



Corporate-Level Evaluation on IFAD's Engagement in Fragile and Conflict Affected States and Situations

**Eighty-seventh Session of the Evaluation Committee
Rome, 30 March 2015**

Definition

“Fragile states are characterized by weak policies, weak institutions and weak governance, resulting in meagre economic growth, widespread inequality and poor human development. Fragile states are more exposed to the risk of outbreaks of violence than are non-fragile states. Fragile states may be well endowed with natural resources or be resource poor”.

Source: IFAD 2006 Policy on Crisis Prevention and Recovery.

Background

- IFAD classifies member states as fragile states based on AsDB, AfDB, OECD and World Bank combined list.
- In 2014, 48 IFAD member states were classified as fragile states. Nearly half are also classified as MICs.
- About 1.25b people live in countries affected by fragility, conflict and violence.
- Fragile States have higher poverty rates, lower growth rates, and weaker human development indicators than other low-income countries.
- Fragile States are also diverse: conflict, post-conflict, chronically violent, rapidly growing, slow-growing, resource-rich, resource-poor, very large and very small.

IFAD policy and operations

- Since 2004, three dedicated policies guide IFAD's work in FCS: (i) 2006 Policy on crisis prevention and recovery; (ii) 2008 Role in fragile states; and (iii) 2011 Guidelines for disaster early recovery.
- Fragile states account for around 45% of PBAS allocation in 2013-15 (around USD1.2 billion). Around 60% of the funds will be lent on HC terms.
- Around 40% of IFAD member states with ongoing operations are classified as fragile states.
- 40% of ongoing projects in the current portfolio are in fragile states.

Evaluation objectives and timelines

- Main objectives: (i) assess the performance of IFAD's engagement in fragile and conflict affected states and situations (FCS); (ii) identify explanatory factors of performance; and (iii) generate findings, lessons and recommendations.
- Evaluation covers IFAD's strategies and operations from 2004-2013 (10 years).
- Presentation to the IFAD10 in October 2014 and to the Executive Board in April 2015.

Evaluation methodology

- Mixed method approach: (i) desk review; (ii) re-analysis of existing performance data; (iii) interviews with key informants; (iv) electronic survey; and (v) 10 country case studies.
- An implicit results chain was developed for defining key evaluation questions and analysis.
- Limitations, for example, in terms of sampling biases in countries selected and lack of operational guidelines for several sectoral policies.

Main findings (1) – Project performance

2004-2009								
% with Satisfactory performance								
2006-2009	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Relevance	Sustainability	Performance of IFAD	Performance of Government	Rural poverty impact	Gender
Always fragile	0	66	100	33	0	33	33	50
Partial fragile	61	50	93	50	39	54	52	72
Never fragile	83	74	96	57	70	74	79	54
2010 onwards								
Always fragile	33	42	83	27	50	33	55	50
Partial fragile	78	53	94	51	86	65	82	86
Never fragile	82	58	91	77	82	78	93	86

Main findings (2) – IFAD’s policy framework

- The 2011-2015 strategic framework pays attention to IFAD’s role in fragile states. The 2002-2006 and 2007-2010 frameworks made no reference.
- The broader policy framework is fragmented, and needs tightening.
- IFAD definition for fragile states dates to 2006, and is oriented more to transitional development and post-crisis.

Main findings (3) – Country strategies

- Fragility classification is unwelcome to member states.
- Poverty analysis is generally good, but fragility and risk analysis is highly variable.
- Customisation of strategies and development approaches in FCS is insufficient.
- Heavy demand on country programme managers, and staff incentives are limited.

Key conclusions

1. IFAD has a critical role to play in FCS in promoting inclusive and sustainable smallholder development and rural transformation, and is paying deeper attention to its work in FCS.
2. Cannot continue with business as usual: IFAD will need to further adapt and sharpen its development approaches and adjust its operating model including incentives framework for staff to achieve better outcomes on the ground.

Recommendations

1. Policy and strategy

- *Adopt a simpler approach to using classifications of fragile states; Draft a policy statement that defines how IFAD plans to engage with fragile and conflict affected states and sub-national situations; Strengthen fragility and conflict analysis in COSOPs.*

2. Project and programme design

- *Programme design needs to identify where IFAD can engage and where it cannot; Need simpler objectives and design and greater customisation; Strengthen grassroots institutions and lower levels of governments.*

Recommendations (Cont.)

3. Implementation

- *Expand implementation support in quantity and technical content.*
- *Fragility should be a key criteria in establishing further ICOs and out posting of CPMs.*

4. Empowerment of staff

- *Strengthen incentives for staff.*
- *Enhance staff capacity building and training.*

5. Results measurement and learning

- *Plan and resource project M&E more selectively.*
- *Revise IFAD's results; Measurement framework to include indicators of outcomes related to fragility.*
- *More attention to lessons learned and knowledge sharing.*