

Independent Office of Evaluation



129<sup>th</sup> Evaluation Committee

10 June 2025

# Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation (CSPE) in the Lao People's Democratic Republic

**Presentation of the evaluation report** 



## Introduction

#### Objectives

- assess the performance and results of the IFAD strategy and operations in Lao PDR
- generate findings and recommendations for IFAD's upcoming country strategy and its partnership with the Government of Lao PDR
- identify lessons that could be shared on IFAD's presence and interventions in other countries with a smaller IFAD portfolio and a large development aid landscape

#### > Scope

- IFAD-supported projects and activities in Lao PDR for the period 2011-2023
- Focus on the current and previous Country Strategic Opportunities Programmes (COSOPs) the 2011 and 2018 COSOPs

#### Portfolio

- First country-level evaluation in Lao PDR
- Portfolio under evaluation (up to end of 2023) consists of 9 projects: 7 completed, 2 ongoing
- Evaluated portfolio of US\$ 341.8 million, of which IFAD financing is US\$ 118.1 million
- Multiple co-financiers ADB, BMZ/GIZ, WFP, SDC, LuxDev, GAFSP

#### Methods

- Theory-based; mixed methods, desk reviews, e-surveys and scoring cards; GIS mapping and asset verification
- Field visits in 15 project villagers, 6 districts, 4 northern provinces; 54 online interviews, 94 survey and score-card respondents



## Findings: relevance and coherence

#### **Strengths:**

- ➤ Adequate alignment with key national priorities (NSEDP; NGPES) and sector plans, bolstered through IFAD strategies and mainstreaming themes (especially nutrition)
- > Continuous engagement with national partners (MAF) reflected changing priorities in government
- > Project designs reduced menu of options, improving coverage and focus
- Partnership streamlining with ADB and WFP synergized different partner strengths in projects
- ➤ Knowledge exchange between projects across subregion through IFAD's Multi-Country Office in Hanoi
- ➤ Early engagement in Sector Working Group on Agriculture and Rural Development (SWG-ARD) allowed knowledge sharing with partners and GoL
- Various policy processes improved through grants, projects supported policy processes on nutrition





## Findings: relevance and coherence

#### **Areas of improvement:**

- > Aspects of country programme did not adjust to evolving country context (e.g. support for extension or grant provision to groups)
- > IFAD leadership in country-level processes limited by absence of stable country representation
- ➤ Developing two programmatic approaches (PICSA / AFN I and II) reduced potential for policy engagement
- ➤ Little integration of knowledge from grant-financed projects into loan portfolio
- Reduced IFAD presence also reduced its visibility and effectiveness in SWG-ARD
- Despite prior experience, no action on policies regarding land or rural finance





### Findings: effectiveness, efficiency and impact

#### **Strengths**

- ➤ Effective outreach: 90 districts in 14 provinces, and nearly 160,000 households
- Positive contributions to strategic objectives on a) smallholder resilience to natural shocks, and b) food security and nutrition security
- Positive synergies between development pathways attributable to village development plans
- Community-driven nutrition activities increased production and beneficiary knowledge
- > Within a context of overall poverty decline
  - Impact attributable to IFAD seen in improved household assets and food
  - Improved incomes attributed to increased animal asset ownership





## Findings: effectiveness, efficiency and impact

#### **Areas of improvement:**

- Climate resilience of infrastructure suffers from lack of effective O&M
- ➤ Lack of evidence across the pathways limits assessment of IFAD's contribution to outcomes
- Implementation delays increased operational expenses and rushed implementation
- Project management costs high, due to operational structures and delivery through local government
- Minimizing unit costs for infrastructure jeopardized quality and sustainability in geographically challenging areas
- Challenging to ascertain impact because of crowded development field, overall economic growth, and limited impact assessments







#### **Strengths:**

- Strong attention for GEWE at COSOP level, and synergized with improved nutrition at strategic level
- Gender transformative approaches emerging through gender-nutrition nexus
- Labor-saving interventions for women came with water infrastructure development
- Rural finance to women was a successful intervention alongside the Laos Women's Union
- Other donors replicate community-based nutrition actions targeting women and children
- ➤ IFAD-funded village banks scaled up in northern provinces
- Farmer-to-farmer services improved sustainability of animal assets







#### **Areas of improvement:**

- ➤ Though Environment, NRM and climate change a strategic focus in both COSOPs, COSOP results framework shifted, making it difficult to measure
- > Loss of previous expertise on land planning management
- ➤ While country programmes aimed to reduce pressure on surrounding land through intensification of existing land and water resources, pressure continues (food price increases)
- SECAP seen as disconnected from recent projects, requiring more expertise
- Unsustainability of infrastructure constantly flagged
- Producer group sustainability could improve if linked to financial services





## Conclusions

- ➤ IFAD contributed to rural poverty reduction, focusing on proven interventions in remote upland areas
- ➤ IFAD followed partner approaches, adding its own value in smallholder agriculture development
- Comprehensive, sustainable approaches to smallscale infrastructure and climate resilience still to improve
- ➤ Limited country presence curtailed IFAD's earlier partnerships and policy engagement
- New approaches must also consider IFAD's role in the ODA landscape and in supporting government capacity





## Recommendations

#### **Recommendation 1**

IFAD should adopt a sustainable approach to ensure continued in-country presence and engagement

#### **Recommendation 2**

IFAD should take a strategic decision regarding cofinancing partnership considering both coherence and potential trade-offs

#### **Recommendation 3**

IFAD should redefine its approach to enhance the sustainability of farmer groups and make them more inclusive

#### **Recommendation 4**

The upcoming COSOP should specify the approach to climate resilience, natural resource management and the needs of those with limited land access

#### **Recommendation 5**

IFAD should set up a transparent system for reporting operational costs with clear financial ceilings



## Steps following report completion

- National Round-Table Workshop
  - hybrid event held both in Vientiane and on-line on 6 May 2025. Over 75 participants including high-ranking Government officials (MoF, MAF), project directors, technical members of PMUs, APR and IOE staff.
- Agreement-at-Completion-Point (ACP) signed by Lao PRD government and IFAD on 26 and 28 May 2025 respectively
- Report to be published in 2025 (second semester)



## Thank you for your attention!



Laos CSPE National Roundtable Workshop – 6th May 2025