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ESR objectives and main building blocks

ESR objectives

• Review and analyze the experience of IFAD-supported SSC initiatives, mainly through non-lending activities (NLAs)
• Identify key issues and lessons learned for reflection and make recommendations

Main building blocks

• Literature review
• IOE evaluations, including Brazil and Turkey CPEs and Mauritania PPA undertaken in 2015 with SSC perspective
• In-depth review of 9 selected IFAD-supported SSC initiatives
• Interviews with IFAD staff, stakeholders from the selected SSC initiatives, key informants, including other agencies
How SSC (or SSTC) has been discussed at IFAD?

• “SSC” “SSTC” visible in IFAD corporate documents since 2008, initially in relation to discussion on MICs
• “SSC in IFAD’s business model” prepared in 2011 (IFAD9) --- only official documented focused on the topic
• Relabeling initiatives as “SSC success stories” – mainly knowledge sharing (some policy dialogue), while others are actually KM
• Priority and commitments in IFAD9 and IFAD10
• IFAD10 reference to “knowledge-based cooperation and investment promotion”, “50% of COSOPs to include an approach for SSTC”
Main typologies and examples of IFAD-supported SSC

1. Mutual peer-to-peer learning and horizontal SSC

- Support to cross-country exchange between peers and various stakeholders (e.g. smallholder farmers, policy-makers)
- Mostly through IFAD regional grants
- The predominant form of IFAD-supported SSC and started even before “SSC” became an explicit agenda item
- IFAD and/or its partners – role of facilitator/brokers
- Examples (all regional/global grants) – initially not framed as “SSC”
- “Learning Routes” facilitated by an NGO (PROCASUR)
- Support to policy dialogue around family farming issues (MERCOSUR)
- Support to regional and sub-regional farmers’ organizations
Main typologies and examples of IFAD-supported SSC (cont.d)

2. **SSC provider-led**
   - To strengthen the capacities of MICs to capture, package and share knowledge
   - Examples:
     - Country grants to China (research institution) and Indonesia (govt agency)
     - Grant to Brazil’s research institute (“Innovation MarketPlace”) – an example of shifting an emphasis to responsiveness to demand
3. Demand-seeker driven

- Response to specific problems/issues encountered in development interventions, closely linked to IFAD-financed projects.

- Some examples of programmatic SSC (e.g. Sao Tome, Mauritania); but often in the form of one-off study tours and exchange visits.

- Sao Tome – example of the receiving partners (cooperatives) graduating to become providers of knowledge for peers in other countries.
Main findings

• So far, IFAD has supported SSC mainly in the form of knowledge sharing and mutual learning among peers
• IFAD support featuring the rural poor and their organizations in mutual learning
• Accumulated experience in rural/agric development and long-term partnerships and networks with multiple stakeholders – IFAD’s capacity to mobilize, connect and broker
• Support to horizontal partnerships with regional perspectives, increasingly linked to integration processes and their bodies (e.g. MERCOSUR)
Main findings (cont.d)

• SSC priority corporate agenda but lack of clear guidance on main objectives, pathways to achieve the objectives, approaches to supporting different types of SSC
• Diverse understanding among IFAD staff and managers, Member States on what SSC is and implies for IFAD
• Weak results orientation. Especially, SSC-centred grants - planned mainly for outputs (e.g. no of workshops held)
• Some cases of support to MICs in sharing their experience, but expected results and impact beyond output level or main beneficiaries not clear
Main findings (cont.d)

• Examples of programmatic SSC reported by IFAD – mostly through grants; examples under loan-financed projects often “one-off” activities (e.g. study tours): room for a structured approach to mainstream SSC in country programming (COSOPs and loan-financed projects)

• “Support to SSC” in COSOPs – tend to be more visible for countries interested in the supply side of SSC.
Recommendations

- Provide conceptual clarity and practical guidance at corporate level for IFAD’s support to SSC
- Better mainstream SSC into country programming through a structured approach
- Systematically build up a catalogue of rural development solutions and provide a platform to make them accessible
- Give consideration to greater in-house coordination arrangements and interdivisional collaboration
- Continue pursuing opportunities to collaborate with the RBAs in a practical manner at corporate and country levels