Objectives and Scope

Objectives:

• Develop conceptual framework for evaluating government performance, with particular focus on institutional efficiency;

• Synthesize evaluative evidence on government performance, identifying the dynamics and factors contributing to good or poor performance; and

• Identify critical areas for IFAD to focus in support of enhanced government performance.

Scope:

• Period from 2010 to 2020.

• Performance data from 421 evaluations, including 57 country strategy and programme evaluations (CSPEs), 364 project-level evaluations
IFAD Evaluation criterion to review government responsibilities and roles in the project cycle

Key responsibility: transforming resources into outputs (efficiency)

Government ownership is a key driver of performance (relevance)

Government also influences project effectiveness and sustainability.

Understanding the dynamics underpinning government performance.
Trends on government performance
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Trends on government performance (2)
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Force field diagram

- **FORCES FOR**
  - Long-standing partnership in country
  - Long-term programme strategic approaches
  - Alignment of COSOP with government year planning and priorities
  - Stable IFAD country presence
  - Use of country systems by IFAD

- **FORCES AGAINST**
  - Over complex/ambitious project designs
  - Disbursement cap
  - Projects not aligning with government priorities
  - Turnover of IFAD Country Directors

**Strong government ownership of IFAD-funded projects**

**GOVERNMENT**

- Accountability for results
- Good Government initiatives and programme designs
- Government staff participating in Supervision
- Staff continuity

**Source:** ESR stakeholder survey (205 respondents)
Government ownership matters: Performance in case study countries

Correlations in 15 case study countries

Government Ownership
[11 out of 15 countries]

0.33
High efficiency: 4 countries

0.60
High effectiveness: 11 countries

0.25
Sustainability: 4 countries

0.36
Scaling up: 6 countries
Relevance Findings

**Contextual issues**

- Alignment with institutional structures
- Flexibility and consistent engagement
- Government decentralisation
- Changes in the institutional and policy framework
- Fragile situations

**Ministries of Agriculture**

- Limited flexibility
- Insufficient sector funding
- Weak decentralised capacities
- Coordination capacity
Efficiency Findings

- **Counterpart funding**
  - Resource constraints in weak economic or fragile situations;
  - Non-monetary forms of counterpart funding, e.g. tax exemptions and in-kind contributions.

- **Project management**
  - Staff turnover, low technical capacities, delays in staff recruitment, and lack of incentives.
  - Red tape, cumbersome procedures, poor procurement practices.

- **Financial management**
  - Improvements where governments put into place systems for fiduciary oversight.
  - Operating cost varied, higher in fragile situations;

- **Adaptive management performance**
  - Timely design reviews to adjust overestimated goals or match government priorities
  - Follow-up on supervision recommendations and evidence of learning from implementation
 Governments perform better if they have **ownership** for the programme.

 **Long standing relationships** based on mutual trust will enhance performance.

 Programmes in **decentralised contexts** require capacities, resources, and support at local level.

 **Project designs** have to match government capacities and resources.

 Weak systemic capacities require incentives from the top (**leadership**).

 **Alignment** with country policies and institutional frameworks will support efficiency.

 Continuous **learning and adaptation** will improve government performance over time.
Government is the key player in IFAD’s development effectiveness.

Knowledge gaps regarding the factors driving government performance; understanding of why and how government performs in certain situations.

Situations of political instability, crisis and fragility, slow governance reforms, challenging to track, respond and adapt; country presence helps.

IFAD to address drivers of government performance within country context, requires careful analysis of institutional and policy frameworks.