

Document: EC 2010/62/W.P.4
Agenda: 5
Date: 26 March 2010
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



India

Country programme evaluation

Executive summary

Evaluation Committee — Sixty-second Session
Rome, 1 April 2010

For: Review

Note to Evaluation Committee members

This document is submitted for review by the Evaluation Committee.

To make the best use of time available at Evaluation Committee sessions, representatives are invited to contact the following focal point with any technical questions about this document before the session:

Luciano Lavizzari

Director, Office of Evaluation
telephone: +39 06 5459 2274
e-mail: l.lavizzari@ifad.org

Queries regarding the dispatch of documentation for this session should be addressed to:

Deirdre McGrenra

Governing Bodies Officer
telephone: +39 06 5459 2374
e-mail: d.mcgrenra@ifad.org

Contents

I.	Introduction	1
	A. Background	1
	B. Evaluation objectives, methodology and processes	1
II.	Country context	2
III.	The strategy adopted by IFAD and the Government	4
	A. Evolution of the country strategy	4
	B. IFAD-funded projects and programmes	6
	C. Country programme management	7
IV.	Portfolio performance	7
	A. Characteristics of the portfolio	7
	B. Relevance	8
	C. Effectiveness	9
	D. Efficiency	11
	E. Rural poverty impact	12
	F. Other performance criteria	13
	G. Overall portfolio assessment	14
V.	Performance of partners	15
	A. IFAD	15
	B. Government	16
	C. Cooperating institutions	17
VI.	Assessment of non-lending activities	18
	A. Policy dialogue	18
	B. Partnership-building	18
	C. Knowledge management	19
	D. Grants	19
	E. Overall assessment	20
VII.	COSOP performance	20
	A. Relevance	20
	B. Effectiveness	21
VIII.	Overall IFAD-Government partnership	21
IX.	Conclusions and recommendations	22
	A. Conclusions	22
	B. Recommendations	25
Annexes		
I.	A snapshot of IFAD-funded operations in India	28
II.	Definition of evaluation criteria applied in the CPE	29
III.	IFAD-supported projects and programmes in India	30

IV.	Composition of the evaluation team	31
V.	India CPE evaluation framework	32
VI.	List of states/projects visited during the India CPE main mission	39
VII.	Senior Independent Adviser's report on the evaluation process and its final report	40
VIII.	Bibliography	45
IX.	Table of ratings	50
X.	IFAD grants to India	51

Abbreviations and acronyms

ARRI	Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations
COSOP	country strategic opportunities programme
CBO	community-based organization
CPE	country programme evaluation
CPM	country programme manager
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
ENRAP	Knowledge-Networking for Rural Development in Asia/Pacific Region
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
LCDD	local and community-driven development
OE	Office of Evaluation
SEWA	Self Employed Women's Association
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
WFP	World Food Programme

India

Country programme evaluation

Executive summary

I. Introduction

A. Background

1. India is IFAD's largest borrower, both in terms of the number of projects financed and the resources invested. Since 1979, the Fund has financed 24 agriculture and rural development projects and programmes on highly concessional terms; nine of these are ongoing.¹ This corresponds to total costs of US\$1.9 billion, including US\$656 million in loans from IFAD and US\$877 million in counterpart funding from the Government of India. The majority of operations have aimed at promoting tribal development and women's empowerment, and establishing sustainable rural financial services. IFAD has also provided grants for, inter alia, capacity-building and agriculture research. India is IFAD's largest developing-country financial contributor, which makes for a special relationship between the Government and the Fund. Annex I provides a snapshot of the IFAD-supported operations in the country.

B. Evaluation objectives, methodology and processes

2. This country programme evaluation (CPE) has two main objectives: (i) to assess the performance and impact of the operations in India; and (ii) to generate a series of findings and recommendations that can serve as building blocks for formulating the forthcoming India results-based country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP), planned for 2010.

3. **Methodology.** The CPE focuses on analysing the performance of three mutually reinforcing pillars in the IFAD-India partnership: (i) the project portfolio; (ii) the non-lending activities, including knowledge management, policy dialogue and partnership-building; and (iii) the India COSOPs. The performance of the project portfolio has been assessed using internationally recognized evaluation criteria: relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; rural poverty impact; sustainability; and innovation, replication and scaling up (see definitions of these criteria in annex II). The performance against each criterion has been rated on a scale of 1 to 6.² The performance of partners (including IFAD, the Government and cooperating institutions) has also been evaluated.

4. Eighteen of the 24 projects in the country are covered by the CPE.³ The oldest project in the cohort is the Orissa Tribal Development Project, approved in 1987. Thus the CPE covers more than 20 years of IFAD-India cooperation and partnership (see annex III for the full list of projects).

5. Apart from the individual assessments of the three pillars, synergies between various operations and across lending and non-lending activities have also been analysed. Based on the above assessments, the CPE has ultimately generated a composite rating for the overall IFAD-Government partnership.

¹ One of these projects is not yet effective.

² Rating scale: 1, highly unsatisfactory; 2, unsatisfactory; 3, moderately unsatisfactory; 4, moderately satisfactory; 5, satisfactory; and 6, highly satisfactory.

³ The six projects excluded from CPE analysis are the first five projects supported by IFAD in India (approved in or before 1983), which were mainly irrigation programmes and as such not representative of the typical project funded by IFAD over the years and therefore of limited learning value; and a new project, the North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project II, approved by the Executive Board of IFAD in December 2009.

6. The CPE process entailed five phases, with the production of specific deliverables in each phase:

- (i) The preparatory phase, which included the development of the CPE approach paper;
- (ii) The desk work phase, leading to the preparation of a consolidated CPE desk review report highlighting initial findings and issues for further investigation during the main mission. During this phase, the Asia and the Pacific Division conducted a useful self-assessment, which provided valuable information, including the perspectives of those involved in country programme development and implementation;
- (iii) The country work phase, which entailed the fielding of a multidisciplinary team of consultants to India for about one month in April-May 2009. The mission visited 12 projects in 11 states, collecting additional data and information, visiting project sites, and holding discussions with, among others, central and state government officials, beneficiaries, project partners, NGOs, private-sector entities and other development organizations;
- (iv) The report-writing phase; and
- (v) The organization of the CPE national roundtable workshop in New Delhi in December 2009, which included the participation of members of the Evaluation Committee. The workshop provided an opportunity to discuss key lessons from the evaluation and to generate inputs for the evaluation's agreement at completion point.

7. All deliverables produced during the evaluation are publicly available and may be downloaded from the dedicated website of the India CPE.⁴ As per standard practice, the Office of Evaluation (OE) hired a senior independent adviser for the India CPE.⁵ His role was to review and provide written comments on the key deliverables generated during the CPE and to produce a report on the quality of the evaluation process and its contents (see annex VII).

II. Country context

8. **Economy and poverty situation.** India has an area of 3,287,260 km² and a population of approximately 1.14 billion (2008). Its economy is one of the fastest-growing economies in the world.⁶ Even during the 2008-2009 worldwide economic recessions, the growth rate of India's economy was still robust.⁷ The locomotives leading the economic growth are the cutting-edge, globally competitive and knowledge-driven service sector and the increasingly modern and competitive manufacturing sector. However, India's population is still predominantly rural, with 72 per cent living in rural areas, and the rural people account for a substantial majority of the poor. According to World Bank estimates based on 2005 data, nearly 42 per cent of India's population live below the poverty line of US\$1.25 (purchasing power parity) per day. Although this percentage has decreased steadily from 60 per cent in 1981, the number of people living under this poverty line has increased slightly due to rapid population growth. Poverty incidence is higher in rural than in urban areas.⁸

9. **Government role.** Since independence, India has paid due attention to agriculture and rural development as a means of improving the lives of poor rural people. The central government has a number of national agriculture-related policies and strategies to improve agricultural growth; create employment in rural areas; secure a fair standard of living for small farmers, agricultural workers and their families; and address other

⁴ http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/public_html/eksyst/doc/country/pi/india/index.htm.

⁵ The Senior Independent Adviser was Mr Hans Binswanger-Mkhize, Honorary Professor at the Institute for Economic Research on Innovation at Tshwane University of Technology, Pretoria, South Africa.

⁶ Real GDP growth has exceeded 8 per cent every year since the fiscal year 2003/2004.

⁷ The growth rate was 6.1 per cent during the fiscal year 2008/2009, and estimated at 6.5 per cent for 2009/2010.

⁸ According to data from Planning Commission, Poverty Estimates for 2004-05.

challenges arising out of economic liberalization and globalization. In recent years, the central government is also making increasing use of centrally supported schemes to improve implementation of national policies at the state level. The central government ministries are not normally involved in project execution at the state level. The state governments have the prime responsibilities for the execution of agriculture and rural development projects, whereas the central government's role is mainly to provide policy advice, technical assistance, resources (through centrally supported schemes), and monitoring and evaluation. In addition to agriculture and rural development, the states are also responsible for primary and secondary education, and health care.

10. **Agriculture and rural development.**⁹ With the impetus of the Green Revolution of the 1970s, India has achieved self-sufficiency in food grains and become a significant agricultural exporter.¹⁰ However, investment in agriculture and rural infrastructure has been lagging behind. Average agricultural growth since 2000 has been around 2 per cent, which is relatively low given overall economic growth rates of around 8 per cent in the same period. Agriculture accounts for about 18 per cent of GDP (2007), but it provides livelihoods for around 60 per cent of the population.

11. Insufficient irrigation facilities, insecure land tenure and limited rural finance services are the main constraints to increased productivity faced by small farm holders. In India, most farmers are marginal landowners or landless. Nearly 63 per cent of rural people own less than 1 hectare of land, and 43 per cent of rural households are landless (up to 0.2 ha of land). Such smallholdings are often overmanned, resulting in unemployment and low labour productivity. Some 65 per cent of farmers rely on rainfed agriculture, which is highly susceptible to natural disasters, especially droughts. To provide viable financial means to small farmers, rural microfinance has expanded in the past 20 years with support from government and other programmes, but much-needed rural finance for moving farmers from subsistence farming to commercial production remains limited. Most smallholder farmers and many rural entrepreneurs have little access to rural financial services.

12. **Women.** Women constitute 48 per cent of the population, but around 38 per cent of the total agricultural labour force. The Government has increasingly realized the importance of devoting attention to the economic betterment and development of rural women, but their full integration in society and economic life has been relatively slow. Rural women are often discriminated against in land and property rights, and in terms of access to medical facilities and rural finance.

13. **Scheduled tribes and scheduled castes.** These are generally the most disadvantaged social groups in the country. India has around 89 million tribal people, mainly residing in rural areas. They represent around 8 per cent of the population, but 16 per cent of the country's poor people. The Government has put in place a large amount of legislation to safeguard their status and an equally large number of programmes to address their continuing poverty. Among other issues, tribal people's land rights are of key concern to policymakers. Due to the constant encroachment of forest land by mining activities and other industrial development, tribal people are frequently displaced from their traditional land and became landless. Unlike tribal people who are geographically concentrated in certain areas, the scheduled castes are relatively evenly distributed among India's rural population. Although the Government has been taking measures to improve their conditions, discriminatory practices still prevail in some parts of the country, including restrictions on their access to communal assets, which constitutes a major constraint on their ability to move out of poverty.

⁹ Data from the World Bank's World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development.

¹⁰ From 2005 to 2007, agricultural exports accounted for around 10 per cent of total exports. Agricultural imports amounted to US\$5.1 million between 2003 and 2005, as compared with US\$8.8 million for agricultural exports.

14. **Government budget and official development assistance (ODA).** The annual government budget for agriculture and rural development in 2002-2007 (the tenth five-year plan) was around US\$13,895 million, representing 19 per cent of the total government budget.¹¹ In addition to the public budget, some funding to agriculture and rural development is available from international cooperation. From 2002 to 2007, average annual ODA commitments in agriculture and rural development to India were around US\$329 million, equivalent to 2.4 per cent of the government budget for the sector. In 2003, Government of India decided that collaboration would continue with only a handful of larger donors (the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID), the European Union, Germany, the Russian Federation, and the United States of America). This policy decision was part of the Government's aim both to reduce dependency on external aid and to limit the transaction costs of managing ODA. This policy change also reflects that, as a middle income economy,¹² India has more domestic financial and human resources for agriculture and rural development.

III. The strategy adopted by IFAD and the Government

A. Evolution of the country strategy

15. In its initial cooperation with India (1979-1987), IFAD was mainly a peripheral cofinancier of projects designed by other donors, supporting the irrigation subsector and funding five projects aimed at enhancing agriculture production. Thereafter, it became a key partner in financing operations chiefly for tribal and women's development. The main lesson from the early experience was that IFAD could not provide sufficient technical and financial support for nationwide irrigation programmes in India. As the Fund started to develop a comparative advantage in grass-roots community development through targeted projects and programmes, it shifted its emphasis to integrated rural development programmes, starting with the Orissa Tribal Development Project in 1987.

16. **The first India COSOP**, developed in 1999, included a provision for US\$100 million in IFAD loans. An enhanced version of this COSOP was discussed by IFAD's Executive Board in December 2001.¹³ This document largely captured the priorities and approaches followed in the late 1980s and 1990s, and defined IFAD's role as a catalyst in rural poverty reduction in India. Through analysis of rural poverty opportunities and constraints as well as lessons learned from IFAD experience, it identified the Fund's strategic niche in India. The main strategic thrusts proposed in the 2001 COSOP were to: (i) increase popular participation and empower poor rural people; (ii) strengthen grass-roots institutions; (iii) create greater access by poor people to resources (including land and water, support services and human resource development); (iv) improve financial services for the poor; and (v) generate sustainable incomes for poor households from non-farm enterprises, supported by market linkages and rural connectivity. The target group would be restricted to scheduled tribes, scheduled castes and women. Three of the five projects and programmes included for financing in the 2001 COSOP focused on tribal development.

17. The second India COSOP covered the period 2005-2009. The goal of the country strategy was for "IFAD to continue its partnership with India, particularly in assisting the Government of India to achieve its target of reducing the poverty ratio by 5 percentage points by 2007 and 15 percentage points by 2012." The 2005 COSOP reaffirmed the key strategic thrusts of the 2001 COSOP, but recognized the need for greater priority to be given to increasing agricultural productivity, including coastal fisheries, and to expanding geographic coverage to include the mid-Gangetic plains. It identified three major

¹¹ Data source: Government of India, Planning Commission, Eleventh Five-year Plan 2007-12, volume 1, chapter 3, annex 3.1 on sectoral allocation for public-sector resources.

¹² According to the World Bank's recent country classification (3 February 2010), India is in the list of lower-middle-income economies (GNI per capita: US\$976 - \$3,855).

¹³ The India COSOP was one of the first such documents discussed in the Executive Board, as part of a trial period in developing procedures for review of COSOPs by the Board.

strategic thrusts: (i) grass-roots institution-building and institutional strengthening of support agencies; (ii) promoting and protecting the access of marginalized groups to resources, including natural resources;¹⁴ and (iii) promoting the diversification of livelihood opportunities within the on-farm and off-farm sectors. A lending programme of US\$190 million was approved for a period of five years from 2005 to 2009.

18. **Non-lending activities.** The COSOPs also include an overview of IFAD's non-lending activities in terms of policy dialogue, knowledge management and partnership-building. Both COSOPs delineated the opportunities for partnership-building and areas for policy dialogue, but neither was explicit about knowledge management priorities and activities.

19. Table 1 provides a summary of the main elements contained in the two COSOPs developed for India thus far.

Table 1
Summary description of the two India COSOPs

PRINCIPAL ELEMENTS	COSOP 2001	COSOP 2005
Overall goal	Support the Government's efforts to promote development policies with greater emphasis on initiative and participation	Assist the Government in reducing the poverty ratio by 5 per cent by 2007 and 15 per cent by 2012
Major strategic thrusts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase popular participation • Strengthen grass-roots institutions • Create greater access of poor people to resources • Improve financial services • Generate sustainable incomes for poor people from non-farm enterprises, including market linkages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grass-roots institution-building and the institutional strengthening of support agencies • Promoting and securing the access of marginalized groups to resources • Promoting the diversification of livelihood opportunities within the on-farm and off-farm sectors
Geographic priority	Not explicitly articulated, but discerned based on the projects financed (Chhattishgarh, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Meghalaya, Orissa and Uttarakhand), in addition to the one nationwide programme (on rural finance)	Mid-Gangetic Plains (Bihar and Uttar Pradesh), north-east, coastal areas, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu
Subsector focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empowerment, social capital and institution-building • Microfinance and income-generation • Livelihoods and natural resources management • Rural infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadly similar to focus of 2001 COSOP, e.g. one project emphasized coastal area resource management, sustainable agriculture and market linkages
Main partner institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Finance • Ministry of Tribal Affairs • State government • DFID and the World Food Programme • NGOs (e.g. the Self Employed Women's Association (SEWA), community-based organizations (CBOs) and the private sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Finance • Ministry of Women and Child Development. • State government • World Food Programme • NGOs, CBOs and the private sector

¹⁴ Including, but not limited to, natural resources (forests lands, highly degraded land, water, fisheries) and financial resources.

PRINCIPAL ELEMENTS	COSOP 2001	COSOP 2005
Target group	Scheduled tribes, scheduled castes and women.	Same as for 2001 COSOP, with addition of coastal fishing communities
Country programme funding	Total lending of US\$100 million during the COSOP period; no specific budget defined for grants and non-lending activities	Total planned lending of from US\$110 to US\$119; no budget defined for grants and non-lending activities
Country programme and COSOP management ¹⁵	Country programme manager and programme assistant based in Rome, supported by a national country presence officer and one programme assistant in New Delhi. In all but one case, projects were supervised by cooperating institution(s).	Country programme manager, programme assistant and secretary based in Rome; national country presence officer, assistant programme officer, and three other staff members in New Delhi country office. All ongoing projects have been directly supervised by IFAD since the beginning of 2008.

B. IFAD-funded projects and programmes

20. As mentioned in paragraph 1, since 1979 IFAD has financed 24 projects and programmes in the country, approving loans for a total of US\$656 million. Government counterpart funding has amounted to US\$877 million, with a total project cost of US\$1.9 billion. Of the 24 projects, nine are ongoing.¹⁶ All loans have been provided on highly concessional lending terms. The principal cofinanciers supporting IFAD-assisted projects in India have been the World Bank (US\$250 million), DFID (US\$74 million), the World Food Programme (WFP) (US\$37 million) and the Netherlands (US\$12 million). It should be pointed out, however, that DFID cofinancing of US\$10.5 million for the Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Programme, envisaged at the time of Executive Board approval, did not actually materialize.

21. **Lending mechanism.** Loans are provided to the central government for operations at the state level – that is, the borrower is the Government of India and not the state governments. The one exception is the National Microfinance Support Programme, where the borrower is the Small Industries Development Bank of India, with the loan being guaranteed by the central government. Since 2004, the central government passes the loans to state governments on the same lending terms of IFAD loans to central government.

22. The Fund has also provided non-lending services comprising policy dialogue, partnership-building and knowledge management. These activities are difficult to track, since, in contrast to the situation for lending operations, IFAD lacks a systematic programme, dedicated resource allocations and reporting systems for non-lending activities – even though in recent years it has increasingly devoted attention to non-lending activities.

23. India has received a variety of technical assistance grants, including global/regional grants and country-specific grants. Annex X provides a full list of grants to India. In a nutshell, India has been included in 21 global/regional grants between 2002 and 2008, for a total grant amount of US\$23.1 million. Sixteen country-specific grants have been approved since 1997, for a total value of US\$3.3 million.

¹⁵ COSOP management was not described, as this is a feature of the results-based COSOP format adopted by the Board in September 2006.

¹⁶ One of these projects is not yet effective.

C. Country programme management

24. The India country programme is managed by a country programme manager (CPM) and a country presence team under the supervision of the CPM. The CPM for India is based in Rome, and is supported by a programme assistant and a secretary shared with two other CPMs.

25. **Country presence.** The IFAD India country office currently has five staff members: an acting coordinator; two implementation support specialists; an officer devoted to knowledge management; and an assistant programme officer. The total cost of the country office in 2009 is estimated at US\$262,000, of which US\$200,000 is for staff costs.

26. The country office was set up under an agreement with WFP in 2001, making it one of IFAD's first country offices. Under this cost-sharing arrangement, the field support manager was to spend 20 per cent of his/her time on WFP-related issues. IFAD was to bear 80 per cent of the salary cost of the field support manager¹⁷ and 100 per cent of the salary of his/her assistant. WFP would provide office space and other backstopping, including equipment and transportation. Contracts were issued by WFP as per its rules and regulations.

27. Under a renewed agreement in December 2007, IFAD would cover 100 per cent of the costs of staff, and provide a 4 per cent service fee to WFP. The costs of premises and other general utilities and services would be shared by WFP and IFAD. This agreement ensured that the CPM would have total responsibility for and directly supervise the country presence coordinator, whereas the latter would be responsible for supervising the other staff in the country office. This agreement was renewed on 30 January 2009, which led to the extension of the partnership with WFP for hosting IFAD country presence until end-2011.

28. Supervision arrangements. Until 2008, all projects but one financed by IFAD in India were supervised by cooperating institutions (the World Bank and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)). One operation (the Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Programme) has always been directly supervised by IFAD as it was then part of the then Direct Supervision Pilot Programme.¹⁸ Since 2008, IFAD has undertaken direct supervision and provided implementation support in all the nine ongoing projects in the country.

29. Supervision missions normally entail the participation of the staff from the country office and, whenever possible, of the CPM, in addition to short-term consultants hired with different subsector expertise depending on the nature of the project being supervised.

IV. Portfolio performance

A. Characteristics of the portfolio

30. The IFAD target group is defined as people living below the national poverty line in rural areas.¹⁹ More specifically, projects have, by and large, focused on two main groups – poor rural women and tribal people – although scheduled castes have also been included to some extent.

31. IFAD has developed a clear and consistent engagement model for its operations in India, combining elements of a top-down, integrated rural development approach with

¹⁷ This was the title of the country presence officer at the time.

¹⁸ Approved by the Board in 1997 and evaluated by OE in 2004/5.

¹⁹ According to the Planning Commission of India, Poverty Estimates for 2004-05, the poverty line at the all-India level was defined as India rupee (INR) 356 per capita per month for rural areas, and INR 538 for urban areas. In 2004-2005, the poverty incidence was 21.8 per cent in rural areas and 21.7 per cent in urban areas.

those of bottom-up community-driven development. In general, IFAD-funded projects in India have taken a holistic approach to rural development, beginning with the community and their needs. The formation of community groups of beneficiaries (e.g. self-help groups) has been a prominent feature in many projects. Community groups are important vehicles for delivering services to poor households, and they also use their collective capacity to articulate community priorities and lobby for resources and key development activities. To support the main target group – poor rural women and tribal people – the operations in India employed mainly three specific instruments in its holistic engagement model:

- (i) **Institution-building and capacity development.** IFAD-supported projects promote the establishment of women’s self-help groups and other community groups in villages, and use membership savings and internal lending as an instrument for group cohesion and sustainability. Key partners in the process are NGOs contracted by IFAD-funded projects. The NGOs are mainly responsible for group formation, including the training and overall capacity-building of groups.
- (ii) **Rural microfinance.** This mainly involves fostering linkages between self-help groups and commercial banks and microfinance institutions. The microfinance strategy adopted is chiefly to promote sustainable financial services for women and other poor people in rural areas for on- and off-farm activities.
- (iii) **Livelihoods promotion.** This includes the provision of economic infrastructure such as rural roads and small irrigation schemes, support for on-farm production and small-scale off-farm investments, and support for larger investments undertaken by communities and groups. In some projects, for example the Livelihoods Improvement Project in the Himalayas, venture capital companies have been involved in developing business skills among beneficiaries. One important component of the livelihoods model is natural resources management aimed at restoring the sustainability of the resource base for agricultural activities, particularly in tribal areas.

B. Relevance

32. In assessing relevance, the CPE examines whether the objectives of the projects in the portfolio are consistent with the needs of poor rural people, with the COSOP and with the Government’s main agriculture and rural development policies and strategies. Under relevance, an assessment is also made of whether projects include adequate strategies, approaches, institutional arrangements and financing to achieve their objectives.

33. The relevance of the India portfolio has been evaluated through a detailed analysis of each of the 18 projects covered by the CPE. Generally speaking, the objectives of all projects were relevant in terms of their alignment with the needs of poor rural people, the COSOP and the Government’s policies and strategies. The following paragraphs underline three main issues related to the strategies and approaches adopted in the projects to achieve their objectives.

34. **Targeting.** The portfolio’s attention to women was appropriate given their poverty levels and social circumstances. In many rural areas in India, women are seriously disadvantaged, despite their commitment to the long-term welfare of the household and community, which is often lacking among the men. The attention to tribal development has been equally important because tribal people are disproportionately represented among poor rural people and their situation has worsened over time. A number of other groups – scheduled castes, the landless, unemployed youth - are also disproportionately represented among the poor but have not received attention commensurate with their poverty levels. IFAD intended to target all these groups and the COSOPs include rhetoric

about the importance of serving them. However, these groups (scheduled castes, the landless and unemployed youth) are widely dispersed among the population living below the poverty line and it has not been easy for IFAD and the Government to design programmes that target them effectively.

35. **Geographic coverage.** IFAD has supported projects in most Indian states.²⁰ The extremely wide dispersion of operations across the country raises various issues that merit consideration, such as the tension between a concern to focus on the poorest states and the capacity of the states to administer effectively and to benefit from development projects funded by IFAD. A specific issue is that some projects cover more than one state, and in some cases the states are not even geographically contiguous. The CPE finds that projects covering two states have faced considerable challenges in implementation and supervision, given the diverse administrative, socio-economic, cultural and agroecological context prevailing in the states covered. Synergies between the activities undertaken in the two different states have been weak. This finding is also underlined in the self-assessment by the Asia and the Pacific Division.

36. **Strategy.** Focusing on institution-building, rural microfinance and livelihoods promotion in women's empowerment and tribal development proved to be relevant for achieving project objectives. This three-pronged strategy represents a holistic approach to improving the situation of poor rural people. Some programme elements have been given relatively low priority, such as financial services for micro-insurance and migrant remittances, and extension services for improving agricultural productivity, even though they are of key importance for sustainable livelihoods. In the past two years, IFAD has made efforts to pay attention to convergence between the activities it supports and various government programmes, and to leverage the strengths of the private sector in providing marketing and related services in rural areas.

37. Overall, the relevance of the portfolio of projects is considered satisfactory. The concentration of the Fund's investments on core target groups and its overall development approach over the past two decades has, by and large, been appropriate.

C. Effectiveness

38. In assessing effectiveness, the CPE aims to determine the extent to which the objectives were achieved in the main thematic areas covered by IFAD-funded projects in India. These include improvement in women's livelihoods, tribal development, institution-building and development of sustainable rural microfinance systems.

39. **Women's empowerment.** Over the years, IFAD-supported projects have yielded far-reaching results in improving poor women's livelihoods in terms of incomes, empowerment and welfare) by promoting self-help groups and providing rural microfinance services for a range of mainly off-farm activities. Although the self-help group concept was not created by IFAD, the Fund has contributed significantly to promoting self-help group formation in the country. In the Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project, 50 per cent of women self-help group members reported having visited new places and travelled longer distances, while 90 per cent had had new opportunities to interact with institutions such as banks, NGOs and project agencies for the first time in their lives. In the Rural Women's Development and Empowerment Project, for example, 90 per cent of women reported that they were able to articulate their opinions, needs and suggestions much more freely within the family; 90 per cent reported that they had increased access to and control over resources such as land, their house and livestock; and 77 per cent reported greater participation in decision-making regarding the sale or purchase of moveable assets. In Uttarakhand, under the Livelihoods Improvement Project in the Himalayas, women self-help group members were elected as heads of the gram panchayat²¹) in 170 out of 669 panchayats in villages.

²⁰ The exceptions have been Jammu and Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala, Punjab and some of the north-eastern areas.

²¹ Gram panchayats are local governments at the village or small town level in India.

40. **Tribal development.** The interventions in tribal areas are generally complex operations with multiple components including livelihoods promotion. The projects have contributed to on-farm activities through livestock development and crop diversification, including the reintroduction of local traditional crops. A good example is the North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas, where a local district horticulture officer in the West Garo Hills in Meghalaya has promoted flower growing, enabling villagers to earn an income from the sale of flowers. This is partly attributable to the project's bottom-up participatory approaches to planning, resource allocation and implementation. In order to address the erosion problems associated with shifting cultivation among tribal people, projects have brought about substantial improvements in small-scale infrastructure (irrigation schemes, water tanks, etc.) and natural resources management (e.g. through soil conservation). The infrastructure activities of the North Eastern Region project were well received among beneficiaries, given the relatively weak infrastructure in the project area. The subsequent project in Meghalaya, the Himalayas Livelihoods Improvement Project, was originally designed without an infrastructure component, but in response to popular demand, IFAD later reallocated a part of loan funds for this purpose.

41. Moreover, evidence from independent evaluations by OE of projects in Andhra Pradesh and the north-east suggests that IFAD has contributed to reducing conflict and peace-building in tribal areas. Despite the efforts of IFAD and the Government, the land rights of tribal people have been a particularly difficult issue to deal with, given the absence of written records and the commercial interests of the private sector and others in forests land and mineral resources. Some operations, notably the Orissa Tribal Development Project and the subsequent Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme, have supported the issuing of land titles to tribal people.

42. **Institution-building.** IFAD-funded operations have played a critical role in developing grass-roots organizations, such as village development committees and self-help groups, by building their organizational, management, and savings and credit capacities, undertaking collective actions for community development, and so on. The community groups have helped empower individuals, especially women, to define their priorities and lobby local governments to address their concerns. These groups have also been effective in providing a rudimentary insurance mechanism to deal with vulnerability. However, the CPE notes that IFAD-funded projects have not yet succeeded in forging adequate links with the panchayati raj institutions in many cases.

43. **Rural microfinance support.** The support for rural microfinance development is a success story. IFAD-funded projects have supported two approaches to rural finance: (i) linking women's self-help groups to commercial banks; and (ii) linking them to non-bank microfinance institutions. Both approaches have expanded rapidly in the last decade. The Maharashtra Rural Credit Project enabled the National Bank for Agricultural and Rural Development (NABARD) to promote the model of linking self-help groups to commercial banks. Commercial bank credits provided under the project were more than four times the originally projected levels, and recovery rates for loans to self-help groups were 100 per cent. Loans to self-help groups in other projects have also exceeded projections and have had high recovery rates. The Rural Women's Development and Empowerment Project, for example, had recovery rates of 99 per cent. Under the National Microfinance Support Programme, the IFAD-funded loan was important for the Small Industries Development Bank of India (the project's executing agency) in providing second-tier capital and long-term funding, which enabled it to expand its support to underserved states and to take a larger share of the risk of microfinance lending. The good practices promoted under IFAD-financed projects in supporting group saving among self-help group members and linking self-help groups to commercial banks and microfinance institutions convinced the Government to promote this model in other women's development programmes as well. As of March 2008, there were over 5 million

self-help groups in India, of which 3.6 million were linked with banks. Meanwhile, the non-bank microfinance institution channel served about 14.1 million clients or about two out of five microfinance clients in India (2007/08). The evidence suggests that rural microfinance has been effective in providing support to the poorest groups in villages, especially women.

44. However, the coverage of microfinance in India is still relatively low²² as compared with the overall needs. Besides, there are some factors that still constrain the development of microfinance institutions. Some of the important issues are improving governance and transparency, reducing operational costs, developing human resources and providing training.

45. **Livelihoods activities.** These cover a broad range of income-generating activities, including both on- and off-farm support. For on-farm activities, the extension services provided by some projects have proved to be successful in diversifying crops and improving productivity. Perhaps, the most successful livelihoods interventions have been the small investments made by self-help group members, who take a small step forward in an area where they have some experience or expertise, be it raising the number and quality of livestock, running or enlarging a small shop, or increasing the output of cottage products. In taking up these activities, self-help group members leverage the microfinance and technical services of project interventions, and these activities have contributed significantly to increased family incomes. Examples from impact surveys undertaken by the projects themselves reveal a 44 per cent increase of family incomes in the Maharashtra Rural Credit Project, and a 73 per cent increase in incomes of self-help group members in the Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project.

46. Nonetheless, promoting access to markets was generally underemphasized in design and under-resourced in implementation, except in a few projects approved in recent years. A commendable feature of the recent IFAD-assisted projects, such as the Mitigating Poverty in Western Rajasthan Project, is the involvement of the private sector in project implementation to integrate the small-scale economic activities of poor rural people into local value chains, so that smallholder farmers can have access to formal markets. Overall, the effectiveness of the portfolio is rated as satisfactory.

D. Efficiency

47. Efficiency is a measure of how economically resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results. The India CPE has used a variety of indicators to assess the efficiency of projects and the portfolio at large.

48. With respect to the design and management of the projects and programmes, there are many positive features – high levels of consultation, clearly defined objectives and generally well-qualified implementing agencies. These features tend to more than compensate for some of the flaws in design that can be observed in individual projects and, in some cases, across the board. These include, for example, too many project components, an overly optimistic assessment of the capacity and poverty orientation of the implementing agencies, and inadequate monitoring and evaluation systems that primarily focus on input-output monitoring.

49. The efficiency of IFAD-funded projects, especially with regard to social and community infrastructure, has been high because of community contributions in the form of labour and local construction materials. An analysis of the data suggests that, as compared with original cost estimates, most infrastructure is being achieved with cost savings of between 10 and 30 per cent. This either comes in the form of less expenditure or through a larger number of structures than originally projected. The evaluation also found that, since 2008, by switching from supervision by cooperating institutions to

²² In 2008, it was reported that 73 per cent of farm households in India had no access to formal sources of credit.

direct supervision and implementation support, IFAD has been able to pool resources allocated for supervision and implementation purposes and improve efficiency and quality.

50. However, the India portfolio has been subject to major delays in ensuring loan effectiveness following loan approval by the IFAD Executive Board. The average time lapse between loan approval and effectiveness is 13.4 months across the portfolio, as compared with the regional average (for Asia and the Pacific) of 9.3 months. On the IFAD side, some of the earlier projects had a large number of effectiveness conditions, which required time to fulfil. On the Government side, an important factor seems to be the amount of time invested in appointing project managers and staff. The lengthy process in obtaining legal opinions from the central and state governments has also caused delays. Efficiency has been further constrained by the rapid turnover of government officials (especially project directors) assigned to IFAD-funded projects in the past. Moreover, most projects have not been completed within the estimated timeframes, requiring one to two (and in some cases three) extensions to the original closing dates. These factors reduce project efficiency.

51. Nonetheless, it is fair to state that IFAD-funded projects are targeted on the more remote and most marginal and risk-prone rainfed areas and on some of the more deprived communities, making implementation of these operations especially challenging. In general, the project management units are effective and the staff show substantial commitment in delivering services. Overall, efficiency is rated as moderately satisfactory.

E. Rural poverty impact

52. As per the OE Evaluation Manual, rural poverty impact is assessed according to five domains (paragraphs 53-57). Based on this, the CPE then provides an overall assessment for rural poverty impact.

53. **Household income and assets.** There are consistent findings indicating that households supported by project activities had larger increases in incomes than those left out. For example, the Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project enabled about 45 per cent of self-help group member households to improve their economic status. By contrast, only 7.5 per cent of non-member households reported a similar improvement. Incomes have also improved through value addition and marketing of non-timber forest produce by the Girijan Cooperatives Corporation in Andhra Pradesh. But the picture is more mixed as far as household assets are concerned. This is mainly because the most important productive asset in rural areas is land. Excluding the tribal development projects, other IFAD-supported projects have not addressed land tenure issues,²³ which are socially and politically complex to deal with.

54. **Human and social capital and empowerment.** There have been major advances in the role of women in decision-making both at the family level and within the community. A similar trend may be observed in the tribal development projects, where tribal people indicate that they are now much more confident about airing their grievances and can more easily obtain a hearing for them. In some projects (e.g. the Andhra Pradesh Tribal Development Project), the apparent success of the community health officer model, whereby local women are trained to provide basic health services, raises the question as to why IFAD has not made this a more consistent part of the country programme.

55. **Food security and agricultural productivity.** The CPE finds that there have been improvements in food security, and this success is particularly striking in the tribal development projects. In Chhattisgarh, under the Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal

²³ Nearly 63 per cent of rural people own less than 1 ha of land, and the landless (up to 0.2 ha of land) account for 43 per cent of rural households.

Development Programme, about 60-70 per cent of households reported greater food security by the programme's end. In the second Orissa intervention, the proportion of families that achieved food security throughout the year increased from 21 per cent in 2004 to 72 per cent in 2008. In some older projects, such as the first Orissa project, there were only modest improvements in food security, largely because of the inappropriate engineering of small-scale irrigation systems. Considering the limited land size and rainfed nature of smallholder agriculture in the country, raising agricultural productivity is central to addressing rural poverty in India. The Fund's main problem with improving agricultural productivity relates to operations that target women's empowerment. While women work in the fields and in processing and marketing, the major decisions on what to plant and cultivate are mostly taken by men. Questions concerning agricultural productivity are understandably almost never the subject of discussion at self-help groups.

56. Natural resources management and the environment. IFAD has focused on natural resources management (e.g. through watershed management approaches, including planting of fruit trees on land used for shifting cultivation), particularly in the tribal development projects. In these projects, it has tackled an important trend – that of the increasing encroachment on tribal lands and their ever-greater degradation. It could be argued that a similarly comprehensive natural resources management intervention is critical for sustainable development in non-tribal projects as well. Also, it is noted that the use of renewable energy sources to reduce fuelwood needs and drudgery has not yet been explored sufficiently as a possible project component.

57. Institutions and policies. The focus of IFAD operations has been mainly on supporting grass-roots institutions, and these operations have made important contributions in catalysing the development of self-help groups across the country and communal groups in tribal areas. The issue to consider, however, is whether IFAD is helping to build the institutional linkages between the community-level institutions and local governments. There has been a positive policy contribution, especially in ensuring land rights for tribal people, promoting self-help groups as a vehicle for rural poverty reduction in government-funded development schemes, and ensuring the participation of NGOs in development activities in the country. Policy dialogue has, however, been limited to the project level, with little engagement in national policy processes.

58. The overall rural poverty impact of the portfolio is satisfactory. All individual rural poverty impact domains are considered satisfactory as well, apart from food security and agriculture productivity, which are rated as moderately satisfactory.

F. Other performance criteria

59. Sustainability. Projects that have manifested satisfactory or better sustainability are those where there is clear institutional responsibility for continuing operations and support to communities after IFAD funding is over. The effective functioning of grass-roots institutions is another factor in sustaining benefits. The estimate is that 80 per cent of self-help groups are self-sustaining at project completion. In many cases, IFAD approaches have been mainstreamed into government programmes (e.g. in Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra), and some projects are further supported by funding from state or central government after project completion or scaled up by other donors (e.g. the World Bank has scaled up some IFAD-funded projects in India). Besides, sustainability is also promoted by embedding project/programme management in existing institutional structures, as is the case in the ongoing National Microfinance Support Programme. In more recent projects, exit strategies are part of design, which clarifies roles and responsibilities for ensuring sustainability.

60. Sustainability remains, however, an area where further improvements can be achieved. Tribal welfare departments in state governments are often weak and have limited resources, and the capacity of women's development corporations are not similar

in all states. The role these institutions play in ensuring post-project sustainability is fundamental. Relatively short project timeframes have also been a constraint to sustainability, as it seems overly optimistic to envisage that, in a single project cycle, self-help groups could become entirely self-standing. Insecure access to land and other natural resources has also limited sustainability, as beneficiaries do not have the necessary incentives to continue investing towards their development. Finally, inadequate access to input and output markets is also constraining sustainability, even though recent operations are paying more attention to promoting market linkages. The overall assessment of sustainability is moderately satisfactory.

61. Innovation, replication and scaling up. In general, the India country programme has a highly innovative content. IFAD-funded operations have supported the introduction of innovative institutional models at different levels. For example, the support provided to the development and refinement of self-help groups has led to their becoming essential instruments for poverty reduction and women's empowerment. Another example is the introduction of Tribal Development Societies for project execution in the Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh programme. This was the first time that execution of a project for tribal development was not entrusted, as was usual, to the concerned state-level line department. The most recent major innovations are related to forging greater convergence between IFAD support and government programmes and to promoting linkages with the private sector.

62. There are examples of scaling up as well. The Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project was scaled up by the state government from six districts to the entire state with its own funds; and the World Bank scaled up the same project across nine states in India in 1996, inviting IFAD as a cofinancier. Currently, the Government and the World Bank are planning to expand the IFAD-funded North Eastern Region project from three to five states in the north-eastern region. However, the role played by IFAD in scaling up does not appear to have been systematic – that is, projects and programmes were not designed in the past with the ultimate objective of ensuring their scaling up; nor were resources allocated to pursue this agenda proactively and strategically. Given the highly innovative content of the portfolio and the various examples of scaling up, the CPE assesses this criterion to be satisfactory.

G. Overall portfolio assessment

63. The overall project portfolio assessment is derived from separate assessments carried out for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, rural poverty impact, sustainability, and innovation, replication and scaling up. The CPE rates the India project portfolio as satisfactory. In part this reflects the view that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts and that the projects' cumulative contribution to women's empowerment, microfinance and tribal development is considerable given the size of the programme. Table 2 below provides an overview of the ratings of the portfolio. It also benchmarks with figures from the 2008 Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRI).

Table 2
CPE ratings of the India project portfolio and benchmarking with the ARRI

Evaluation criteria	India CPE portfolio assessment	Percentage of projects in the India portfolio with a moderately satisfactory or better rating^a	Percentage of IFAD-funded projects in all regions with moderately satisfactory or better rating from the 2008 ARRI^b
Core performance criteria			
▪ Relevance	5	100	96
▪ Effectiveness	5	85	74
▪ Efficiency	4	69	65
Project performance	4.7	85	86
Rural poverty impact	5	92	69
▪ Household income and assets	5	92	71
▪ Human and social capital and empowerment	5	85	65
▪ Food security and agricultural productivity	4	92	68
▪ Natural resources and the environment	5	100	53
▪ Institutions and policies	5	92	55
Other performance criteria			
▪ Sustainability	4	85	48
▪ Innovation/replication/scaling up	5	92	72
Overall portfolio achievement	5	85	74

^a Evaluation criteria that have a rating of 4 (moderately satisfactory), 5 (satisfactory) or 6 (highly satisfactory) are all considered satisfactory.

^b To make the benchmarking more meaningful, the data contained in the ARRI for the entire block from 2002-2007 has been used for comparison purposes (see section V in the 2008 ARRI).

V. Performance of partners

A. IFAD

64. IFAD deserves credit for the overall coherence of the country strategy. Both country strategies (2001 and 2005) were developed following wide consultation with local stakeholders and partners, ensuring ownership by the Government in most cases. Mid-term reviews and implementation support activities have been used skilfully to turn around a number of projects that faced challenges at the outset. Moreover, since 2008, IFAD has been directly supervising and providing implementation support to all projects. In this regard, it has successfully moved away from a model of six-monthly visits to one of frequent interaction with project management units, government agencies, NGOs and other executing partners. In fact, supervision and implementation support is now undertaken as joint reviews together with government and other partners. In addition,

IFAD has built a strong relationship with the Government, contributed to wider acceptability of partnering with NGOs and civil society organizations for grass-roots development, devoted much attention to promoting pro-poor innovations, and not refrained from working in districts with high prevalence rates of insecurity, such as in Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and the north-eastern region.

65. At the same time, there have been some shortcomings. First, for an 18-month period in 2004-2006, the country programme was largely managed by an associate professional officer, owing to the delay in appointing a senior CPM commensurate with the importance of the country portfolio. This was unfortunate timing given that the 2005 COSOP was under preparation and the crisis over the Livelihood Security Project for Earthquake-Affected Rural Households in Gujarat coming to a head.²⁴ Second, IFAD has not established service standards for its own contacts with the project management units in areas such as providing timely feedback and responses to queries. Third, the Fund has not established a wide enough dialogue with the National Planning Commission or the relevant central government ministries, which, among other issues, would be important for national policy formulation in agriculture and rural development.

66. The establishment of a country presence office in New Delhi has enabled more timely follow-up actions, facilitated the identification of new partnerships, improved communication and information flows with and among projects and Government authorities, and consequently made a significant contribution to improving the performance of the country programme. As mentioned earlier, the country presence office now has five staff members. The CPE believes that there is merit in strengthening the country presence office and exploring the possibility of converting the India country office to a subregional office, covering operations in selected countries in the subregion. South Asia deserves IFAD's enhanced efforts in tackling rural poverty, because this subregion hosts around 40 per cent of the poorest people in the world, and there are a large number of IFAD-supported ongoing projects (32) in its seven countries. This would achieve better efficiency in terms of travel time and costs, and accelerate the response to country and project requests, facilitate knowledge-sharing among neighbouring countries, promote policy dialogue on subregional issues, and further enhance the profile and visibility of IFAD in India and the subregion at large. In conclusion, the CPE assesses IFAD's overall performance in India as satisfactory.

B. Government

67. This section entails an overall assessment of both central and state governments and their agencies involved in IFAD-supported operations. IFAD's main partner agency in the central government, the Department of Economic Affairs in the Ministry of Finance, has been very supportive of IFAD's role in the agriculture and rural development of India, and has been forthcoming in terms of advice on strategy and operational issues. The Ministry has also provided valuable support to all independent evaluations conducted by IFAD in the country, and encouraged an open and transparent dialogue focusing on learning lessons. Moreover, it has been a strong advocate of IFAD within India in general, and has been instrumental in ensuring the country's active participation in IFAD governing body discussions and mobilizing significant domestic contributions towards the periodic replenishment of IFAD resources.

68. However, it appears that the interaction between the Ministry of Finance and other technical ministries in the central government has not been as strong on issues related to the country programme in the past, even though there are encouraging signs in recent years of more dialogue and consultation. This is, however, partly also limited by the fact

²⁴ During implementation of the Gujarat project, there were concerns about the role and responsibilities entrusted to the NGO involved, the Self Employed Women's Association (SEWA), and IFAD was unable to win the full confidence of the state government and broker a partnership relationship between the state government and SEWA. The power struggle between the government and SEWA led to a premature termination of the project.

that IFAD itself has not proactively reached out to other key central technical ministries, even though it has recently been making more efforts to do so.

69. There has also been limited follow-up on several key points, which are systemic issues across the country. First, there is concern about the rapid turnover of project directors; second, there are repetitive delays in obtaining legal approvals on matters related to the country programme, both at the state and the central levels; third, as mentioned before, the project monitoring and evaluation systems have mainly focused on input-output measurements, which, especially in the agriculture and rural sector, is generally insufficient. There are, however, some recent initiatives by the Government to establish an independent national body within the National Planning Commission capable of undertaking rigorous and useful evaluations of development projects and programmes. This is an important step towards enhancing accountability and promoting learning.

70. The experience with state governments underlines the importance of their ownership of IFAD-supported projects. In most cases, state governments have had strong commitment and provided good support for the implementation of programmes. The two less positive cases relate to the first Orissa project and the Gujarat project, as the respective state government was not comfortable with the design of the operation. In particular, in both cases, there were concerns about the role and responsibilities entrusted to the NGO involved (SEWA in Gujarat and Agramee in Orissa).

71. The CPE assesses the performance of the central government as satisfactory, and the performance of state governments as moderately satisfactory. On balance, however, the CPE rates the overall performance of the Government as moderately satisfactory, given that the state governments have a much larger role in project design, execution, monitoring and evaluation.

C. Cooperating institutions

72. Until the beginning of 2008, the United Nations Office for Project Services was the main cooperating institution responsible for supervision of IFAD operations in the country. For most of the period under review, it provided effective supervision of process aspects. The view of most project completion reports and evaluations is that UNOPS generally did a good job of identifying problems, particularly relating to process, and many project directors expressed appreciation for the interactions and the quality of the advice received during the annual visits.

73. While UNOPS receives substantial commendations for its efforts on process, the general sense is that it took insufficient interest in the substantive aspects of projects and was unable to provide effective follow-up. In situations where there was a need for technical consultants to provide advice to the project management unit, UNOPS was not funded at a level that made this possible, nor did it come back to IFAD and insist that funding was needed to hire this expertise. In addition, as mentioned earlier, in the two-state projects, UNOPS was often unable to visit both states on its annual missions. The performance of the cooperating institutions is rated moderately satisfactory.

Table 3
Rating of performance of partners

Partner agency	Rating
IFAD	5
Government	4
Cooperating institution	4

VI. Assessment of non-lending activities

74. IFAD-funded operations serve not only to contribute directly to rural poverty reduction through investment projects, but also to promote wider policy dialogue, to build partnerships with the Government, other donors, NGOs and civil society, and private-sector enterprises, and to share knowledge among concerned stakeholders (project units, government authorities, financial institutions, small enterprise associations, service providers, donors and others). Grant-funded activities have also been covered in this section, albeit in a more cursory manner.

A. Policy dialogue

75. IFAD speaks out in policy dialogue mainly by demonstrating the good practices and lessons learned from project activities. There are several areas in which IFAD has contributed to policy development in favour of poor rural people in India. For instance, IFAD-funded tribal development projects have drawn the attention of policymakers to the issue of tribal rights over traditional forest land. As mentioned earlier, state governments have issued land rights to tribal people in the framework of some IFAD-funded projects. Self-help groups have been embedded as a vehicle for rural poverty reduction in government-funded schemes. There was also policy impact in the use of NGOs to support tribal development and women's empowerment. In the past decade, the views of the Government have evolved from seeing NGOs as opposing development projects to recognizing the potential of partnership with them. While this shift is not directly attributable to IFAD-supported projects, they certainly form part of a fabric of operations demonstrating the positive role that NGOs can play in supporting disadvantaged groups. IFAD has also played a role in the dialogue between the Reserve Bank of India and the Ministry of Finance on regulations of the rural microfinance sector, particularly in relation to building links between self-help groups and formal financial institutions.

76. However, policy dialogue at the national level with the Government and other donors has been limited in the past. In fact, outside the handful of government agencies that deal directly with IFAD, there is little knowledge of its experiences and innovations. Contributing to national policy debate in a country as large as India requires, inter alia, the ability to undertake (or have access to) analytic work on key policy issues, knowledge management, and a sufficient presence at an appropriate level to gain access to high-level policy platforms. All in all, the CPE assesses IFAD's results in policy dialogue as moderately satisfactory.

B. Partnership-building

77. As mentioned in the assessment of Government performance, partnership with the Government has been positive as far as the key counterpart ministry, the Ministry of Finance, is concerned. But links with other central sector ministries and the Planning Commission have not been strong. This was a particular handicap with regard to the Rural Women's Development and Empowerment Project, where lack of commitment by the counterpart ministry (Departments of Women and Child Development at the state level and the Central Government's Ministry of Human Resource Development) led to slow implementation.

78. Partnerships with state governments are a particular challenge. Two good examples of projects where the Government took a leadership role are the Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project and the Convergence of Agricultural Interventions in Maharashtra's Distressed Districts Programme (the most recent IFAD-funded operation in Maharashtra). But there are also less positive examples such as the first Orissa project and in Gujarat, where IFAD was unable to win the full confidence of the state government and broker a partnership between the state government and the NGOs involved in project execution.

79. The Fund has built good partnerships with a range of competent NGOs such as Myrada, Outreach and Pradan. Recently IFAD has put some effort into strengthening its relationships with the private sector for improving poor rural people's access to markets and other services. The latest Maharashtra project has included significant cofinancing from the private sector, including the Sir Ratan Tata Trust.

80. Partnership with the international donor community has yielded mixed results thus far. The World Bank cofinanced a number of IFAD-funded projects in the past, and has recently scaled up the North Eastern Region project funded by IFAD. This important partnership has been evolving, thanks largely to the individual initiatives and commitment of the CPM rather than a strategy. The partnership with DFID has been on the whole uneasy. For instance, DFID withdrew its support to the Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh programme and the second Orissa project, as it believed that IFAD's "hands off" approach to project execution and monitoring caused implementation and disbursement delays.

81. Partnerships with the United Nations system tends to be opportunistic and not part of a strategic approach reflecting common interests. The main partnership has been with WFP, which houses the IFAD country presence office in New Delhi. The relationships with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) have been weak, although more efforts have been made in recent years to find ways and means to engage with FAO.

82. Partnership-building has high transaction costs in the short term and, in fairness, IFAD has had neither the resources nor the local presence required to do this effectively. In conclusion, the results in partnership-building are rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

C. Knowledge management

83. A number of knowledge management activities have been undertaken by IFAD in India. Since 2003, IFAD has held nationwide portfolio reviews, which bring together all key projects managers, enabling them to exchange experiences and knowledge from the field. A useful website has been developed by the India country office, dedicated to IFAD-funded activities in the country. India is part of ENRAP (Knowledge Networking for Rural Development in the Asia and the Pacific), which allows for exchanges of experiences and good practices among projects within India, and across the region and beyond. A knowledge management specialist has been hired in the India country office to give impetus to this area of work.

84. However, as the Asia and the Pacific Division acknowledges in the IFAD self-assessment, knowledge management is still weak. There is only limited capacity within the country office and the project management units to document and disseminate innovations that have been successfully implemented and lessons learned in general, although a step forward was made in 2008 by organizing capacity-building events for quality documentation and better knowledge capture. At present, the country office in New Delhi is preparing a draft knowledge management approach paper, which is indicative of a genuine commitment to strengthening further this aspect of activities and recognition of how central it is to the effectiveness and impact of operations. In general, knowledge management is assessed as moderately satisfactory.

D. Grants

85. The grant programmes can be divided into two broad categories: global/regional grants and country-specific grants. The global/regional grants are ad hoc studies and activities often driven by the Operational Policy and Technical Division at IFAD as part of the Fund's involvement in global partnerships. India has been covered in 21 global/regional grants (see table 2, annex X for the list). While these grants are often for worthy purposes, they do not seem to have much involvement from the CPM or the

country presence office, and, in many cases, the supervision of the grant-supported projects by IFAD is weak.

86. India has received 16 country-specific grants, as is also shown in annex X. A large number of these grants have been used to expedite project execution, especially to ensure the smooth start-up of a project during the initial years of implementation. Other country-specific grants have been used for more general purposes, for example, supporting agricultural extension reform and accelerating technological adoption.

87. While many of the grants have been useful and most have been given for worthwhile activities, they are not linked to investment projects and there is no guiding strategic vision for their design and use. Moreover, their allocation is opportunistic and arbitrary, and they are inadequately monitored and supervised. For global/regional grants, there should be clear accountability for these – including monitoring arrangements – and a requirement for consultation with the concerned CPMs prior to approval. The country-specific grants, on the other hand, need to be, and are not as yet, fully incorporated into the COSOP. At present, the grant programme represents an important missed opportunity for increasing the effectiveness of the India country programme.

E. Overall assessment

88. Overall, non-lending activities are rated as moderately satisfactory. Most of the non-lending activities are mainly ad hoc and not strategic. They have not received specific resources, and were not driven by a coherent agenda that would contribute to meeting COSOP objectives.

Table 4
Ratings for non-lending activities

Type of non-lending activity	Rating
Policy dialogue	4
Partnership-building	3
Knowledge management	4
Overall assessment	4

VII. COSOP performance

A. Relevance

89. The first COSOP (2001) was a reflection of the programme that had evolved since the late 1980s. Before this COSOP, IFAD had effectively put in place the model linking community groups to rural microfinance and livelihood promotion activities. The COSOP articulated the model, correctly identifying the central role that capacity-building played in these programmes.

The 2005 COSOP essentially continued the main strategy mapped out in the 2001 COSOP. It included a number of cross-cutting issues related to gender, HIV/AIDS, sustainable agriculture and NGO involvement. Two new projects – the Post-Tsunami Sustainable Livelihoods Programme for the Coastal Communities of Tamil Nadu and the Women’s Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme in the Mid-Gangetic Plains – moved the established IFAD model to two new settings: disaster relief and a region recognized as the core of the rural poverty problem. On the face of it, these new directions were high risk and, in the case of the relief programme, of doubtful strategic impact. One useful step forward was the recognition that more focus was required on raising agricultural productivity. However, the 2005 COSOP did not well reflect the evolution of

government initiatives. For example, between 1999 and 2005, a substantial number of government-funded investments and programmes were put in place to expand road access to villages, improve primary education and provide a range of social benefits in rural areas. With hindsight, the issue of convergence between IFAD support and the government programmes would have merited separate treatment.

90. A number of issues that had emerged in the course of project implementation were not systematically treated in the COSOPs. For example, there were apparent challenges in targeting scheduled castes because they are so widely dispersed. Similarly, the difficulty of bringing landless migrant labourers into the self-help groups was emerging as a significant constraint to reaching poor rural people. Non-tribal operations had only a limited focus on agriculture and productivity improvement on small farms. Finally, HIV/AIDS was not mainstreamed into the country programme to the extent intended by the COSOP.

91. The COSOPs covered non-lending activities, but did not sufficiently integrate them into the strategy. Areas for policy dialogue, such as land reform and market access, were emphasized in both COSOPs. It was not clarified, however, how IFAD could move the national debate forward on such broad and sensitive issues. Opportunities for deepening partnership with the Government, NGOs and the private sector were also considered, and it was noted that the potential for partnership-building was significantly enhanced through the expansion of country presence. However, there was little examination of the opportunities for harmonization with other bilateral and multilateral agencies. In 2005, the Fund as an institution lacked a well-articulated knowledge management strategy and thus the treatment in the COSOPs is implicit rather than explicit. Finally, the grant programme is mentioned in the COSOPs, but there is no integration into the overall programme, which was essentially driven by investment projects. In conclusion, the relevance of the COSOPs is rated as satisfactory. This is a composite of a highly satisfactory rating for the 2001 COSOP, and a moderately satisfactory rating for the 2005 COSOP.

B. Effectiveness

92. The effectiveness of the COSOP largely reflects the effectiveness of the portfolio. The COSOPs closely reflected the projects, both on the ground and in the pipeline, and the COSOP objectives were essentially part of all IFAD-funded projects in India. As a consequence, in this particular case, there is no disconnect between the effectiveness of the COSOP and that of the programme in India. The lending and non-lending activities approved since 1999 have made significant progress in relation to the three key thrusts of the COSOPs: capacity-building of grass-roots institutions; access to natural resources and social and financial resources; and diversification of livelihood opportunities. As a consequence, the CPE rates the effectiveness of the COSOPs as satisfactory.

93. Finally, the overall performance of the COSOP – which is a combination of the ratings for relevance and effectiveness – therefore is also considered to be satisfactory.

VIII. Overall IFAD-government partnership

94. The overall assessment of the IFAD-government partnership is based on the ratings of portfolio performance, non-lending activities and COSOP performance. It is important to note that the final score is not a simple arithmetic average of the three individual ratings, but is based on an informed and objective judgement by the evaluation team. The overall partnership has been rated as satisfactory, in spite of non-lending activities being rated as moderately satisfactory. This is partly because the approach to non-lending activities has slowly been improving in recent years, with increased synergies between lending and non-lending activities, which together contribute to furthering the objectives in the COSOP.

Table 5
The CPE's overall assessment

Assessment	Rating
Portfolio performance	5
Non-lending activities	4
COSOP performance	5
Overall IFAD-government partnership	5

IX. Conclusions and recommendations

A. Conclusions

95. Since IFAD started operations in India in 1979, the country has undergone fundamental changes in socio-economic development. India is now classified as a middle-income economy by the World Bank, and correspondingly, its human resource base and agriculture research capabilities and academic institutions are advanced, and domestic funding for agriculture and rural development is ample. Yet, poverty reduction is still a challenging task in the government agenda, as poverty is still widespread in India, with nearly 42 per cent of the people still living below the poverty line of US\$1.25 per day. This implies the need for continued focus on the country by multilateral organizations and the development community at large.

96. Despite the changing context, the CPE considers that there is substantial value in the government-IFAD partnership, and that the Fund has played, and can continue to play, an important catalytic role in promoting rural poverty reduction in India. In this regard, the partnership has made significant contributions in the past in two areas: (i) the promotion of replicable and innovative pro-poor approaches, especially in terms of institutional development, such as linking self-help women's groups and tribal people with rural financial service institutions, government departments, NGOs and other service providers; and (ii) a demonstration effect in terms of the rigour and attention needed to design, implement, supervise, and monitor and evaluate inclusive and grass-roots-oriented agriculture and rural development operations in marginal and remote locations. These two characteristics make IFAD different from other donor organizations operating in India.

97. The projects funded by IFAD have achieved satisfactory results, especially in terms of livelihoods promotion among tribal people, women's development and the promotion of rural finance systems. In particular, women are more empowered and have generally a greater voice in decision-making and resource allocation. Efforts to promote tribal development have been good, for example in terms of enhancing tribal people's access to natural resources, including land and non-timber forest products, which are central to their livelihoods. There is evidence that some of the IFAD-funded projects have contributed to reducing conflict (e.g. in Andhra Pradesh and the north-east). However, given the vast numbers of tribal people (more than 80 million) in the country and their low economic and social status, the agenda remains incomplete: more efforts and resources are required to ensure their full integration into the economy, while at the same time preserving their cultural heritage. IFAD-funded operations have contributed significantly to developing new and successful models for the provision of microfinance to poor rural people, and to linking them and their organizations to commercial banks. There are, however, areas in which microfinance activities can be further developed to ensure an even wider impact on poverty – for instance, supporting microfinance institutions in building rural money transfer systems and networks that can channel remittances to and within rural areas effectively and efficiently. The CPE also finds

evidence of policy impact, for example, in terms of ensuring secure land titles for tribal people and including NGOs in development activities.

98. In general, the overall achievement of the IFAD loan-funded project portfolio in India is satisfactory, and better than the results of IFAD-funded projects in all regions – as reported in the 2008 ARRI. Performance has been particularly good in terms of relevance of operations and in the impact domains of natural resources management and environment, followed by household income and assets, human and social capital and empowerment, institutions and policies, and innovations, replication and scaling up. Performance is relatively weak in efficiency of operations and sustainability of benefits, where there is room for improvement.

99. The CPE finds that frequent rotation of project directors is a cause for concern, and a solution needs to be found for better impact. Another issue is the rather wide geographic coverage of the country programme, with numerous relatively small projects dispersed throughout the country in 17 states. Five projects were designed to cover two or three states, which in some cases are not even contiguous. Wide and fragmented programme coverage poses deep challenges to country programme management, for example, in terms of coordination, monitoring, supervision and implementation support, efficiency and sustainability.

100. Various innovations have been successfully tested on the ground through IFAD-funded projects and programmes, several of which have been scaled up by the Government and other donors. This is a remarkable achievement. In spite of that, however, the CPE does not discern a systematic or strategic approach by IFAD to scaling up, and the Fund's grants programme has not been used to its potential for promoting pro-poor innovations.

101. The evaluation finds, however, that, until the most recent operations, limited attention has been paid to agriculture. Selected crop development and research activities were funded through IFAD's grants but had limited linkages with loan-funded projects. The establishment of market linkages, engagement with the private sector and involvement of panchayati raj institutions has been limited. One recent interesting feature, however, is the US\$20 million funding raised from the Sir Ratan Tata Trust and other private-sector operators in the context of the latest programme in Maharashtra for, inter alia, biofuels development, promotion of organic cotton and dairy development (including milk collection centres).

102. Project monitoring and evaluation systems have mainly focused on input-output measurements, and evaluation capacity, especially in the agriculture and rural sector, focusing on results and impact is generally insufficient. There are, however, some recent initiatives by the Government to establish an independent national body capable of undertaking rigorous and useful evaluations of development projects and programmes.

103. The CPE underscores the importance of convergence between IFAD assistance and government schemes, especially at the district level. The absence of convergence has contributed in the past to inefficient use of resources and poor results, with duplication of efforts between departments (e.g. in terms of the capacity-building of communities), overlapping development activities and multiple reporting requirements. The latest programme in Maharashtra, however, is a good example of efforts by IFAD to ensure convergence with the Government's own initiatives.

104. Performance of non-lending activities (knowledge management, policy dialogue and partnership-building) has been moderately satisfactory. While there have been some interesting knowledge management initiatives in recent years, these have not extended over the period covered by the CPE. IFAD has contributed significantly in some policy areas, but resources and capacities for analytic work and knowledge management have

been few. As mentioned earlier, the Fund has also contributed to some important achievements in policy dialogue (e.g. the recognition of self-help groups as an instrument for poverty reduction in national policies and programmes; the provision of land titles to tribal peoples; the widespread involvement of NGOs in development initiatives), but these contributions have been unsystematic and largely confined within project-related processes. Engagement in national policy formulation relating to agriculture and rural development has been limited, partly due to inadequate resources. IFAD's partnership with government in general is good, as it is with civil society and the NGO community, but partnership with the private sector and other multilateral organizations working in agriculture in India has not been vibrant, even though there have been recent signs of improvement. With regard to the central government, its partnership is particularly strong with the Ministry of Finance, but somewhat limited with other key agriculture and rural development-related ministries, and other central agencies. Even though project execution is the responsibility of state authorities, central government agencies have an important role, not least because they are responsible for formulating national policies and acts that establish nationwide priorities and targets for poverty reduction. They also finance large centrally sponsored schemes for agriculture and rural development.

105. A number of grants have been provided in support of the country programme, both from IFAD's global/regional and from its country-specific grant windows. Apart from some global/regional grants (e.g. for ENRAP), the evaluation finds little evidence that the grants have had much of an impact on the loan-funded activities in the country. Country-specific grants tied to selected projects and programmes support project activities more directly, but their total volume has been minute. This is partly because the country-specific grant window only became available after the approval of the IFAD Policy for Grant Financing in 2003.

106. The evaluation concurs with the recent move to direct supervision and implementation, even though there are resource issues that need consideration, especially given the size of the ongoing portfolio in the country. Similarly, good efforts have been made to establish a country presence in India since 2001. The country presence is growing and involved in a range of activities related to the country strategy and programme management. There are challenges, however, in the current arrangements, and concerns about the impact country presence can truly have, especially in terms of implementation support, partnership-building, policy dialogue, knowledge management and donor coordination – given the level of delegation of authority as well as the size and complexity of the country programme. According to the CPE, a strengthened country office in India would not only contribute to achieving better results in the country, but could also possibly play a wider role in the subcontinent in terms of enhancing efficiency and improving performance in selected countries in the region. The evaluation also concludes that, overall, the hosting arrangements with WFP may in the future no longer be the most attractive option for IFAD country presence, not only because of the forthcoming cost increases for services rendered by WFP but also because of the limited space available. Furthermore, the temporary nature of staff contracts does not provide the required job security and incentives for further enhancing performance.

107. Perhaps the CPE's most important message is that the context in India has changed significantly. The emerging middle-income country status of India will have important implications for IFAD's role and focus in the country in the coming decade and beyond. Together with the vast amount of national technical expertise and funds available both through centrally supported schemes and state-financed initiatives, this will pose a major challenge for IFAD in articulating its objectives and priorities in the future, also in light of the relatively high transaction costs for the government in nurturing and expanding its partnership with IFAD. All in all, the implications are far-reaching, and after 30 years of cooperation, IFAD and the Government are at a crossroad. They will need to carefully and jointly reflect on the alternative options, directions and approaches to pursue in

order to ensure the continued high relevance of their important partnership for the future. But one thing is clear: the transfer of financial resources will not be the main focus of the partnership in the future.

B. Recommendations

108. The CPE offers the following recommendations for IFAD and the Government to consider when developing the new India COSOP and future projects and programmes. The recommendations are clustered in two broad categories: strategic issues and operational issues:

i. Strategic issues

- a. **Give more priority to smallholder agriculture.** Given its crucial role as an engine for promoting pro-poor growth and reducing hunger and rural poverty; sustainable smallholder agriculture should be included as a central strategic objective in the new COSOP. Among other issues, this should include an emphasis on promoting smallholder farm viability and risk management, with specific attention to rainfed areas and, in particular, to in situ water conservation, livestock development and crop production, including staple cereal and pulse productivity;
- b. **Refine targeting and reduce geographic coverage.** IFAD should pay greater attention to smallholder farmers, but also continue to support rural women and tribal peoples. The geographic focus should in principle be narrowed, and not expanded beyond the states covered by ongoing operations. Also two-state projects funded through one loan and one supervision budget should be avoided in the future;
- c. **Enhance private-sector engagement.** In line with corporate social responsibility principles, private-sector enterprises should be mobilized to deliver rural finance and extension services, provide input supply and access to agro-processing infrastructure, facilitate transport of agricultural produce to market points, promote innovations and scaling up, make information and communication technology more widely available in rural areas, and so on;
- d. **Promote innovations that can be scaled up.** The main aim of IFAD-funded projects and programmes in India in the future should be to introduce pro-poor innovations that are suitable for scaling up. It is therefore recommended that the new COSOP include a well-defined innovations agenda outlining areas that merit prioritization. The agenda could include, for example, promoting innovations in microfinance (e.g. to enable crop insurance, transfer of remittances), pro-poor drought- and pest-resistant agriculture technology, and the use of information and telecommunications to link poor people to markets. In each case, the country strategy should make explicit the approach that will be pursued for scaling up.
- e. **Launch a coherent knowledge programme.** A key aim of the programme should be to narrow knowledge gaps in agriculture and rural development, and more generally in rural poverty reduction in the country. The programme could, inter alia, include activities to document and share lessons learned from IFAD's own experience in India; distil and promote lessons from IFAD operations in other countries that are relevant to the India country programme; and encourage exchange visits by government officials, project staff, civil society and NGOs to IFAD-financed projects within and outside India.

- f. **Seek deeper convergence with government.** For better effectiveness and efficiency, there must be greater convergence within government-funded programmes, and between IFAD-funded operations and other donor- and government-assisted programmes. The aim would be to ensure complementarities in objectives and activities between IFAD-funded and government-financed agriculture and rural development projects and programmes.
- g. **Widen partnership with central government.** IFAD needs to engage more proactively not only with the central Ministry of Agriculture but also with other ministries and the National Planning Commission in order to help direct their expertise and experience on areas that are critical for achieving sustainable livelihoods in the agricultural sector. These agencies also play an important role in national policy and legislation formulation, coordination and monitoring and evaluation, as well as in financing large and important centrally sponsored schemes in the agriculture and rural sectors.
- h. **Ensure ownership and commitment by state governments.** State governments need to be involved from the very beginning of project design to ensure that they take full responsibility for activities and act on the issues that IFAD-supported operations recurrently face.
- i. **Increase loan size.** This would contribute to lowering transaction and administrative costs for both the Government and IFAD, while allowing greater attention to be paid to implementation support, learning and impact achievement. It would also free up time, allowing IFAD to devote greater attention to non-lending activities.

ii. Operational issues

- a. **Strengthen the India country office.** A strengthened country office is required, inter alia, to enhance project supervision and implementation support, improve policy dialogue, promote and scale up innovations, strengthen cooperation and harmonization with other donors, build partnerships and enhance knowledge management. Consideration should be given to establishing the India country office as a subregional office. The idea would be to establish an office covering, in addition to India, countries in the region that could efficiently and feasibly be dealt with from New Delhi.
- b. **Ensure greater continuity in project directors.** Rapid turnover of some project directors is a systemic concern. Therefore, IFAD should, right at the beginning of project design, reach a written agreement with state governments that project directors will remain in their positions for at least three years and preferably longer.
- c. **Improve project efficiency.** Some of the measures recommended above are expected to contribute to better efficiency, such as limiting the geographic coverage of IFAD-funded operations, and ensuring deeper convergence. There are other measures that should be taken to improve efficiency, including streamlining the flow of funds to limit implementation delays, and strengthening capacity in project management units and state governments.

- d. **Resource issues.** Greater attention in the future to non-lending activities, implementation support, mobilization of expertise in conflict resolution and peacebuilding, scaling up of innovations, deeper engagement with the government and the private sector, and the strengthening of the country office and establishment of a subregional office is likely to have additional recurrent administrative resource implications. It is therefore recommended that Management conduct a detailed cost analysis during the formulation of the next COSOP and make the necessary allocations commensurate with the size, focus and coverage of IFAD-supported activities in India.
- e. **Evaluation capacity development.** In close collaboration with the Asia and the Pacific Division, OE will explore opportunities for supporting the Planning Commission's efforts to establish an independent evaluation unit in India.

A snapshot of IFAD-supported operations in India

First IFAD loan-funded project to India:	1979
Total number of loan-funded projects approved:	24
Total amount of IFAD lending:	US\$656 million
Lending terms:	Highly concessional ²⁵
Counterpart funding from Government:	US\$877 million
Bilateral and multilateral cofinancing:	US\$358 million
Total portfolio cost:	US\$1.9 billion
Focus of operations:	Tribal development, women's empowerment, microfinance, institution-building and livelihoods.
Major cofinanciers:	DFID, the Netherlands, UNDP, WFP and the World Bank
Number of ongoing projects:	9 (of which 1 is not yet effective)
Total grant amount:	<p>Global and regional grants 21 grants between 2002 and 2008 for a total value of US\$23.1 million</p> <p>Country-specific grants 16 grants provided to India since 1997 for a total value of US\$3.3 million</p>

²⁵ IFAD provides loans according to three different lending terms: highly concessional, intermediate, and ordinary. According to the IFAD lending policies and criteria, special loans on highly concessional terms shall be free of interest but bear a service charge of 0.75 per cent per annum and have a maturity period of 40 years, including a grace period of 10 years.

Definition of evaluation criteria applied in the CPE

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Definition^a</i>
Project performance	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance 	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, institutional priorities and partner and donor policies. It also entails an assessment of project coherence in achieving its objectives.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness 	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency 	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.
Rural poverty impact	
	Impact is defined as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Household income and assets 	Household income provides a means of assessing the flow of economic benefits accruing to an individual or group, whereas assets relate to a stock of accumulated items of economic value.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human and social capital and empowerment 	Human and social capital and empowerment include an assessment of the changes that have occurred in the empowerment of individuals, the quality of grassroots organizations and institutions, and the poor's individual and collective capacity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food security and agricultural productivity 	Changes in food security relate to availability, access to food and stability of access, whereas changes in agricultural productivity are measured in terms of yields.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural resources and the environment 	The focus on natural resources and the environment involves assessing the extent to which a project contributes to changes in the protection, rehabilitation or depletion of natural resources and the environment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutions and policies 	The criterion relating to institutions and policies is designed to assess changes in the quality and performance of institutions, policies and the regulatory framework that influence the lives of the poor.
Other performance criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability 	The likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. It also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of pro-poor innovation, replication and scaling up 	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have: (i) introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction; and (ii) the extent to which these interventions have been (or are likely to be) replicated and scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and others agencies.
Overall project achievement	
	This provides an overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the analysis made under the various evaluation criteria cited above.
Performance of partners	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFAD • Government • Cooperating institution • NGO/CBO 	This criterion assesses the contribution of partners to project design, execution, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation. The performance of each partner will be assessed on an individual basis with a view to the partner's expected role and responsibility in the project life cycle.

IFAD-supported projects and programmes in India

(1987-2009)

Project Name	Project Cost US\$ million	Loan US\$ million	Board Approval	Loan Effectiveness	Completion Date	Status
1. Orissa Tribal Development Project	24.4	12.2	03 Dec 87	27 May 88	30 Jun 97	Closed
2. Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project	30.6	17.0	26 Apr 89	26 Jan 90	30 Jun 98	Closed
3. Andhra Pradesh Tribal Development Project	46.5	19.9	04 Apr 91	27 Aug 91	30 Sep 98	Closed
4. Maharashtra Rural Credit Project	48.3	29.1	06 Apr 93	06 Jan 94	31 Mar 02	Closed
5. Andhra Pradesh Participatory Tribal Development Project	50.3	26.7	19 Apr 94	18 Aug 94	30 Sep 02	Closed
6. Mewat Area Development Project	22.3	14.9	12 Apr 95	07 Jul 95	31 Dec 04	Closed
7. Rural Women's Development and Empowerment Project	53.8	19.2	05 Dec 96	19 May 99	30 Jun 05	Closed
8. North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas	33.2	22.9	29 Apr 97	23 Feb 99	31 Mar 08	Closed
9. Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Programme	41.7	23.0	29 Apr 99	21 Jun 01	31 Dec 11	Ongoing
10. National Microfinance Support Programme	134.0	21.9	04 May 00	01 Apr 02	31 Dec 09	Closed
11. Livelihood Security Project for Earthquake-Affected Rural Households in Gujarat	24.0	14.9	12 Sep 01	04 Nov 02	09 Oct 06	Closed
12. Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme	91.2	19.9	23 Apr 02	15 Jul 03	31 Mar 13	Ongoing
13. Livelihoods Improvement Project in the Himalayas	84.2	39.9	18 Dec 03	01 Oct 04	31 Dec 12	Ongoing
14. Post-Tsunami Sustainable Livelihoods Programme for the Coastal Communities of Tamil Nadu	68.5	29.9	19 Apr 05	09 Jul 07	30 Sep 15	Ongoing
15. Tejaswini Rural Women's Empowerment Programme	208.7	39.4	13 Dec 05	23 Jul 07	30 Sep 15	Ongoing
16. Women's Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme in the Mid-Gangetic Plains	52.4	30.1	14 Dec 06	4 Dec 10	31 Dec 17	Ongoing
17. Mitigating Poverty in Western Rajasthan Project	62.3	30.9	24 Apr 08	11 Dec 08	31 Dec 14	Ongoing
18. Convergence of Agricultural Interventions in Maharashtra's Distressed Districts Programme	118.6	40.1	30 Apr 09	4 Dec 09	30 June 18	Ongoing

Composition of the evaluation team

EVALUATION TEAM	
Overall Responsibility	Mr Luciano Lavizzari, Director, Office of Evaluation (OE)
Evaluation Manager	Mr Ashwani Muthoo, Senior Evaluation Officer (OE)
Research Analyst	Mr Jicheng Zhang (OE)
Administrative support	Ms Kendra White, Evaluation Assistant (OE)
Senior Independent Adviser	Mr Hans Binswanger, Agriculture and Rural Development
	Mr Majid Benabdellah, Senior Evaluation Officer
	Mr Andrew Brubaker, Evaluation Officer
	Mr Mark Keating, Evaluation Officer
	Mr Pau-Andre Rochon, Senior Evaluation Officer
Internal OE Peer Reviewers	
Consultants	
Team Leader	Mr Basil Kavalsky, Economist
Team Members	Mr Dusmanta Kumar Giri, Institutions, Decentralization and Tribal Affairs
	Mr Michael Macklin, Agriculture, Natural Resources Management, and Environment
	Mr Sarath Mananwatte, Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Efficiency Analysis
	Ms Meera Mitra, Gender and Social Development
	Mr Kotaiah Pamidi, Rural Financial Services
	Ms Laura Gagliardone, Desk Review Work

India CPE evaluation framework

	Key questions	Main sources of data and information
Portfolio performance	<p>Project relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are project objectives realistic and consistent with India's national agriculture and rural development strategies and policies, the COSOP and relevant IFAD sector and subsector policies, as well as with the needs of poor rural people? • Was the project design (including synergies between and among activities and services, financial allocations, project management and execution, supervision and implementation support, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements) appropriate for achieving the project's core objectives? • How coherent was the project in terms of its fit with the policies, programmes and projects undertaken by the Government and other development partners in India? • Was the project design participatory in the sense that it took into consideration the inputs and needs of key stakeholders, including the Government, executing agencies, cofinanciers and the expected beneficiaries and their grass-roots organizations? • Did the project benefit from available knowledge (for example, the experience of other similar projects in the area or in the country) during its design and implementation? • Did project objectives remain relevant over the period of time required for implementation? In the event of significant changes in the project context or in IFAD policies, has design been retrofitted? • What are the main factors that contributed to a positive or less positive assessment of relevance? <p>Project effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the objectives of the project and its components been attained both in quantitative and in qualitative terms? • If the project is not yet complete, is it likely that so far unattained objectives may be accomplished in full/in part before its closure? • What factors in project design and implementation account for the estimated results in terms of effectiveness? • In particular, what changes in the overall context (e.g. policy framework, political situation, institutional set-up, economic shocks, civil unrest, etc.) have affected or are likely to affect project implementation and overall results? <p>Project efficiency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the costs of investments to develop specific project outputs (e.g. what is the cost of constructing one kilometre of rural road)? The quality of works/supplies needs to be fully (and explicitly) recognized for such input/output comparisons. • Is the cost ratio of inputs to outputs comparable to local, national or regional benchmarks? • What are the loan costs per beneficiary (both at the time of appraisal and at the time of evaluation) and how do they compare with those of other IFAD-funded operations (or those of other donors) in the same country and/or other countries? 	<p>Government of India plans; IFAD policy statements and India COSOPS. Interviews with IFAD managers, the Government and project officials.</p> <p>Evaluations of completed projects, project completion reports, mid-term reviews and supervision reports. Surveys of project beneficiaries.</p> <p>Evaluations of completed projects, project completion reports, mid-term reviews and supervision reports. Surveys of project beneficiaries. Interviews with project managers.</p>

	Key Questions	Main sources of data and information
Portfolio performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the economic rate of return at evaluation compare with project design? • What are the administrative costs per beneficiary and how do they compare with those of other IFAD-funded operations (or those of other donors) in India of other countries, especially in South Asian countries? • Have a number of IFAD-funded projects had substantial delays in effectiveness? What has been the cause of these delays and how costly have these delays been? • By how much was the original closing date extended, and what were the additional administrative costs incurred during the extension period? • What factors helped account for project efficiency performance? <p style="text-align: center;">Rural poverty impact</p> <p>I. Household income and assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the composition and level of household incomes change (more income sources, more diversification, higher income)? • What changes are apparent in intra-household incomes and assets? • Did farm households' physical assets change (farmland, water, livestock, trees, equipment, etc.)? Did other household assets change (e.g. dwelling is makeshift or a <i>pucca</i> house with walls and roof made of permanent materials), bicycles, radios, television sets, telephones, etc.)? • Did households' financial assets change (savings, debt, borrowing, insurance)? • Were poor rural people able to access financial markets more easily? • Did poor rural people have better access to input and output markets? • Do the better health and education promoted by the programme allow poor rural people to obtain higher incomes and more assets? <p>II. Human and social capital and empowerment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did rural people's organizations and grass-roots institutions (such as self-help groups, water user groups) change? • Were the self-help groups established under the project effective in empowering women in the community and promoting gender equity? • Are changes in the social cohesion and local self-help capacities of rural communities visible? • To what extent did the project empower poor rural people vis-à-vis development actors and local and national public authorities? Do they play more effective roles in decision-making? Was the devolution process facilitated by the project? • Were poor rural people empowered to gain better access to information needed for their livelihoods? • Did poor rural people gain access to better health and education facilities? • Two important social areas – young people and migration – have not figured prominently in IFAD's programme in India. Should there have been a greater effort to integrate these issues into the programme? <p>III. Food security and agricultural productivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did cropping intensity change? Was there an improvement in land productivity and, if so, to what extent? Did the returns to labour change? How many tribal households have transferred from subsistence shifting cultivation to economic agricultural activities? Did children's nutritional status change (e.g. stunting, wasting, underweight)? 	<p>Evaluations of completed projects, project completion reports, mid-term reviews and supervision reports. Surveys of project beneficiaries. Interviews with beneficiaries and project managers.</p>

	Key Questions	Main sources of data and information
Portfolio performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did household food security change? • To what extent did poor rural people improve their access to input and output markets that could help them enhance their productivity and access to food? <p>IV. Natural resources and the environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the status of the natural resources base change (land, water, forests, pastures, fish stocks, etc.)? In tribal development, how much shifting cultivation land was treated with sound conservation measures? • Did local communities' access to natural resources change (in general and specifically for poor people)? • Has the degree of environmental vulnerability changed (e.g. exposure to pollutants, climate change effects, volatility in resources, potential natural disasters)? • Have the projects facilitated the implementation of policies and legislation such as those relating to the access of poor people to natural resources, adaptation to climate change, and the protection of biodiversity? <p>V. Institutions and policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were there any changes in rural financial institutions (e.g. in facilitating access for poor rural people)? • How did public institutions and service delivery for poor rural people change? • What improvements were discernable in local governance, including the capacity and role of government departments, NGOs, the private sector, and elected bodies and officials? • Were there any changes in national/sectoral policies affecting poor rural people? • Did the regulatory framework change insofar as its impact on poor rural people? • Did market structures and other institutional factors affecting poor producers' access to markets change? <p><i>Note: For each domain, the evaluation should describe the impact achieved and also the underlying reasons (i.e. the "why" factor) behind the observed or expected changes.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Project sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was a specific exit strategy or approach prepared, and agreed upon, by key partners to ensure post-project sustainability? • What are the chances that benefits generated by the project will continue after project closure, and what factors militate in favour of or against maintaining benefits? What is the likely resilience of economic activities to shocks or progressive exposure to competition and reduction of subsidies? • How robust are the institutions that have been established under IFAD-funded projects, and are they likely to be able to ensure the continuation of benefits to poor rural people? • Is there a clear indication of government commitment after the loan closing date, for example, in terms of provision of funds for selected activities, human resources availability, continuity of pro-poor policies and participatory development approaches, and institutional support? Did the IFAD project design anticipate that such support would be needed after loan closure? 	<p>Visits to sites of completed projects and interviews with beneficiaries and project managers. In selected cases, consideration to be given to commissioning new surveys.</p>

	Key Questions	Main source of data and information
Portfolio Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do project activities benefit from the engagement, participation and ownership of local communities, grass-roots organizations, and poor rural people? • Did the NGOs involved continue their support to village organizations after project closure? • Are adopted approaches technically viable? Do project users have access to adequate training for maintenance and to spare parts and repairs? • Are the ecosystem and environmental resources (e.g. freshwater availability, soil fertility, vegetative cover) likely to contribute to project benefits or is there a depletion process taking place? • IFAD is one of the few agencies that has operated in conflict situations in India. Are there lessons from IFAD's involvement in such situations? <p style="text-align: center;">Innovations, replication and scaling up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the characteristics of innovation(s) promoted by the project or programme? Are the innovations consistent with the IFAD definition of this concept? • How did the innovation originate (e.g. through the beneficiaries, Government of India, IFAD, NGOs, research institution, etc.) and was it adapted in any particular way during project/programme design? • Are the actions in question truly innovative or are they well established elsewhere but new to the country or project area? • Were successfully promoted innovations documented and shared? Were other specific activities (e.g. workshops, exchange visits, etc.) undertaken to disseminate the innovative experiences? • Have these innovations been replicated and scaled up and, if so, by whom? If not, what are the realistic prospects that they can and will be replicated and scaled up by the Government, other donors and/or the private sector? <p style="text-align: center;">Performance of partners</p> <p>IFAD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did IFAD mobilize adequate technical expertise in the project design? • Was the design process participatory (with national and local agencies, grass-roots organizations) and did it promote ownership by the borrower? • Were specific efforts made to incorporate the lessons and recommendations from previous independent evaluations in project design and implementation? • Did IFAD adequately integrate observations resulting from its quality enhancement and quality assurance processes? • Did IFAD (and the Government) take the initiative to suitably modify project design (if required) during implementation in response to any major changes in the context, especially during the mid-term review ? • What was the performance of IFAD in projects that are under direct supervision and implementation support? In the case of the supervision of a cooperating institution, how effective was IFAD in working with the institution to carry out the mandated task? In both cases, has IFAD exercised its developmental and fiduciary responsibilities, including compliance with loan and grant agreements? 	<p>Interviews with the Government and state and local governments. In depth reviews of project documents. Discussions with IFAD managers.</p> <p>Interviews with partner agencies, NGOs and IFAD managers.</p>

	Key Questions	Main sources of data and information
Portfolio performance	<p style="text-align: center;">Performance of partners</p> <p>IFAD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was prompt action taken to ensure the timely implementation of recommendations stemming from the supervision and implementation support missions, including the mid-term review? • Did IFAD undertake the necessary follow-up to resolve any implementation bottlenecks? • Where applicable, what is the role of IFAD's country presence team in India (including proxy country presence arrangements) and what is its performance? Did IFAD headquarters provide the necessary support to its country presence team, for example, in terms of resources, follow-up and guidance, adequate delegation of authority, and so on? • Has IFAD made proactive efforts to be engaged in policy dialogue activities at different levels in order to ensure, inter alia, the replication and scaling up of pro-poor innovations? • Has IFAD been active in creating an effective partnership and maintaining coordination among key partners to ensure the achievement of project objectives, including the replication and scaling up of pro-poor innovations? • Has IFAD, together with the Government, contributed to planning an exit strategy? <p>Government of India</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Government assumed ownership and responsibility for the project? Judging by its actions and policies, has the Government, including national, state and local governments, been fully supportive of project goals? • Has adequate staffing and project management been assured? Have appropriate levels of counterpart funding been provided on time? • Has project management discharged its functions adequately, and has the Government provided policy guidance to project management staff when required? • Did the Government ensure suitable coordination of the various departments involved in execution? • Has auditing been undertaken in a timely manner and have reports been submitted as required? • Did the Government (and IFAD) take the initiative to suitably modify the project design (if required) during implementation in response to any major changes in the context? • Was prompt action taken to ensure the timely implementation of recommendations from supervision and implementation support missions, including the mid-term review? • Has an effective monitoring and evaluation system been put in place and does it generate information on performance and impact that is useful for project managers when they are called upon to take critical decisions? • Has the Government (and IFAD) contributed to planning an exit strategy and/or making arrangements for continued funding of certain activities? • Have loan covenants and the spirit of the loan agreement been observed? • Has the Government facilitated the participation of NGOs and civil society where appropriate? • Have procurement procedures and the flow of funds been suitable for ensuring timely implementation? • Has the Government engaged in a policy dialogue with IFAD concerning the promotion of pro-poor innovations? 	Interviews with government officials and IFAD managers.

	Key Questions	Main sources of data and information
Portfolio performance	<p>Cooperating institution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should there have been greater involvement of partners such as the United Nations agencies and other development agencies in the design, financing and implementation of the programme? • Has the supervision and implementation support programme been properly managed (frequency, composition, continuity)? • Has the cooperating institution complied with loan covenants? • Has the cooperating institution been effective in financial management? • Has the cooperating institution sought to monitor project impacts and IFAD concerns (e.g. targeting, participation, empowerment of the poor, and gender aspects)? • Have implementation problems been highlighted and appropriate remedies suggested? Have the suggestions and related actions been followed in the next supervision missions? • Has the cooperating institution promoted or encouraged self-assessment and learning processes? • Has the supervision process enhanced implementation and poverty impacts? • Has the cooperating institution been responsive to requests and advice from IFAD when carrying out its supervision and project implementation responsibilities? <p>CBOs and NGOs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effectively have NGOs fulfilled their contractual service agreements? • Have NGOs/CBOs acted to strengthen the capacities of rural poor organizations? • Did NGOs/CBOs contribute to the sustainability of project activities? 	Interviews with representatives of cooperating institutions. Project completion reports, mid-term reviews and evaluations of completed projects.
Non-lending activities	<p>Relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are policy dialogue, partnership-building, and knowledge management objectives clearly outlined in the COSOP? Are they in line with the needs of poor people and are they consistent with the strategic objectives of the COSOP and lending operations, as well as with the Government's priorities? • Do the selected non-lending activities provide sufficient support for country programme objectives as per the COSOP and for the loan portfolio in the country? • Were resources earmarked for non-lending activities and explicitly outlined in the COSOP (e.g. in the form of grants and/or the IFAD administrative budget)? • Was the selected mix of policy dialogue, partnership-building and knowledge management appropriate and relevant? • Were the advisory services delivered by other partners taken into account in selecting the focus of non-lending work? 	Review of IFAD documentation on non-lending activities. Discussions with counterparts responsible for implementing these activities.

	Key Questions	Main sources of data and information
Non-lending activities	<p style="text-align: center;">Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have non-lending activities achieved their objectives if they were explicitly articulated? • How did non-lending activities contribute to the replication and scaling up of innovations promoted by IFAD? • Has IFAD systematically engaged in and contributed to the deliberations of donor working groups related to agriculture, food issues and rural development? • How much progress has been made as a result of non-lending activities in furthering the application of the provisions contained in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in terms of ownership, alignment, donor coordination and harmonization, managing for results and mutual accountability? • With regard to knowledge management, were the COSOP's strategic objectives and project design and implementation properly informed by IFAD experiences in India and elsewhere? • Were the most appropriate approaches deployed to achieve the desired results? • What have been the roles of the IFAD country representative, where applicable, and of the main government institutions in making non-lending services effective? <p style="text-align: center;">Efficiency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could alternative instruments and activities be implemented to reduce costs in non-lending activities? • What were the costs of the different types of non-lending activities and how do they compare with IFAD benchmarks (where available)? • Was the administrative burden on country officials minimized? 	

List of states/projects visited during the India CPE main mission

13 April– 15 May 2009

Office of Evaluation, IFAD

Date	State	Related Projects	Team members participated
April 20-22	Uttar Pradesh	National Microfinance Support Programme	Mr B. Kavalsky Mr P. Kotaiah
		Women's Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme in the Mid-Gangetic Plains (Uttar Pradesh)	
	Gujarat	Livelihood Security Project for Earthquake-Affected Rural Households in Gujarat	Mr S. Mananwatte Ms M. Mitra
	Rajasthan	Mitigating Poverty in Western Rajasthan Project	Mr M. Macklin Mr D.K. Giri
April 23-26	Maharashtra	Tejaswini Rural Women's Empowerment Programme (Maharashtra)	Mr B. Kavalsky, Mr P. Kotaiah, Mr S. Manawatte, Ms M. Mitra, Mr M. Macklin, Mr D.K. Giri
		Maharashtra Rural Credit Project	
		Convergence of Agricultural Interventions in Maharashtra's Distressed Districts Programme	
April 27 -29	Meghalaya	North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas (Meghalaya)	Mr B. Kavalsky Mr. D.K. Giri
		Livelihoods Improvement Project in the Himalayas	
	Tamil Nadu	Post-Tsunami Sustainable Livelihoods Programme for the Coastal Communities of Tamil Nadu	Mr P. Kotaiah, Ms M. Mitra
		Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project	
Jharkhand	Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Programme (Jharkhand)	Mr S. Mananwatte, Mr M. Macklin	
May 4-8	Madhya Pradesh	Tejaswini Rural Women's Empowerment Programme (Madhya Pradesh)	Mr B. Kavalsky, Ms M. Mitra, Mr J. Zhang, Ms S. Fazalbhoy
	Orissa	Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme	Mr P. Kotaiah, Mr S. Mananwatte
	Uttaranchal	Livelihoods Improvement Project in the Himalayas	Mr M. Macklin
	Chhattisgarh	Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Programme (Chhattisgarh)	Mr D.K. Giri
May 14	Gujarat	Livelihood Security Project for Earthquake-Affected Rural Households in Gujarat	Mr A. Muthoo

Note: The main mission visited a total of 11 states.

Senior Independent Adviser's report on the evaluation process and its final report

Hans P. Binswanger-Mkhize, Senior Independent Advisor
13 January 2010

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to serve as senior independent advisor on the India country programme evaluation (CPE). I provided a review of the evaluation mission report and of the final report, and participated in the dissemination mission and the associated field visits, all of which I enjoyed.

The CPE report was produced by an excellent evaluation team with a strong consultants' team leader and good guidance from the Office of Evaluation (OE) team. It produced a comprehensive and well written report. The line of reasoning is clear, and the conclusions and recommendation follow from the analysis. They emphasize the usefulness of IFAD-financed projects in India in the past and foresee an equally useful role in the future, for which recommendations are made. The team had harmonious relationships with the IFAD country team and benefited from its support. Conversely, the country team saw the review as a learning opportunity, rather than a threat. Relationships with government were also excellent, as indicated by the strong support provided by government to the dissemination event in New Delhi. Finally, the team responded well to my suggestions, in particular the one to embed the history of IFAD-funded interventions in a better discussion of the history of rural development in India itself, and of its efforts to strengthen decentralization and participation.

The report discusses the history of IFAD-funded interventions in India and in particular the objectives and accomplishments under the 2001 and 2005 COSOPs. It does so by placing the contribution of IFAD in the context of the longer-term history of agriculture and rural development in India and of recent trends. The discussion provides an understanding of what the current key issues in Indian agriculture and rural development are that need to be addressed, and how to deal with the central issue of scaling up in the future, and with the connection of the IFAD-funded projects to projects financed by state governments or the national government.

The report emphasizes the following features of the IFAD programme that contributed to its success:

- IFAD-financed projects are based on a convergence into a holistic view of rural development that involves empowerment and capacity development, microfinance and livelihoods promotion. For example, in tribal development it typically combines the following interventions: a village empowerment fund for infrastructure (community-driven development), self-help groups and microfinance.
- The report is particularly positive about the empowerment and capacity development components through self-help groups and in the natural resources management areas. It suggests that IFAD innovations were scaled up in state, national and other donors' projects. Innovations include: (i) promoting replicable pro-poor innovative approaches with regard to a new institutional framework for agriculture and rural development, which includes linking self-help groups of women and tribal peoples with rural financial service institutions, government departments, NGOs and other service providers; and (ii) a demonstration effect in terms of the rigour and attention needed to design, implement, supervise, and monitor and evaluate inclusive and grass-roots-oriented agriculture and rural development operations in marginal and remote locations.
- During the field visits of the dissemination, we not only got a chance to see the self-help groups on the ground, but also learned how the whole movement had

been scaled up so that, by now, tens of millions of women all over India are members of such groups.

The report also analyses the following weaknesses in the programme:

- The issue of performance evaluation has not been adequately addressed. The sustainability and impact of projects in tribal areas has not been established; while there are many indications of the success of self-help groups, the projects that supported them did not include any impact evaluations, which would have quantified their impacts and documented the causes of success.
- Policy dialogue and knowledge management have not been as strong as desirable. This was associated with inadequate knowledge transfer even within the IFAD portfolio.
- Replication and scaling up has not been systematically approached. The traditional approach to projects will no longer work: the approaches promoted by IFAD have largely been mainstreamed in India. Therefore, the case of taking the IFAD model to new location is no longer convincing.
- Livelihoods and income-generation components have been relatively weak: from the report and our field visits, it is clear that livelihoods have been strengthened in a demand-driven way through the self-help groups and microfinance interventions; but that a more structured value chain approach to livelihoods has been missing, which would have focused on the demand side as well as on the technology side; and that agriculture in particular has been relatively neglected. Indeed, it is just such support that the self-help groups visited by the mission are demanding.
- In the microfinance area, it suggests that several systemic issues need to be better addressed. In particular, it emphasizes the need to look at micro-insurance.
- Finally the report identifies a set of issues that received limited attention: dryland agriculture; facilitation of technology transfer for increasing small farmers' productivity; support to migrant workers; private-sector involvement and market linkages; land tenure issues; partnerships with central government agencies and other donors; and use of the country's excellent information technology basis for agriculture and rural development purposes.

The report is a good input for the forthcoming COSOP. The COSOP preparation, however, needs to take account of a number of dilemmas with which the poverty-targeted IFAD-funded interventions are confronted and which are not fully addressed in the report. They include:

- i. Mainline institutions are usually poorly motivated and ill-equipped to target poor areas and poor people. Given these difficulties, it is no accident that IFAD has chosen to use parallel systems involving communities, self-help groups and NGOs, but that model also encounters limitations that are fully discussed in the report. The broadening of the interventions for the target groups, in particular with respect to their inclusion in value chains, requires integration of the services and skills that the mainline institutions can provide with the implementation mechanisms of the poverty-targeted interventions. Anchoring interventions within mainline institutions is also necessary for scaling up.
- ii. IFAD clearly has done pioneering work in tribal areas, and the tribal groups are a large poverty group. They are also threatened by outsiders wanting their resources, as well as by an increasing number of Naxalite rebel groups that are threatening

their lives and, in some cases, the state itself. Yet, the IFAD approach is called a work in progress.

- iii. Tribal groups and women are not the only poor people: members of scheduled castes, young people and temporary migrants are often severely disadvantaged, but are dispersed within the general population, or highly mobile and therefore difficult to reach. An organizational framework for targeting them has not been developed under the IFAD-funded projects, and I do not know of any other.
- iv. Focusing on women is highly desirable, and has been a success in the IFAD-financed operations. However, if agriculture is to be promoted, men also need to be involved. It is not clear what organizational models could be used without undermining the focus on and benefits for women.
- v. Poor people derive their livelihoods from multiple sources, including farming, wage labour, temporary migration and trading. The model that IFAD is using lets the self-help groups and communities decide which of these activities should be prioritized. There is also an understanding that, to support sustainable income growth fully, more agricultural development in poor communities and greater linkage of poor people to value chains are required. Should the selection of activities of the communities and groups be the determinant factor, or should agricultural priorities be enhanced by project design choices from above?
- vi. This dilemma is further aggravated by the fact that supporting agricultural innovations and investments requires different institutional and organizational models than those typical of IFAD-funded projects, or more generally local and community-driven development (LCDD) programmes. The organizing principles derive from the value chain itself, and go from the firms involved in managing marketing and processing to the smallholder farms, input suppliers and other agricultural services. Neither poverty nor gender, and in fact not even co-residence, is easily used to form the corresponding communities. Instead, they have to be based on common interest in the product of the value chain. These communities will go beyond the village or even groups of villages. Membership of better-off farmers is desirable, since they can help the viability of the institutions and the value chain.

In advocating for more emphasis on agriculture, the COSOP needs to deal with dilemmas number (iv), (v) and (vi).

Dilemma (i) is more easily addressed by framing IFAD-funded projects firmly as LCDD projects that involve co-production of services by communities, local governments, sector specialists, and NGOs and other private-sector actors. While the report deals with all these co-producers, it still pays little attention to local government, and instead spends a lot of time on dealing with the roles of the central and state governments. (What is said on these is of course important). More is needed on local government, especially the poor development of the panchayati raj system in the poverty states. What are appropriate funding mechanisms for local government using the intergovernmental fiscal system, and how can the silo nature of the centrally and state-sponsored schemes be overcome through reforms?

As far as dilemma (ii) is concerned, that approaches on tribal groups is a work in progress suggests to me that IFAD's future programme should focus primarily on these areas, as it has the best basis to make progress here for all of India. If IFAD were to succeed here, it would deserve the Nobel Prize.

Dilemma (iii) about targeting additional poverty groups may just have to be left unresolved. In the absence of any models of how to target migrant workers, young

people and scheduled castes in IFAD operations, it seems a stretch to ask the organization to deal with them as well. There is enough to do in the areas where it has competence.

In the report, most successful investments are said to be those of individuals. That suggests that private choices of productive activities as practised by IFAD are indeed appropriate and necessary, rather than imposition from above of a focus on agriculture.

- But private choice also creates a dilemma for marketing and connections to value chains. During our field visits we found that MAVIM, an NGO in Maharashtra, is now setting up support centres for women self-help groups that ultimately are expected to become self-sustaining by providing support to the self-help organizations in each of the villages in the area of linkage to markets, value chains, finance, training and other support functions. This effort is in its infancy, but if successful, would provide a model for solving dilemma (v) of who should choose the investment activities and dilemma (vi) of the alternative organizational model required by value chain promotion. Other modes of federations are being tried in Andhra Pradesh and other states. They will need to be carefully followed in order to derive lessons for the next COSOP.

In Senegal, dilemmas (v) and (vi) were solved in another way, namely by designing two different projects: an LCDD project with a geographic basis for action at local government and community level, and a project in support of commercial and export agriculture, with organizations based on specific commodities. While both projects collaborated with each other and with local government, and while both benefited some of the poor, they were not poverty-targeted along the lines of IFAD. I am not at all clear how a project or even parallel projects would be able to simultaneously deal with freedom of choice of the beneficiaries, the organizational dilemmas and intensive poverty targeting. I am, therefore, not sure that the emphasis on strengthening agricultural interventions in IFAD-funded projects is a feasible recommendation (what a strange thing to say for an agricultural economist!).

If incomes have been rising in the projects, as stated in the report, and women have been empowered, then why try to go beyond this to field crops and to include the men? That will only complicate the project design. The fact that most money from self-help groups went for livestock rather than crops may not only reflect the preponderance of women in these groups but more importantly that crop production cannot be financed through microfinance. This is shown by the fact that no microfinance institution in the world has yet been able to finance crop production in dryland areas. Focusing on the crop production activities of men, therefore, involves not only the development of an organizational framework for including poor men, but also a different way of making credit available. Alternatively, it would imply a move towards grants, as is done in some of the mainline interventions. Including men will, therefore, require specific organizational and process innovations that may not yet be in IFAD's arsenal.

As stressed in my book on LCDD, scaling up requires careful and participatory assignment of specific functions and tasks to the co-producers, and resolution of the funding problems of all of them. While there are general principles and guidelines, such assignment of functions and responsibilities cannot be worked out in an office, but has to be worked out in the field with those who are supposed to execute the functions as part of the group that determines them. And it will differ from region to region. Resolving these issues will properly address the problems of entirely parallel channels that the report puts centre stage.

Suggestions for further activities in preparation of the next COSOP

- i. While there are some good examples of linkages with the private sector, the successful examples given are for milk, a success all over India. Clearly, if the

forthcoming COSOP is to emphasize private-sector linkages, a review should be undertaken of what else is going on in India, and perhaps in China, as the future programme cannot be expected to do small pilots but must be able to scale up successful experiences.

- ii. Undoubtedly the next COSOP will focus more on tribal groups. Here too a review of successful approaches all over India, not just IFAD experience, is necessary, so that the need for further experimentation is reduced and the work can focus more on scaling up.
- iii. The issue of micro-insurance needs further thought. Clearly, the self-help groups are multi-purpose groups that, besides support to income-generation projects, also provide support to members who experience an individual-specific shock that can be insured within small groups. The question then becomes what a specific micro-insurance product would add to this. Note that micro-insurance, if it is to be anchored in small groups or within villages, will never be able to insure systemic or covariant shocks such as those coming from the weather or from market prices. I am, therefore, sceptical about what micro-insurance can do in this area.

Bibliography

General references:

- Asian Development Bank, *Asian Development Outlook*, 2008
- Asian Development Bank, *India Country Strategy and Programme Update 2006 - 2008*, Manila, 2005
- Asian Development Bank, *Key Indicators of Developing Asian and Pacific Countries*, 2007
- Department for International Development, *India Country Plan 2008 - 2015: 'Three Faces of India'*, London, 2008
- European Commission, *India: Country Strategy Paper 2007 - 2013*, Brussels, 2008
- GTZ Sustainet, *Sustainable agriculture: A pathway out of poverty for India's rural poor*, Eschborn, 2006
- Hans P. Binswanger-Mkhize, Jacomina P. de Regt, and Stephen Spector, *Scaling Up Local & Community Driven Development (LCDD), A Real World Guide to Its Theory and Practice*, 2009
- IFPRI, *Indian Agriculture and Rural Development: Strategic Issues and Reform Options*, Washington DC, 2005
- IMF, *India: 2007 Article IV Consultation - Staff Report, Staff Statement, Public Information Notice on the Executive Board Discussion and Statement by the Executive Director for India*, Washington DC, 2007
- Kakwani N., *Poverty measurement matters: an Indian story*, Brasilia, United Nations Development Programme, International Poverty Centre, 2004
- Kumar Arun, *World Bank rural finance scheme to help Indian farmers*, newKerala.com, Washington, 9 June 2009
- Mahub ul Haq, *Human Development in South Asia 2002: Agriculture and Rural Development*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, Human Development Centre, 2003
- OECD, *Agricultural Policies in Non-OECD Countries: Monitoring and Evaluation*, Paris, 2007
- OECD, *International Development Statistics*, 2008
- Shah A. and Guru B., *Poverty in Remote Rural Areas in India: A Review of Evidence and Issues*, Working Paper No. 139, Ahmedabad, Gujarat Institute of Development Research, 2003
- Singh R.P., Kumar R. and Singh N.P., *Economic Growth and Sustainability in North-East Region of India: A Perspective*, Journal of Rural Development, 2005, 24 (1): 89-104
- Srivastava P., *Poverty Targeting in Asia: Country Experience in India*, Discussion Paper No. 5, Tokyo, ADB Institute, 2004
- Srivastava N. and Sharma P. (eds), *Protecting the Vulnerable Poor in India: The Role of Social Safety Nets*, New Delhi, World Food Programme, 2006
- Sundaram K. and Tendulkar S. D., *Poverty in India, An Assessment and Analysis*, Manila, Asian Development Bank, 2003
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, *Country strategy: India 2005 - 2009*, Stockholm, 2005
- The Economist Intelligence Unit, *India Country Profile*, London, 2008
- UNDP, *Country Programme for India (2008 - 2012)*, New York, 2007
- UNDP, *Human Development Report 2007 - 2008*, New York, 2008
- USAID/India, *Strategy 2003 - 2007*, Washington DC
- World Bank, *India Country Briefings & Country Overview*, 2007
- World Bank, *Country Strategy for India 2005 - 2008*, Washington DC, 2004
- World Bank, *Development Policy Review, Inclusive Growth and Service Delivery: Building on India's Success*, Washington DC, 2006
- World Bank, *India: Re-energizing the Agricultural Sector to Sustain Growth and Reduce Poverty*, Washington DC, 2004
- World Bank, *World Development Indicators, India*, 2008
- World Bank, *World Development Report: Agriculture for Development*, Washington DC, 2008

Government of India policies and strategies:

- Bharat Nirman, *A time-bound plan for rural infrastructure by the Government of India in partnership with State Governments and Panchayat Raj Institutions 2005 - 2009*, Ministry of Rural Development, 2005
- Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture & Cooperation, *National Agriculture Policy*, 2000
- Ministry of Agriculture, *National Agriculture Development Programme (Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana - RKVY)*, 2007
- Ministry of Agriculture, *National Food Security Mission*, 2007
- Ministry of Agriculture, *National Policy for Farmers*, 2007
- Ministry of Environment and Forests, *National Forest Policy*, 1988
- Ministry of Law and Justice, *The Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act*, 1989
- Ministry of Rural Development, *National Rural Employment Guarantee Act-2005*, 2005
- Ministry of Rural Development, *Rural Roads Development Plan - Vision 2025*, 2007
- Ministry of Water Resources, *National Water Policy*, 2002
- Planning Commission, *Eleventh Five Year Plan 2007 - 12*, 2008
- Prime Minister's Office, *National Common Minimum Programme of the Government of India*, 2004

Evaluations conducted by other organizations:

- Asian Development Bank, *Country Assistance Programme Evaluation for India*, 2007

Canadian International Development Agency, *Evaluation of India-Canada Development Cooperation*, Gatineau (Quebec), 2005
 FAO, *Evaluation of FAO cooperation with India in the period 2003-2008*, 2009
 Heath J., *An Evaluation of DFID's India Programme 2000-2005*, London, Department for International Development, 2006
 International Development Center of Japan, *Country Assistance Evaluation of India*, Tokyo, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 2004
 UNDP Evaluation Office, *Country Evaluation: India*, New York, 2002
 World Food Programme, *Summary Report of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the India Country Programme 2003-2007*, 2007
 Zanini G., *India - The Challenges of Development: a Country Assistance Evaluation*, Washington DC, World Bank, 2001

IFAD strategy and policy documents:

Anti-corruption policy, 2005
Country Strategic Opportunities Paper (COSOP), 2001
Country Strategic Opportunities Paper (COSOP), 2005
Decision Tools in Rural Finance, 2002
Evaluation policy, 2003
Framework for a Results-based and Impact Management System, 2003
IFAD Policy for Grant Financing, 2003
IFAD Strategic Framework 2007-2010, 2007
Innovation strategy, 2007
Knowledge management strategy, 2007
Land policy, 2008
Rural enterprise policy, 2004
Rural finance policy, 2000 and 2009 (update)
Strategy for Poverty Reduction in Asia and the Pacific, 2002

IFAD evaluations:

Direct Supervision Pilot Programme, 2005
Evaluation of IFAD's Regional Strategy (EVEREST) in Asia and the Pacific, Country Working Paper, 2006
Field Presence Pilot Programme, 2007
IFAD's Regional Strategy for Asia and the Pacific, 2006
Local Knowledge and Innovations, 2004
Organic Agriculture, 2005

IFAD projects evaluations:

Andhra Pradesh Tribal Development Project, 2001
North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas, 2005
Orissa Tribal Development Project, 1999
Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project, 2000

IFAD projects and programmes documents:

Andhra Pradesh Participatory Tribal Development Project

Appraisal Report, 1993
Loan Agreement, 1994
Mid-Term Review, 1999
Project Completion Report, 2003
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 1994

Andhra Pradesh Tribal Development Project

Project Completion Evaluation, 2001

Convergence of Agricultural Interventions in Maharashtra's Distressed Districts Programme

Programme design report, 2009
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 2009

Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Programme

Appraisal Report, 1999
Loan Agreement, 2001
Mid-Term Review, 2006
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 1999

Supervision Report, 2002
Supervision Report, 2003
Supervision Report, 2004
Supervision Report, 2005
Supervision Report, 2007
Supervision Report, 2008

Livelihood Security Project for Earthquake Affected Rural Households in Gujarat

Appraisal Report (Implementation Edition), 2002
Desk Paper on "How can improved service delivery in governments increase citizen trust? The Jeevika Programme for Earthquake Recovery"
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 2001

Livelihoods Improvement in the Himalayas

Appraisal Report (Implementation Edition), 2004
Mid Term Review Report (Meghalaya and Uttarakhand), 2009
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 2003

Maharashtra Rural Credit Project

Appraisal Report (Implementation Edition), 1992
Loan Agreement, 1993
Mid-Term Review, 1997
Project Completion Report, 2003
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 1993

Mewat Area Development Project

Appraisal Report (Implementation Edition), 1995
Loan Agreement, 1995
Project Completion Report, 2008
Project Status Report, 1999
Project Status Report, 2002
Project Status Report, 2003
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 1995

Mitigating Poverty in Western Rajasthan Project

Appraisal Report, 2008
Loan Agreement, 2008
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 2008

National Microfinance Support Programme

Appraisal Report, 2000
Loan Agreement, 2002
Mid-Term Review, 2003
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 2000
Supervision Report, 2008

North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas

Appraisal Report (Implementation Edition), 1997
IFAD and TANGO International, Case study report, 2008
Interim Evaluation, 2006
Loan Agreement, 1997
Project Completion Report, 2008
Project Status Report, 2007
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 1997
Self assessment report presented to IFAD Interim Evaluation Team, 2005

Orissa Tribal Development Project

Project Completion Evaluation, 1999

Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme

Appraisal Report, 2002
Loan Agreement, 2002
Mid-Term Review / Phase I Review Report, 2006
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 2002
Supervision Report, 2008

Post Tsunami Sustainable Livelihoods Programme for the Coastal Communities of Tamil Nadu

Appraisal Report, 2005
Loan Agreement, 2005

Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 2005
Supervision Report, 2008

Rural Women's Development and Empowerment Project

Mid-Term Review reports (Bihar and Jharkhand, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, and Uttar Pradesh), 2001
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 1996

Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project

Project Completion Evaluation, 2000

Tejaswini Rural Women's Empowerment Programme

Appraisal Report (Implementation Edition), 2006
First Joint Review Mission Report (Madhya Pradesh), 2008
Joint Review Mission Report (Maharashtra), 2008
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 2005

Women's Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme in the Mid-Gangetic Plains

Appraisal report, 2006
Report and Recommendation of the President to the Executive Board, 2006

UNOPS documents on IFAD projects and programmes:

Andhra Pradesh Participatory Tribal Development Project

Supervision Report, 1996
Supervision Report, 1997
Supervision Report, 1998
Supervision Report, 1998
Supervision Report, 2001
Supervision Report, 2002

Livelihood Security Project for Earthquake Affected Rural Households in Gujarat

Supervision Report, 2005

Livelihoods Improvement in the Himalayas

Supervision Mission Report, 2007

Maharashtra Rural Credit Project

Supervision Report, 1994
Supervision Report, 1995
Supervision Report, 1996
Supervision Report, 1998
Supervision Report, 2000
Supervision Report, 2001

Mewat Area Development Project

Supervision Report, 1996
Supervision Report, 1997
Supervision Report, 1998
Supervision Report, 1999
Supervision Report, 2000
Supervision Report, 2001
Supervision Report, 2002
Supervision Report, 2003
Supervision Report, 2004

National Microfinance Support Programme

Supervision Report, 2002
Supervision Report, 2005
Supervision Report, 2007

North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas

Supervision Report, 2007

Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme

Supervision Report, 2005
Supervision Report, 2006
Supervision Report, 2007

World Bank documents on IFAD-cofinanced projects:

Rural Women's Development and Empowerment Project

Implementation Completion Report, 2006
Staff Appraisal Report, 1997

Websites:

Government of India: <http://india.gov.in>

ENRAP: <http://www.enrap.org>

ENRAP IFAD in India: <http://www.enrap.org.in>

World Bank India:

<http://www.worldbank.org.in/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/SOUTHASIAEXT/INDIAEXTN/0,,menuPK:295589~pagePK:141159~piPK:141110~theSitePK:295584,00.html>

World Bank World Development Indicators: <http://ddp->

ext.worldbank.org/ext/DDPQQ/member.do?method=getMembers&userid=1&queryId=6

The Jeevika Project: http://www.jeevikasewa.org/project_monitoring_and_evaluation.htm

Table of ratings

Evaluation Criteria	Orissa TDP	Tamil Nadu WDP	Andhra Pradesh TDP	Maharashtra RCP	Andhra Pradesh PTDP	Mewar ADP	Rural Women's DEP	North Eastern CRMP	Jharkhand Chhattisgarh TDP	National Micro-finance SP	Gujarat LSP	Orissa TELP	Himalayas LIP	Tamil Nadu Post-Tsunami LSP	Tejaswini RWEF	Mid-Gangetic WELP	Western Rajasthan MP	Maharashtra CAI	CPE Portfolio Assessment
I. Core Performance Criteria																			
Relevance	4	6	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	6	4	6	4	5	4	5	5	6	5
Effectiveness	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	5	5	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	5
Efficiency	2	5	4	5	5	5	3	4	4	5	2	4	3	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	4
Project performance	3.0	5.3	4.3	5.0	5.0	5.3	4.7	4.7	4.3	5.3	3.0	5.0	4.0	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	4.7
II. Rural Poverty Impact	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	3	5	5	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	5
Household income and assets	4	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	5
and empowerment	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	4	5	3	5	5	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	5
Food security and agricultural productivity	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	4	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	4
Natural resources and the environment	5	Na	5	Na	5	Na	Na	5	Na	Na	NA	5	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	5
Institutions and policies	4	6	5	5	5	4	6	4	4	4	3	5	5	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	5
III. Other performance criteria																			
Sustainability	2	6	4	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	4	5	4	Na	4	Na	Na	Na	4
Innovations, Replication and Upscaling	3	6	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	Na	4	Na	Na	Na	5
IV. Overall project portfolio achievement	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	5
Partner performance																			
IFAD	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	2	4	3	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	5
Government	3	5	5	5	5	4	3	4	3	5	2	4	4	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	4
Cooperating Institutions	4	6	4	5	5	5	6	3	4	5	2	3	3	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	4

IFAD grants to India

Table 1. IFAD Country Specific Grants to India

Type	Number	Recipient	Title	Approval	Effectiveness	Closing	IFAD financing US\$	Disbursement	Status
Grants for IFAD-funded projects	E-36	India	Environmental Grant: Andhra Pradesh Tribal Development Project	03/02/1997	03/02/1997	12/04/1999	35 000	80%	closed
	R-502K	India	Technical Assistance Grant: Andhra Pradesh Tribal Development Project	20/11/2000	20/11/2000	19/03/2002	22 000	73%	closed
	R-502P	India	Technical Assistance Grant: Andhra Pradesh Tribal Development Project	20/11/2000	20/11/2000	23/04/2002	3 400	100%	closed
	S-33	India	Special Operational Facility Grant: Rural Women's Development and Empowerment Project	27/05/1997	27/05/1997	30/01/2004	60 000	21%	closed
	E-21	India	Environmental Grant: North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas	19/05/1994	19/05/1994	12/04/1999	100 000	98%	closed
	S-38	India	Special Operational Facility Grant: North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas	02/10/1997	02/10/1997	23/05/2003	60 000	83%	closed
	E-21A	India	Environmental Grant: North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas	19/05/1994	19/05/1994	12/04/1999	10 000	100%	closed
	S-79	India	Special Operational Facility Grant: Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Project	07/10/1999	14/06/2000	31/05/2005	60 000	91%	closed
	S-101	India	Special Operational Facility Grant: National Microfinance Support Programme	28/08/2000	14/11/2001	06/04/2004 Cancelled	60 000	0%	closed
	S-145	India	Special Operational Facility Grant: Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme	28/10/2002	17/04/2003	10/07/2007	60 000	99%	closed
	S-134	India	Special Operational Facility Grant: Livelihood Security Project for Earthquake-Affected Rural Households in Gujarat	31/12/2001	22/10/2002	31/01/2006	90 000	98%	closed
	C-967	India	Loan Component Grant: Livelihoods Enhancement through Drudgery Reduction Initiative in Uttaranchal	24/07/2007	21/01/2008	30/04/2010	100 000	40%	Ongoing
	C- 1029	India	Loan Component Grant: Mitigating Poverty in Western Rajasthan Project	24/04/2008	11/12/2008	30/06/2015	608 000		Ongoing
Other Grants to India	C-1106	India	Loan Component Grant: Convergence of Agricultural Interventions in Maharashtra's Distressed Districts Programme	30/04/2009			1 008 000		Ongoing
	242	Chaitanya India	NGO/ECP Grant - Creation of Resources for the Self-Help Movement: Capacity-building, Resource Center, Fellowship Programmes and Information Sharing Initiatives	23/12/2002	11/07/2003	16/01/2008	50 000	100%	Closed
	881	IRRI	Accelerating technological adoption to enhance rural livelihoods in disadvantaged areas of India	14/09/2006	16/05/2007	31/12/2010	1 000 000	43.5%	Ongoing
Total	16 grants						3326400		

Type	Number	Recipient	Title	Approval	Effectiveness	Closing	IFAD financing US\$	Disbursement	Status
------	--------	-----------	-------	----------	---------------	---------	---------------------	--------------	--------

Note: 1. Grant data are from LGS. 2. Disbursement data are from PPMS.

Table 2: Regional Grants Covering India (2002-2008)

Large Global/Regional PI/PT/EAD									
Grant No.	Implementing Agency	Programme	Approval Year / Effectiveness	Completion and Closing	Grant Amount (IFAD)	Cofinancing	Disbursement (as of June 2008)	Countries	
634	IRRI/CIMMYT	Multistakeholder Programme to accelerate Technology Adoption to Improve Rural Livelihoods in the Rainfed Gangetic Plains (builds on TAGs 148 and 263)	11/12/2002 effective 22/09/2003	30/06/2007 31/12/2007	1 500 000	0	100%	Bangladesh, Nepal, Pakistan, India (NARES)	
651	CIFOR	Programme For Improving Income-Generation for Forest Communities through IFAD's loan portfolio in the Asia and Pacific region	10/04/2003 effective 15/04/2004	31/12/2007 30/06/2008 Extension Granted	900 000	0	95%	China, India, Nepal	
655	FAO (non CGIAR)	Organic Production of Underutilized Medicinal, Aromatic & Natural Dye Plants (MADP) Programme for sustainable rural livelihoods in Southern Asia Programme for overcoming poverty in coconut growing communities	10/04/2003 effective 28/03/2006	31/03/2009 30/09/2009	1 400 000	0	34.71%	India, Nepal, Sri Lanka	
705	IPGRI		09/09/2004 effective 07/09/2005	30/09/2008 31/03/2009	1 000 000	0	93.62%	China, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, The Philippines, the United Republic of Tanzania, Vietnam and Thailand	
706	IRRI	Programme for Managing Rice Landscapes in the Marginal Uplands for Household food security & Environmental sustainability	09/09/2004 effective 26/07/2005	30/09/2008 31/03/2009 EXTENSION REQUESTED	1 190 000	810 000	68.9%	India, Laos, Nepal and Vietnam	
773	ICIMOD	Programme for Securing Livelihoods in the Uplands and Mountains of the Hindu Kush-Himalayas - Phase II	19/04/2005, effective 29/09/2005	30/09/2009 31/03/2010	1 200 000	400 000	56.4%	Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Nepal and Pakistan	

Large Global/Regional PI/PT/EAD

Grant No.	Implementing Agency	Programme	Approval Year / Effectiveness	Completion and Closing	Grant Amount (IFAD)	Cofinancing	Disbursement (as of June 2008)	Countries
774	INBAR	Programme for Enhanced bamboo rattan based small holder livelihoods opportunities	19/04/2005 effective 24/10/2005	31/12/2008 30/06/2009	1 500 000	0	100%	China, Philippines, India
811	FAO IAAH	Supporting a community led state alliance against hunger in Meghalaya	02/12/2005 effective 22/03/2006	31/03/2008 30/09/2008	127 730	0	0%	India
21	FAO	Pro-Poor Policy Formulation, Dialogue and Implementation at the Country Level	13/12/2005 effective 08/02/2007	31/03/2010 30/09/2010	1 500 000	626 000	46.32%	China, India, Indonesia, Cambodia, Vietnam, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka
836	INBAR	Developing Approaches, Tools, Methods and Institutional Arrangements to Increase Scalability and Adaptive Replication of Bamboo and Rattan Options in Investment Projects	22/12/2005 effective 30/03/2006	30/06/2007 31/12/2007	190 000	0	95%	China, India, Philippines
861	Glasgow Caledonian University	Sustainable gender sensitive agricultural extension reform to reach rural women in India	05/06/2006 effective 28/09/2006	31/01/2009 31/07/2009	198 760	0	50.31%	India
875	APRACA	Programme for Accelerating the Financial Empowerment of Poor Rural Communities in Asia and the Pacific Through Rural Finance Innovations	14/09/2006, effective 11/01/2007	31/03/2012 30/09/2012	1 200 000	1 500 000	20%	All Asian countries
899	Bioversity International (IPGRI)	Programme for Empowering the Rural Poor by Strengthening their Identity, Income Opportunities and Nutritional Security through the Improved Use and Marketing of Neglected and Underutilized Species	14/12/2006 effective 26/07/2007	30/09/2010 31/03/2011	1 400 000		43.57%	India (Bolivia, Peru, Yemen, Italia)
954	ICRISAT	Programme for Harnessing the True Potential of Legumes: Economic and Knowledge Empowerment of Poor Farmers in Rainfed Areas in Asia	18/04/2007 effective 17/10/2007	31/12/2011 30/06/2012	1 400 000	0	40.25%	India, Nepal, Vietnam

Large Global/Regional PI/PT/EAD								
Grant No.	Implementing Agency	Programme	Approval Year / Effectiveness	Completion and Closing	Grant Amount (IFAD)	Cofinancing	Disbursement (as of June 2008)	Countries
956	IDRC	Programme for Knowledge Networking for Rural Development in Asia/Pacific Region ENRAP III	18/04/2007 effective 14/09/2007	30/09/2010 31/03/2011	1 085 000	1 061 000	47.93%	all ongoing IFAD projects in Asia
974	ICRISAT	Programme for Linking the Poor to Global Markets: Pro-poor Development of Biofuel Supply Chains	12/09/2007 effective 03/12/2007	31/12/2010 30/06/2011	1 500 000	0	0%	China, India, Philippines, Vietnam
998	UNOPS	Asia and the Pacific Region Asian Project Management Support (APMAS) programme	13/12/2007	22/12/2022 approved	1 400 000	400 000	0%	Camdodia, Lao PDR, India, Viet Nam
1032	ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF): Programme on Rewards for Use of and Shared Investment in Pro-poor Environmental Services (RUPES II)	25/04/2008	22/12/2022 approved	1 500 000	2 400 000	0%	China, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Philippines, Vietnam
1034	FAO/SEWA	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/Self Employed Women's Association (FAO/SEWA): Medium-term Cooperation Programme with Farmers' Organizations in Asia and the Pacific Region	25/04/2008	22/12/2022 approved	1 420 000	533 000	0%	India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, Philippines, Vietnam, China
1037	INBAR	International Network for Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR): Programme for Enhanced Bamboo-based Smallholder Livelihood Opportunities - Phase II	25/04/2008	22/12/2022 approved	1 250 000	4 117 000	0%	India, Nepal, Philippines
Small Regional								
763	ICIMOD & TEBTEBBA	Decade of Indigenous people in Asia (Assessment)	21/12/2004 effective 21/09/2005	31/03/2007 31/12/2007 no cost ext	198 950	63000	94.97%	Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, India, Nepal, Cambodia, Indonesia, Philippines
Total	21 grants				23 060 440			

