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Analysis of trends in performance over time: areas of strengths of IFAD operations

• **Positive picture of performance**: over 70% of projects MS+ for all criteria (SD<1 in most cases)

  Combined overview of the main evaluation criteria
  Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better

  - Relevance: 86% MS+
  - Gender equality and women’s empowerment: 89% MS+
  - Innovation and scaling-up: 82% MS+
Analysis of trends in performance over time: areas of strengths of IFAD operations – (cont.)

- Good impact on rural poverty: 87% of projects MS+ in 2011-2013

**Rural poverty impact**

*Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion years (N of projects)</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2009 (25)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2010 (39)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2011 (57)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2012 (52)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2013 (53)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rural poverty impact sub-domains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% of MS+ projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income and assets</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human and social capital empowerment</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural productivity and food security</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions and policies</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and natural resources management</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of trends in performance over time: areas of challenge of IFAD operations

• Performance in most criteria is largely moderately satisfactory
• Areas of IFAD’s operations that need specific attention:

Efficiency (65% MS+)

![Efficiency chart]

**Efficiency – by year of completion**
*Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better*

- 2007-2009 (25)
- 2008-2010 (42)
- 2009-2011 (60)
- 2010-2012 (56)
- 2011-2013 (55)

Completion years

%
Analysis of trends in performance over time: areas of challenge of IFAD operations – (cont.)

- Environment (70% MS+)
  Natural resources and environment and climate change – by year of completion
  Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCRV/PPA data series)

- Sustainability of benefits (62% MS+)

- M&E, in particular inadequate baselines and limited data on nutritional impacts
Country programme performance

- **Performance of non-lending activities**

  **Performance of non-lending activities 2006-2014**
  
  Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better

  ![Graph showing performance of non-lending activities 2006-2014](image)

- **Country Strategies**
  
  ✓ 87% of COSOPs rated as MS+ for relevance
  
  ✓ 74% of COSOPs rated as MS+ for effectiveness
Recurrent issues in the IFAD9 period

- **Monitoring and evaluation**: absence or poor quality of baseline surveys; limited focus on outcome and impact; and logical frameworks need improvement, including measurable indicators

- **Non-lending activities**: definition of attainable objectives; linkages between non-lending activities and IFAD’s investment portfolios; strengthening of partnerships; and out-posting of CPMs;

- **Government performance as a partner**: weak institutions; limited human resources capacities; scarce knowledge of IFAD procurement processes, financial management and M&E requirements; and frequent rotation of project management staff
2015 Learning Theme: sustainability of benefits of IFAD operations

Proportion of all ratings and ratings for sustainability of benefits (2002-2014)

Mean Ratings of Sustainability by Region and Sector (2002-2014)
Drivers and limiting factors to sustainability of benefits

• **Drivers:**
  - adequate integration of project objectives into national development strategies
  - investment in activities that enhance communities’ human and social capital through inclusive development
  - clear and realistic strategies for gender mainstreaming
  - promoting community-level ownership and responsibility

• **Limiting factors:**
  - weak assessment and management of risks
  - financial and economic analysis not always integrated in project design
  - wide geographic and sub-sector coverage of operations
  - Lack of exit strategies
  - Scarce resilience-building efforts
Recommendations

- **Sustainability**: exit strategies embedded in programme design. Including definition of: (i) respective roles and responsibilities of government, IFAD, community-based organizations and other concerned players in post-project activities; (ii) recurrent costs needed and the corresponding sources of funding to ensure continuation of services to project beneficiaries.

- **M&E**: incentives framework and separate budget line devoted specifically to M&E activities. Quality of indicators. Baseline surveys done within twelve months from project effectiveness. COSOP RMFs should include specific and measurable indicators and targets also for non-lending activities.

- **Country Strategies**: new COSOPs should contain (i) realistic and achievable objectives; (ii) a detailed account of the estimated “costs” needed to achieve stated objectives; (iii) clear timeframes; and (iv) indication of how lending and non-lending activities mutually reinforce each other.

- **2016 ARRI Learning Theme**: Knowledge Management – with particular emphasis on *how operations learn to improve performance*. 