Republic of Cameroon
Country strategy and programme evaluation

101th Session of the Evaluation Committee
27 June 2018
Country context

- Rural poverty has increased (57%)
- Almost 10% of the rural population is food insecure
- Important agricultural sector but lack of public funding

Some characteristics of fragility:
  - Weak governance
  - Instabilities in the northern and eastern regions
IFAD in Cameroon

- 11 projects covering the whole country since 1980
- Total cost of US$374 million – IFAD financing of US$143 million
- IFAD country office and country director since 2011

1. Participatory development
2. Agricultural productivity
3. Farmer organization
4. Market access
5. Rural financial services
6. Rural youth entrepreneurship
From 2007 to May 2017
• 6 projects (US$160M)
• Non-lending activities
• IFAD & Government performance
• Country strategy performance
Relevance

• Good alignment of project objectives with Government and IFAD policies and strategies
• Evolution of project approaches in line with evolution of the approaches advocated by Government and IFAD
• Projects too ambitious and complex in relation to local capacities
• Significant simplifications in intended implementation approaches with negative consequences for quality of achievements and sustainability
• IFAD’s primary target is increasingly left out
Effectiveness

- Wide adoption of new farming techniques and crop varieties though seed production and agricultural advisory support systems remain highly dependent on projects
- Beginnings of producer organization
- Modest improvements regarding access of small producers to:
  - appropriate rural finance services
  - markets
- Quantitative design targets rarely met
- Weaknesses in project M&E
Efficiency

• Fluid disbursement of IFAD funds
• Government contribution sometimes exceeded plans but frequent delays in availability
• Significant delays in project implementation
• Very high management costs (34% to 57%)
• Insufficient attention by the Government for the fiduciary management of projects
• IFAD country office in Yaoundé dedicated to supervision and support for project implementation
Rural poverty impact

• Increased agricultural production
• Increasing cooperation between producers helps to:
  - reduce production costs
  - reduce product transformation costs
  - Improve storage conditions
→ increased added-value for producers with likely impact on income and food security
• Depth and breadth of impact limited by poor portfolio efficiency and effectiveness

Most significant changes related to agricultural production perceived by project beneficiaries

- Production cost reduction
- Production volume increase
- Product quality improvements

N = 590
No change = 37

Source: IOE SenseMaker Study
Gender and rural youth

• Gender-specific targets generally attained
• Effective participation of some women in the decision-making bodies of producers’ organisations
• Newer projects have a gender strategy but limited staff capacity and dedicated resources to implement them
• Deep-rooted gender inequalities poorly taken into account (e.g. land)

• Rural youth are targeted by the 2 most recent loans (PEA-Jeunes and ECO-Jeunes)
• Young entrepreneurs incubation process may exclude young people without means
Knowledge management & Policy engagement

• Limited documentation and dissemination of tested approaches and success stories, but recent efforts to train & guide project staff in KM
• Regular exchanges between IFAD and Government around project design, supervision and management
• Strengthened advocacy capacity of producers’ organizations
• Results that can fuel policy engagement remain modest
• Low functionality of donor coordination fora with limited Government leadership in the coordination of development partners
Partnerships

**IFAD**

- Expanding partnerships at government level
- Limited co-financing
- Collaboration with FAO and WFP constrained by limited Government leadership and differences in intervention areas and modalities, and programming and funding cycles

**Projects**

- Successful partnerships with agricultural research institutions and incubation centres for young entrepreneurs
- Limited involvement of beneficiaries and deconcentrated services in project design, implementation, monitoring and management
Synthesis – relevance of the country strategy and programme

- Country strategies developed in a consultative manner and aligned with Government and IFAD policies and strategic frameworks
- Rural development approaches have evolved in line with Government and IFAD strategies and have good potential to stimulate the rural economy
- Targeting the poorest and most vulnerable rural people is less a priority in the new generation of projects

Recommendation 1: Continue support for producer organizations, the development of rural youth entrepreneurship, and the promotion of access to appropriate financial services for the rural poor.

Recommendation 2: Ensure the inclusion of the very poor and vulnerable rural populations in the country programme to address inequalities, by improving the geographical and social targeting of interventions.
Synthesis – effectiveness of the country strategy and programme

- Improved agricultural productivity and social capital (POs)
- Overall limited effectiveness and efficiency of the project portfolio
- Little progress in rural sector coordination and public policy implementation in favour of smallholder farmers
- Knowledge management and policy engagement are insufficient at the country programme level

**Recommendation 3**: Ensure that funding reaches the target populations quickly and in full, by accelerating the start-up and implementation of interventions and streamlining management costs.

**Recommendation 4**: Strengthen project performance and upscaling of successful approaches, through stronger government leadership in rural sector coordination, strategic partnerships (incl. at subnational level), and improved project M&E.
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