Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation (CSPE): Scope

- **Coverage**: 2011-2021
- **Lending portfolio 128 mil USD**
  - HSP (2013-2019)
  - DVCDP (2017-2022)
  - ADMP (2019-2025)
- **COSOP**: 2017 – 2021
- **Non-lending activities**: knowledge management, partnership building, policy dialogue
- **Performance of partners**: IFAD and the Government
- **COVID-19 sensitive methodology**: remote interviews, field visits conducted by national experts, mixed-methods
CSPE: Key findings
Key evaluation findings: areas of strength

- IFAD responded to important shifts in agriculture policies.

- IFAD was the first IFI to provide loan finance to horticulture value chain and direct support to the most vulnerable group, the dehkan farmers.

- The focus at design on dehkans, women, and later youth, was innovative: IFAD is covering a specific niche in Uzbekistan which reflects its comparative advantage with smallholders.
Key evaluation findings: areas of strength (cont.)

- **Geographic targeting** has been fairly successful.

- Focus at design on **the pro-poor value chain approach**, combined with rural finance and capacity building, **was relevant**.

- **IFAD projects contributed to some extent to enhance access to rural finance service, capacity building and to an increase in production:**
  - HSP: Surkhandarya is now large horticulture production region.
  - DVCDP: some increase in milk production (& consumption).
Key evaluation findings: areas for improvement

- Absence of an effective data collection and monitoring system

- Disconnect between the design documents and feasibility studies:
  - Value chain focus translated into production focused operations. Attention to gender, M&E and knowledge management was lost
  - Disbursement and implementation delays

- Effectiveness of the social targeting strategy was limited during implementation and not tailored to the needs of the poorest.
  - Evidence suggests that the projects had challenges in reaching the poorest

- Geographic and sectoral focus changed from one project to the other
Key evaluation findings: areas for improvement (cont.)

- **Weak internal coherence and strategic orientation** of the 2017 COSOP.

- Little effort in **knowledge management** to unlock learning, innovation and scaling-up.

- There is insufficient evidence of direct links to IFAD’s **policy dialogue** efforts.

- The potential for **partnerships**, including with the private sector, remains untapped.

- **High turnover of staff** on IFAD and Government sides constrained continuity, partnerships and country-level policy dialogue.
1. The **targeting strategy was not tailored to the needs** of the different beneficiary groups.

2. **Shifting geographic and sector targeting** constrained the opportunity to consolidate results and build on experience.

3. The assessment of results was constrained by the **lack of a solid M&E system**.

4. IFAD’s **weak programme support and limited interactions with in-country partners** during the review period, affected results and the potential of policy dialogue.
**Recommendation 1.** Effective targeting strategies should be at the core of the new strategy in order to reach the poorest including through pro-poor value chains.

**Recommendation 2.** IFAD and the Government of Uzbekistan should develop a COSOP that includes a coherent and viable action plan for non-lending activities and provide opportunities to engage with the private sector and consolidate results.

**Recommendation 3.** IFAD’s country strategy should devote attention and resources to develop robust project level M&E systems.

**Recommendation 4.** Enhance country presence and programme support.