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Total IFAD portfolio: USD376 million; 20 loans; 18 projects since 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluated portfolio</th>
<th>Total: USD 542.2 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFAD Government</td>
<td>USD 283.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>USD 53.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cofinancing:</td>
<td>USD 68.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan projects</td>
<td>4 closed, 4 ongoing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 starting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>59 regional/global grants,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 country grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSOPs</td>
<td>2011, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsector allocations

- Marketing and value chain
- Rural finance
- Aquaculture
- Management
- Natural resource management
- Capacity building
- Infrastructure
Highlights

- **Outreach**: 2.3 million people reached
- **Natural resource management**: 2,000 ha of improved irrigation schemes; Rehabilitation of 33 river basins
- **Community-based organisations**: 30 Community Forest Associations, 43 Water Resource Users Associations; 1096 smallholder diary groups, 49 Apex groups
- **Gender results**: Women have greater access to and control over assets; more equal voice at home, improved health and nutrition
Overall strategy and programme

- Strong relevance of thematic focus and targeting, but insufficient focus on non-lending activities
- Overall moderately satisfactory achievements

Strategic objectives (2013 COSOP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objective</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO1: Gender responsive, climate resilient and sustainable community-based natural resource management</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO2: Access to productivity enhancing assets, technologies and services</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO3: Access to post-production technologies and markets</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Efficiency

- Slow disbursements
- Recruitment of qualified project staff often late
- Management costs higher than planned
- Cost per beneficiary higher in value chains
Sustainability of benefits

- Community groups
  - NRM, dairy groups strong
  - Horticulture and community finance groups weak
- Some infrastructure and assets well maintained by counties, e.g. clinics, roads, bridges
- County funding insufficient for maintenance, e.g. of markets, community forest groups, Water resource user groups
“Non-lending activities”

- Partnerships effective, e.g. with GEF, FAO, EU
- Private sector not sufficiently involved
- ICO capacity insufficient for substantial policy engagement
- Grants not used to support knowledge management or policy engagement in the lending portfolio
Conclusions

- Ongoing process of Government decentralisation has affected performance and sustainability
- Low efficiency of loan portfolio, but overall performance moderately satisfactory
- Most success in NRM; value chains and rural finance performed reasonably well
- Targeting partly successful (poor farmers, women); youth not sufficiently targeted.
- Large scale of operations, complexity of projects and geographic spread demanding on management
- Limited resources in IFAD Country Office overstretched
1. Consistent with the importance and size of the Kenya portfolio, commit sufficient effort and resources to non-lending activities.

2. Build on IFAD's comparative advantage and retain focus on selected themes and geographic areas.

3. Address recurrent design and institutional issues undermining programme efficiency within the context of the ongoing devolution process.

4. In line with Government's strategic planning, create space and opportunities for engaging the private sector.