5,025	\$ 10,051	\$ 15,076	\$ 20,102	\$ 25,127	\$ 25,127	\$ 25,127	\$ 25,127	\$ 25,127	\$ 25,127
Cassava	USD	\$ 11,896	\$ 23,793	\$ 35,689	\$ 47,586	\$ 59,482	\$ 59,482	\$ 59,482	\$ 59,482	\$ 59,482	\$ 59,482
Total COSTS (USD)	USD	\$ 44,645	\$ 73,290	\$ 101,935	\$ 130,581	\$ 159,226	\$ 159,226	\$ 143,226	\$ 143,226	\$ 143,226	\$ 143,226
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	(26,784)	(21,178)	(7,977)	31,415	43,269	43,269	59,269	59,269	59,269	59,269
Economic Sustainability Metrics - Without Emissions		USD									
Discount Rate	6%										
Values in USD											
ENPV	442,702										
ERR	46%										
EMIRR	19%										
B/C Ratio	1.34										

IT 9 Road improved drainage and reinforcement during the rehabilitation

Table 13: IT9 Paving or encroachment – Summary of benefits

	Unit of Measure	Unit Cost	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042.
Number of Kilometers			108	216	324	432	540	540	540	540	540	540
Jobs and Income creation	Income/USD/Km	USD	\$ 3,957	\$ 7,914	\$ 11,871	\$ 15,828	\$ 19,785	\$ 19,785	\$ 19,785	\$ 19,785	\$ 19,785	\$ 19,785
Avoided costs of travel interruption in one year - primary and Secondary road	Reduced damage	USD	\$ 1,299,018	\$ 2,598,036	\$ 3,897,054	\$ 5,196,072	\$ 6,495,091	\$ 6,495,091	\$ 6,495,091	\$ 6,495,091	\$ 6,495,091	\$ 6,495,091
TOTAL BENEFITS (REAL USD)		USD	\$ 1,302,975	\$ 2,605,950	\$ 3,908,925	\$ 5,211,900	\$ 6,514,875	\$ 6,514,875	\$ 6,514,875	\$ 6,514,875	\$ 6,514,875	\$ 6,514,875
COSTS												
Capital Investment		USD	\$ 171,117	\$ 171,117	\$ 171,117	\$ 171,117	\$ 171,117	\$ -				
Operation and Maintenance Costs		USD	\$ -	\$ 34,223	\$ 51,335	\$ 68,447	\$ 85,558	\$ 85,558	\$ 85,558	\$ 85,558	\$ 85,558	\$ 85,558
TOTAL COSTS (REAL USD)		USD	\$ 171,117	\$ 205,340	\$ 222,452	\$ 239,564	\$ 256,675	\$ 85,558	\$ 85,558	\$ 85,558	\$ 85,558	\$ 85,558
NET RESOURCE FLOW (USD REAL)		USD	\$ 1,131,858	\$ 2,400,610	\$ 3,686,473	\$ 4,972,337	\$ 6,258,200	\$ 6,429,317	\$ 6,429,317	\$ 6,429,317	\$ 6,429,317	\$ 6,429,317
Incremental Economic Sustainability Metrics (Aggregate)												
Discount Rate		6%										
Values in USD												
ENPV		63,466,963	USD									
ERR		#DIV/0!	%									
EMIRR		#DIV/0!	%									
B/C Ratio		50.2										

ERR does not compute where the cash-flow is positive throughout

IT 10 Storage infrastructure for road construction and rehabilitation (to allow faster actions)

Table 14: IT10 Storage infrastructure for road construction and rehabilitation – Summary of benefits

	Unit	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032-2042.
Farm Benefits - Intervention 10 (Amount in US\$ '000)											
Vanilla	USD	\$ 38	\$ 139	\$ 208	\$ 402	\$ 502	\$ 502	\$ 502	\$ 502	\$ 502	\$ 502
Maize	USD	\$ 9	\$ 27	\$ 114	\$ 191	\$ 239	\$ 239	\$ 239	\$ 239	\$ 239	\$ 239
Rice	USD	\$ 14	\$ 64	\$ 124	\$ 277	\$ 346	\$ 346	\$ 346	\$ 346	\$ 346	\$ 346
Onion	USD	\$ 10	\$ 98	\$ 206	\$ 353	\$ 442	\$ 442	\$ 442	\$ 442	\$ 442	\$ 442
Cassava	USD	\$ 105	\$ 248	\$ 429	\$ 723	\$ 904	\$ 904	\$ 904	\$ 904	\$ 904	\$ 904
Avoided costs of travel interruption in one year - primary road	USD	\$ 220	\$ 440	\$ 660	\$ 880	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100	\$ 1,100
Total Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ 396	\$ 1,016	\$ 1,742	\$ 2,827	\$ 3,534	\$ 3,534	\$ 3,534	\$ 3,534	\$ 3,534	\$ 3,534
Costs											
Capital Expenditure	USD	\$ 1,373	\$ 1,373	\$ 1,373	\$ 1,373	\$ 1,373					
Vanilla	USD	\$ 78	\$ 157	\$ 235	\$ 314	\$ 392	\$ 392	\$ 392	\$ 392	\$ 392	\$ 392
Maize	USD	\$ 36	\$ 72	\$ 107	\$ 143	\$ 179	\$ 179	\$ 179	\$ 179	\$ 179	\$ 179
Rice	USD	\$ 47	\$ 94	\$ 141	\$ 188	\$ 235	\$ 235	\$ 235	\$ 235	\$ 235	\$ 235
Onion	USD	\$ 69	\$ 138	\$ 207	\$ 276	\$ 345	\$ 345	\$ 345	\$ 345	\$ 345	\$ 345
Cassava	USD	\$ 164	\$ 327	\$ 491	\$ 654	\$ 818	\$ 818	\$ 818	\$ 818	\$ 818	\$ 818
Total COSTS (USD)	USD	\$ 1,767	\$ 2,160	\$ 2,554	\$ 2,948	\$ 3,341	\$ 1,969	\$ 1,969	\$ 1,969	\$ 1,969	\$ 1,969
Net Incremental Benefits	USD	\$ (1,371)	\$ (1,144)	\$ (812)	\$ (120)	\$ 193	\$ 1,566	\$ 1,566	\$ 1,566	\$ 1,566	\$ 1,566

Economic Sustainability Metrics - Without Emissions	
Discount Rate	6%
Values in USD	
ENPV	10,293 USD
ERR	23% %
EMIRR	14% %
B/C Ratio	1.48

Bibliography

- Crop Monitor . (2020). *East Africa 2020 flood impacts on agriculture* . Retrieved from Reliefweb:
https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Special_Report_East_Africa_202005.pdf
- 3ie. (2018). *Improving irrigation access in Madagascar*. International Initiative for Impact Evaluation.
- Alvarez, S., Rufino, M. C., Vayssières, J., Salgado, P., Tiftonell, P., Tillard, E., & Bocquier, F. (2014). Whole-farm nitrogen cycling and intensification of crop-livestock systems in the highlands of Madagascar: an application of network analysis. *Agricultural systems*, 126, 25-37.
- AVSF. (2013). *Micro-irrigation à Madagascar*. Agronomes et Vétérinaires Sans Frontières.
- Burney, J., Woltering, L., Burke, M., Naylor, R., & Pasternak, D. (2010). Solar-powered drip irrigation enhances food security in the Sudano–Sahel. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(5), 1848-1853.
- Cervigni, R., Losos, A. M., Neumann, J. L., & Chinowsky, P. (2016). *Enhancing the climate resilience of Africa's Infrastructure: the roads and bridges sector* . The World Bank.
- Curtis, I. (2004). Valuing ecosystem goods and services: a new approach using a surrogate market and the combination of a multiple criteria analysis and a Delphi panel to assign weights to the attributes. *Ecological Economics*, 50(3-4), 163-194.
- Debnath, S., & Mohiuddin, G. (2020). *Protected Cultivation and Smart Agriculture*.
- Delgado, C., Wolosin, M., & Purvis, N. (2015). Restoring and protecting agricultural and forest landscapes and increasing agricultural productivity. *New Climate Economy*.
- FAO. (2021). *FAOSTAT*. Retrieved from Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations: <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/PP>
- Grewer, U., Nash, J., Gurwick, N., Bockel, L., Galford, G., Richards, M., & Wollenberg, E. (2018). Analyzing the greenhouse gas impact potential of smallholder development actions across a global food security program. *Environmental Research Letters*, 13(4), 044003.
- IFAD. (2015). *IFAD'S INTERNAL GUIDELINES Economic and Financial Analysis of rural investment projects*.
- JICA. (2020). *Data Collection Survey on Food Value Chain Development for Food Security and Nutrition Improvement in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Japan International Cooperation Agency.
- Ministry of Natural Resources–Rwanda. (2014). *Forest Landscape Restoration Opportunity Assessment for Rwanda*.

- NUMBEO. (2022). *Gas Prices in Madagascar*. Retrieved from https://www.numbeo.com/gas-prices/country_result.jsp?country=Madagascar
- OECD & SELECTED PARTNER ECONOMIES. (2016). *Effective Carbon Rates on Energy*. OECD.
- Reyes, F., Gosme, M., Wolz, K., Lecomte, I., & Dupraz, C. (2021). Alley Cropping Mitigates the Impacts of Climate Change on a Wheat Crop in a Mediterranean Environment: A Biophysical Model-Based Assessment. *Agriculture*, 11(4), 356.
- Roadsforwater. (2014). *Guided Learning on Roads Water Management*. Retrieved from MetaMeta Research: http://roadsforwater.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/20161206_Guided-Learning-on-Roads-Water-Management-LQ.pdf
- Selina Wamucii. (2021). *Prices*. Retrieved from <https://www.selinawamucii.com/insights/prices/>
- Tadamun. (2015). *Practical Solutions | Principles of Street Paving & Maintenance*. Retrieved from <http://www.tadamun.co/practical-solutions-low-cost-maintenance-street-paving-alternatives/?lang=en>
- The World Bank. (2019). *INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION PROJECT APPRAISAL DOCUMENT ON A PROPOSED CREDIT IN THE AMOUNT OF SDR 107.9 MILLION (US\$150 MILLION EQUIVALENT) TO THE REPUBLIC OF MADAGASCAR FOR THE LEAST-COST ELECTRICITY ACCESS DEVELOPMENT (LEAD) PROJECT*. Retrieved from <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/pt/248241551754885741/pdf/MADAGASCAR-PAD-02112019-636873336790665817.pdf>
- Thevs, N., Aliev, K., & Lleshi, R. (2021). Water productivity of tree wind break agroforestry systems in irrigated agriculture—An example from Ferghana Valley, Kyrgyzstan. *Trees, Forests and People*, 4, 100085.
- University of Calgary. (2015). *Diesel generator*. Retrieved from https://energyeducation.ca/encyclopedia/Diesel_generator#:~:text=Diesel%20generators%20produce%20carbon%20dioxide,per%20liter%20of%20diesel%20fuel.
- van Steenberg, F., Arroyo-Arroyo, F., Rao, K., Hulluka, T. A., Woldearegay, K., & Deligianni, A. (2021). *Green Roads for Water*. Washington, DC: World Bank.