

IOE



Investing in rural people

Independent Office of Evaluation



133rd
Evaluation
Committee

18 June 2026

Republic of Honduras Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation

Main findings, conclusions and recommendations

By Steven Jonckheere – Senior Evaluation Officer IOE [LINK](#)

- Second country-level evaluation in Honduras
- Evaluation period: 2013–2024
 - COSOP 2013–2019 and 2020–2025
 - Portfolio: 6 projects (3 completed, 2 ongoing, 1 recently approved)
 - Total cost: USD 203.3 million
 - IFAD financing: USD 75.3 million
 - Co-financing: Government, CABEI, OPEC Fund, GEF, GAFSP and others



IFAD's strategy and portfolio were well aligned with national priorities on rural poverty reduction, food security and climate resilience.

The portfolio responded to key constraints faced by poor rural communities, including weak market access, limited rural finance, low productivity, poor infrastructure and climate vulnerability.

The country strategy evolved toward a more territorial and sustainable approach, with stronger attention to climate resilience, nutrition and social inclusion.

Recent projects better incorporated lessons on nutrition, climate adaptation, producer organization support and simplified legalization processes.

However, diagnostics and market analysis were often insufficient, weakening the design and sequencing of support to producer organizations.

Targeting remained geographically dispersed and did not always prioritize the poorest and most vulnerable territories or groups.

Critical contextual risks — including violence, insecurity, land conflicts and migration — were not systematically integrated into project design.



IFAD had a recognized comparative advantage in inclusive rural development, rural finance, family farming and work with remote communities.

The portfolio showed thematic continuity around producer organizations, value chains, rural finance, climate resilience and inclusion.

Grants and partnerships generated useful innovations in areas such as youth, nutrition, climate adaptation, digital rural finance and access to markets.

However, limited institutional articulation and operational fragmentation constrained coordination with government, donors and other IFAD-supported initiatives.

Knowledge management, policy engagement and partnerships remained useful but scattered, without a clear strategy, systematic follow-up or strong contribution to scaling up.

Goal
Reduce poverty and improve food security

Impact Pathway 1

Rural businesses and income diversification

Strengthening of producer organizations

Value chain development and commercialization

Rural finance and access to financial services

Impact Pathway 2

Natural resource management and climate change adaptation

Climate-resilient agricultural technologies and water management

Impact Pathway 3

Social infrastructure and nutrition

Rural roads, sanitation, nutrition and social inclusion

Cross-cutting Institutional strengthening and national ownership

Technical training, planning and institutional coordination

Satisfactory achievements

Moderately satisfactory achievements



The portfolio generated positive impacts on incomes, productive assets, organizational capacities and access to basic infrastructure.

Food security gains were modest, and nutrition outcomes remained limited and weakly evidenced.

Women's participation was high, with gains in economic empowerment and leadership, but structural barriers to land, finance, markets and care responsibilities persisted.

Efficiency was reduced by start-up delays, slow disbursements, high staff turnover, complex procedures and weak planning.

Sustainability was constrained by weak institutionalization, limited post-project support, fragile local maintenance arrangements and few clear exit strategies.

Environmental and climate-resilience benefits remained vulnerable due to uneven adoption, discontinuous technical assistance and weak links with territorial institutions.

Scaling up remained limited: innovations had replication potential, but lacked dedicated resources, institutional leadership and a clear scaling strategy.



IFAD consolidated its role as a strategic partner in rural development, with a clear comparative advantage in inclusive approaches

Progress in financial inclusion, community organization and infrastructure was significant but fragmented and with limited structural projection

Partial implementation of the territorial approach reduced effectiveness, local ownership and sustainability

Limited and dispersed targeting reduced equity and effectiveness in reaching the most vulnerable groups

Persistent critical gaps in market access, financial inclusion and continuous technical assistance

Monitoring, evaluation and learning were weak, reducing adaptive management capacity and policy influence

Low efficiency of the portfolio affected technical quality, community participation and continuity of results



Recommendation 1: Consolidate an integrated, coordinated and operational territorial approach to improve the effectiveness, sustainability and institutionalization of interventions

Recommendation 2: Define and implement robust, differentiated and context-specific targeting strategies to effectively reach the most vulnerable groups

Recommendation 3: Strengthen access to markets and financial services through structured, integrated interventions articulated with key economic ecosystem actors

Recommendation 4: Reinforce monitoring, evaluation and learning systems to promote evidence-based decision-making, enhance sustainability and support scaling-up

Recommendation 5: Address structural bottlenecks affecting portfolio efficiency and sustainability through proactive, stable and performance-oriented management



Thank you for your attention

