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JCTDP: background information

- Board approval: 1999
- Implementation period: 2001-2012
- Project cost: US$41.7 million
- IFAD loan: US$23 million
- Contribution of the Government: US$4.8 million
- Contribution of beneficiaries: US$3.4 million
- Executing agencies: Tribal Development Societies
Target group: schedule tribes, schedule castes, landless and other vulnerable people in rural areas of the two States

3 main objectives
(i) Empowerment and capacity building of tribal grassroots associations and users’ groups;

(i) Livelihood enhancement; and

(i) Generation of alternative income generating activities.
Objectives

- Assess impact in a quantitative manner, with due attention also to qualitative aspects; and

- Generate findings and recommendations that can be used in the design and implementation of similar interventions in India and elsewhere.
JCTDP impact evaluation
Methodology

- **Evaluation criteria**: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, gender, innovation and scaling up, and performance of partners (IFAD and Government)

- **Rating system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highly satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluability assessment of data

“With and Without” analysis
- Quasi-experimental techniques (Propensity Score Matching): matching of treatment group (“WITH”) and comparison group (“WITHOUT”)

Mixed-method approach, including triangulation
- Quantitative: impact survey
- Qualitative: FGDs, in-depth interviews
Methodology – cont.

- **Sample size** based on the Poverty Head Count Ratio (8,804 households)

- **Sampling strategy**
  - Block level: all blocks in treatment areas
  - Village level: selection through multi-stage sampling
  - Households level: selection through random sampling
**Main evaluation findings**

**Rural poverty impact**

**Households monthly income** (higher in treatment areas by $7 in Jharkhand and $5 in Chhattisgarh)

**Paddy productivity** (marginal in Jharkhand, 4% higher in treatment areas of Chhattisgarh)
Evaluation findings

Rural poverty impact – cont.

**Assets**
Standard of Living Index

Access to financial services of SHGs (higher by 14% and 5% in treatment areas of Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh respectively)
Main evaluation findings
Rural poverty impact – cont.

Status of nutrition
Children underweight

Women Empowerment
Index
Main evaluation findings

Some other areas of strengths

- Alignment of objectives with government and IFAD policies and strategies and needs of the poor

- Good achievements in building the capacity of grassroots organizations and mobilization of tribal communities

- Good outreach (86,888 households, as compared to 86,000)

- Positive innovations (e.g. in terms of institutional arrangements), and scaling-up in Jharkhand
Main evaluation findings

Some areas of challenge

- Context analysis and complexity in design (too many activities)
- Insufficient diversification of crops to enhance incomes and minimize risks
- Marginal attention to economic activities and linkages to input and output markets
- Operational efficiency constrained, *inter-alia*, due to frequent staff rotation
- Weak sustainability prospects, with no exit strategy
- Quality of data
Recommendations

- Design for context and ensure simplicity
- Need for greater convergence with government schemes
- Focus on sustainability of benefits
- More attention and resources to monitoring and evaluation
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