

Document:	<u>EC 2016/93/W.P.4</u>
Agenda:	<u>5</u>
Date:	<u>9 August 2016</u>
Distribution:	<u>Public</u>
Original:	<u>English</u>



Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations Evaluated in 2015

Note to Evaluation Committee members

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Oscar A. Garcia
Director
Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2274
e-mail: o.garcia@ifad.org

Johanna Pennarz
Lead Evaluation Officer
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2558
e-mail: j.pennarz@ifad.org

Simona Somma
Evaluation Specialist
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2124
e-mail: s.somma@ifad.org

Dispatch of documentation:

William Skinner
Chief
Governing Bodies Office
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2974
e-mail: gb_office@ifad.org

Evaluation Committee — Ninety-third Session
Rome, 6 September 2016

For: Review

Document:	<u>EB 2016/118/R.X</u>
Agenda:	<u>X</u>
Date:	<u>August 2016</u>
Distribution:	<u>Public</u>
Original:	<u>English</u>



Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations Evaluated in 2015

Note to Executive Board representatives

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Oscar A. Garcia
Director
Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2274
e-mail: o.garcia@ifad.org

Johanna Pennarz
Lead Evaluation Officer
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2558
e-mail: j.pennarz@ifad.org

Simona Somma
Evaluation Specialist
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2124
e-mail: s.somma@ifad.org

Dispatch of documentation:

William Skinner
Chief
Governing Bodies Office
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2974
e-mail: gb_office@ifad.org

Executive Board — 118th Session
Rome, 21-22 September 2016

For: Review

Contents

Acknowledgements
Overview

ii
iii

Appendix

Main report: Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations
Evaluated in 2015

1

Acknowledgements

The Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations – the 2016 ARRI – was prepared by Simona Somma, Evaluation Officer of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE), under the supervision of Johanna Pennarz, IOE Lead Evaluation Officer. They were ably supported by Renate Roels, IOE Evaluation Research Analyst. The report benefited from the IOE internal review process, taking into account the comments and perspectives of other IOE staff.

IOE would like to express its deep appreciation to IFAD Management and staff for the overall support and insightful comments on the draft final report, which have been duly considered in line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy in the preparation of the final report. Comments by IFAD staff provided during a dedicated workshop held in July on the 2016 ARRI have also been considered in the document.

The comments contained in IFAD Management's written response to the 2015 ARRI and the feedback by the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board on last year's edition have also been reflected in this year's document.

Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations Evaluated in 2015

Overview

1. **Background.** The Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRI) is the flagship report of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE) and provides a synthesis of independent evaluation findings. In line with the requirements of the IFAD Evaluation Policy,¹ IOE has prepared this report on an annual basis since 2003, making this the fourteenth edition of the ARRI. IFAD is among the few multilateral and bilateral organizations to produce such a report on an annual basis, reflecting the Fund's continued commitment to strengthening accountability and learning for better development impact.
2. **Objectives.** The ARRI has two main objectives: (i) to present a synthesis of the performance of IFAD-supported operations based on a common evaluation methodology; and (ii) to highlight systemic and cross-cutting issues, lessons and challenges that IFAD and recipient countries need to address to enhance the development effectiveness of IFAD-funded operations. Moreover, as agreed with the Executive Board last year, the 2016 ARRI includes a dedicated chapter on knowledge management, with a particular emphasis on how operations can learn to improve performance.
3. **New features.** The 2016 ARRI includes several new features. First, ratings for portfolio performance, non-lending activities and country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs) – generated by the country programme evaluations (CPEs) undertaken by IOE since 2006 – are made publicly available in the independent evaluation database, thus adding to its comprehensiveness, accountability and transparency.
4. **Second,** the 2016 ARRI includes a specific section in the CPE chapter on the experiences of IFAD-supported South-South and triangular cooperation initiatives, as documented in the 2015 evaluations, and identifies key issues and lessons learned for reflection and further action. Third, it provides an analysis of IFAD's cofinancing performance for the most recent loan-funded projects evaluated in the context of the 2015 CPEs. Finally, the 2016 ARRI explores the effects of fiduciary-related aspects on results in the section devoted to assessment of government performance as a partner.
5. **Context of the 2016 ARRI.** The food security and nutritional status of poor rural populations have historically been key dimensions of IFAD's mandate. Given growing inequality, especially in developing countries, and the challenging global environment, the relevance of this mandate becomes even more important. In this complex environment, poor rural people – IFAD's main target groups – are facing increasing risks and are vulnerable to climate change and other shocks.
6. **Against the backdrop of these challenges,** the international community adopted the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) within the broader framework of Agenda 2030, which is founded on the principle of "no one will be left behind and reach the furthest behind first". The centrality of smallholder agriculture and rural development to the global agenda underlines the relevance and importance of IFAD's mandate and provides a key reference for its policies, priorities and development interventions in the Tenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD10) and beyond.
7. **During the Ninth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD9),** the emphasis on the key dimensions of the Fund's mandate – reducing rural poverty and improving the food security and nutritional status of poor rural people – constituted the

¹ See www.ifad.org/gbdocs/eb/102/e/EB-2011-102-R-7-Rev-1.pdf.

foundation of the IFAD Strategic Framework 2016-2025 (strategic framework) and is at the centre of IFAD's operational priorities for IFAD10.


8. IFAD measures its contribution to the above global objectives of poverty reduction and better food security and nutrition through the Results Measurement Framework (RMF), which covers a three-year period and sets indicators and targets for the Fund's country programmes and projects and measures performance against them. The RMF also sets targets and indicators for the quality of internal processes and management, which lead to good results on the ground.
9. The 2016 ARRI assesses results against some of the main indicators in the RMF for IFAD9, while also identifying opportunities and challenges in light of the priorities for IFAD10 and beyond.
10. Independent evaluation database and data sources. The independent evaluation database is publicly available. It includes project ratings from 327 independent evaluations carried out by IOE since 2002 and, as mentioned earlier, it now also includes ratings generated by the CPEs² in a separate Excel sheet. The database contains ratings for those projects that have been evaluated more than once by IOE over the years. Thus only the most recent ratings for each project evaluated by IOE are used in preparing the ARRI. As such, the 2016 ARRI draws on a database of 270 project evaluations completed by IOE since 2002.
11. Age of the portfolio. Of the 40 new evaluated projects included in this year's ARRI, six were approved from 1997 to 2001, 16 from 2002 to 2005, and 18 from 2006 to 2009. None of these projects are still ongoing: one closed in 2006, seven closed from 2009 to 2012, and 32 from 2013 to 2015. The average project duration was 8.7 years, with eight projects having an implementation period of more than 10 years. Thus, although these projects were designed 10 years ago or more, a large number of them were under implementation until recently.
12. Methodology. The project evaluations informing the 2016 ARRI were performed in 2015 and thus follow the provisions of the 2009 Evaluation Manual.
13. Each project is assessed and rated across seven internationally recognized evaluation criteria, including: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, rural poverty impact, sustainability, gender equality and women's empowerment, and innovation and scaling up.
14. IOE also has two composite evaluation criteria: project performance and overall project achievement. Project performance is based on the ratings of three individual evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), whereas overall project achievement is based on all seven criteria applied by IOE. Last, but not least, each project is also evaluated for IFAD and government performance as partners, in line with practice at other international financial institutions.
15. Ratings scale and data series. IOE uses a six-point rating scale³ to assess performance in each evaluation criterion. The ratings, which are the foundation of performance reporting in IOE evaluations, are aggregated and used in ARRI analyses for reporting on IFAD's operational performance.
16. Project evaluation ratings are presented in two data series in the ARRI: (i) all evaluation data; and (ii) project completion report validation (PCR)/project performance assessment (PPA) data only. The former presents project ratings from all evaluation reports going back to 2002; the latter contains only data from PCRVs, PPAs and impact evaluations. The PCR/PPA data series currently includes ratings from 127 evaluations of the total 270 evaluations analysed in the 2016 ARRI. Both data series present the ratings by year of project completion.

² www.ifad.org/evaluation/policy_and_methodology/tags/1852158.

³ Projects rated moderately satisfactory or better are in the 'satisfactory' zone (4-6), while projects rated moderately unsatisfactory or worse are in the 'unsatisfactory' zone (1-3).

17. Main trends in performance are explained through an analysis of the percentages of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better.
18. The 2016 ARRI also analyses the mean and median rating for selected evaluation criteria, along with the most commonly used measures of dispersion of a distribution, which are the standard deviation and the interquartile range. This analysis helps indicate how close or how far performance actually is from an assigned rating.
19. Project performance. The broad picture of project performance emerging from the 2016 ARRI is positive. The institution performed well in the IFAD9 period, with 80 per cent of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better for most of the criteria in 2012-2014. More specifically, IOE evaluations show that IFAD has made a positive contribution to rural poverty reduction, for which the percentage of moderately satisfactory or better projects increased from 87 per cent for operations completed in 2011-2013 to 92.3 per cent in 2012-2014 (chart 1). This is the result of the Fund's efforts to improve performance in key impact subdomains.

Chart 1



Rural poverty impact – by year of completion
Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data series)

20. IFAD operations completed in 2012-2014 achieved the highest impact on household income and assets, as compared with other impact domains, with 92.3 per cent of the projects completed in 2012-2014 rated moderately satisfactory or better as compared with 86 per cent in 2011-2013. Human and social capital and empowerment is also an area of strength, with nearly 91 per cent of the projects completed in 2012-2014 rated moderately satisfactory or better, out of which 7.3 per cent highly satisfactory.
21. The contribution of IFAD's operations to food security and agricultural productivity, which is the keystone of the Fund's mandate, has been substantive and positive in terms of both improving the availability of and access to food, and enhancing agricultural productivity. Eighty-six per cent of projects are assessed as moderately satisfactory or better in 2011-2013, which is the highest percentage since 2007.
22. As anticipated in previous ARRI, the performance of IFAD and governments as partners keeps improving. IFAD performance as a partner is moderately satisfactory or better in 87 per cent of the projects completed in 2012-2014, of which 42.9 per cent are satisfactory projects. A key indicator in the assessment of IFAD's performance as a partner is cofinancing. Thus the 2016 ARRI introduced a new analysis to assess the performance of IFAD in cofinancing as part of the broader assessment of IFAD's performance as a partner. The cofinancing ratios

have been calculated and analysed across the portfolio of new projects approved in the time frame covered by the six CPEs conducted in 2015. The results of the analysis show that IFAD surpassed the cofinancing ratio indicator in four countries out of six.

23. Government performance as a partner is among the most important factors in ensuring the successful outcome of IFAD-financed projects, as governments have the main responsibility for implementation of IFAD-financed projects and programmes. Their performance improved considerably – from 60 per cent of the projects rated moderately satisfactory or better in 2009-2011 to 82.2 per cent in 2012-2014. However, most of the projects were only moderately satisfactory and none of them were rated highly satisfactory. Project evaluations and CPEs, such as those undertaken for the Gambia and Nigeria, pointed to the management of fiduciary aspects – such as slow release of counterpart funds, delays in and quality of audit reports, and weak financial management – as major constraints on government performance.
24. The positive impact of IFAD-funded operations is also driven by IFAD's good performance in gender equality and women's empowerment and in innovation and scaling up. These are central operational priorities in both IFAD9 and IFAD10, and key principles of engagement in the strategic framework. IFAD-supported operations have been successful in empowering poor rural communities and vulnerable groups, including women, in participating in decision-making processes at all levels and accessing rural services, basic amenities and productive resources. Recent projects are devoting increasing attention to sensitizing men to the transformational role women can play in broader social and economic development activities. As a result, 90.2 per cent of the projects completed in 2012-2014 are in the moderately satisfactory or better zone, out of which 53 per cent are satisfactory or better.
25. In recent years, the Fund's performance in promoting innovative solutions for rural poverty reduction has generally been satisfactory and in line with the main pillars of the 2007 strategy and the innovation agenda of the strategic framework. However, further efforts are needed to ensure that successful approaches and technical innovations from IFAD operations can be replicated elsewhere and can ultimately be scaled up by governments, development partners and the private sector, beyond individual project areas or provinces, for a wider and more significant impact on rural poverty.
26. In terms of benchmarking, IFAD's project performance remains at the forefront and is most similar to that of the agriculture sector operations of the World Bank, with 80 per cent of all operations evaluated as moderately satisfactory or better. IFAD's project performance is better than the performance of the agriculture sector operations of the Asian Development Bank and the African Development Bank. There are, however, some inherent challenges in benchmarking, such as the differing sector coverage and sizes of the organizations being compared, which need to be taken into account when interpreting findings.
27. Notwithstanding the good performance in key operational priorities, the ARRI identified a number of challenging areas that demand continued attention to raise the performance bar from moderately satisfactory projects to satisfactory and highly satisfactory. The first area concerns IFAD's targeting approach. Agenda 2030 is driven by the principle of "no one will be left behind and reach the furthest behind first". Along the same lines, targeting is one of IFAD's principles of engagement, which is central to its mandate of rural poverty reduction. Comprehensive targeting approaches enable operations to reach the poorest of the poor by combining solid livelihood and poverty analysis, based on context-specific circumstances, and dynamic participatory processes. Good poverty analysis at design makes projects more relevant, while a dynamic strategy to target the poor will lead to better effectiveness on the ground.

28. The 2015 evaluations found that poverty analyses conducted at design do not sufficiently capture the differences among groups of poor rural people. As a result, project activities often do not reach all target beneficiaries, in particular the poorest of the poor and other marginalized groups that are the most difficult to reach. Moreover, they are often not flexible enough to adapt to changing contexts. Thus more can be done to ensure that appropriate attention is devoted to IFAD's targeting strategies at design and that monitoring efforts are deployed during implementation.
29. The second key area is related to food security, nutrition and mainstreaming of nutrition-sensitive agriculture in the IFAD portfolio. While nutritional security is fundamental for better rural livelihoods, the evaluations found that IFAD-funded operations could have done more to explore and further improve the contribution that improved agricultural productivity can make to improved food security. Project results are mainly focused on productivity and have yet to reflect achievements in nutrition. With an increased urgency to address malnutrition, it is thus commendable that, for IFAD10, the Fund has adopted the 2016-2018 Action Plan to Mainstream Nutrition-Sensitive Agriculture, which aims to ensure that at least one third of new projects will be designed with a nutrition lens. Still, the ARRI concludes that more attention and efforts can be devoted to ensuring that all projects focusing on food security are nutrition-sensitive, in line with the organization's core mandate and the requirements of the new global agenda.
30. The quality of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is the third area of attention that emerges from the 2015 evaluations. In line with previous annual reports, the 2016 ARRI concludes that weak project M&E systems and results measurement impinge on the assessment and attribution to IFAD operations of impact on rural poverty, and in particular on income, food security and nutrition. It is important to recognize and commend IFAD Management for its responsiveness to the challenges posed by results and impact measurement and the increased focus on strengthening its results culture and paying attention to improving its internal corporate performance monitoring and reporting instruments.
31. However, more systematic efforts will be needed moving forward, as M&E systems in general have not received the required level of resources and attention. IFAD has the potential to bring immense field experience into the policy discourse, based on a systematic collection of evidence from operations. Yet, given the data gaps and lack of sound empirical impact assessment in many projects, M&E data are of limited use when it comes to dissemination of results and the scaling up of successful practices.
32. Peer-to-peer comparison. Following the practice introduced in last year's report, the 2016 ARRI presented the results of the peer-to-peer comparison between ratings by IOE and the Programme Management Department (PMD) for all evaluation criteria using the mean and mode values. The analysis draws from a larger sample of 126 projects completed in the period 2007-2014, as compared with 97 in the 2015 ARRI. For the 126 projects assessed in this analysis, PMD ratings were higher, on average, for all criteria.
33. Relevance presents the largest disconnect, where the PMD ratings tend to be 0.42 higher on average. Also the difference in the mode ratings is the same as last year. The IOE mode rating is 4 (moderately satisfactory) for every criterion except human and social capital and empowerment, for which the mode is 5 (satisfactory). The mode of PMD ratings is 5 (satisfactory), as presented by nine criteria, with a mode of 4 (moderately satisfactory) for the remaining ones. This demonstrates that the frequency of satisfactory ratings is higher in PMD assessments.
34. Country performance. Moving beyond the project level, CPEs provide a broader assessment of the IFAD/government partnership in the reduction of rural poverty and serve to inform the development of new country strategies and IFAD-supported activities in the country. CPEs assess portfolio performance, non-lending


activities (e.g. policy dialogue, knowledge management and partnership-building) and performance of country strategies, and identify lessons that cut across IFAD country programmes.

35. Historically, a total of 58 CPEs have been undertaken by IOE since the product was introduced in the 1990s. Of these, 36 have been conducted since 2006 based on a consistent methodology, including the use of ratings, which allows aggregation of results across country programmes. This year's ARRI is informed by the ratings of these 36 CPEs, including six new CPEs carried out in 2015 in Brazil, Ethiopia, the Gambia, India, Nigeria and Turkey.
36. Non-lending activities are mutually reinforcing actions to complement IFAD's investment projects. They are increasingly recognized as essential instruments in promoting institutional and policy transformation at the country level and in scaling up the impact of IFAD operations for deeper results in rural poverty reduction.
37. Chart 2 provides a summary of the performance of non-lending activities in the period 2006-2015. It shows that the plateau in performance in the period 2011-2014, analysed in the 2015 ARRI, has evolved into an improvement in knowledge management (KM), but a worsening of performance in policy dialogue and partnership-building in 2013-2015.

Chart 2

Performance of non-lending activities 2006-2015

Percentage rated moderately satisfactory or better by criterion



38. Overall, performance in non-lending activities is only moderately satisfactory. KM shows an encouraging upward trend from 67 per cent of country programmes moderately satisfactory or better since 2010-2012 to 78 per cent in 2013-2015. The performance of policy dialogue declined from 73 per cent of country programmes rated moderately satisfactory or better in the period 2009-2011 to 58 per cent in 2011-2014, to 54 per cent in 2013-2015. None of them is satisfactory or highly satisfactory. The downward trend is even sharper for partnership-building. In this case, performance diminished from 91 per cent of country programmes assessed as moderately satisfactory or better in 2009-2011 to 75 per cent in 2011-2014, to 62 per cent in 2013-2015.
39. As anticipated by the 2015 ARRI, in both cases performance is below the targets of 70 per cent and 90 per cent set in the IFAD9 RMF for policy dialogue and partnership-building, respectively. The decline in performance raises concerns in view of the substantive contribution that the Fund is expected to make to the achievement of SDG17, which focuses on strengthening and revitalizing the global partnership for sustainable development, as well as in view of the IFAD10 target for 2018, which was increased to 85 per cent for policy dialogue.

40. The 2015 CPEs draw attention to some enabling factors that are key to enhancing IFAD's capacity to significantly engage in non-lending activities moving forward. First, the adoption of more strategic approaches is key to strengthening the linkages between lending and non-lending activities to ensure synergies and improve development effectiveness. Second, efforts to expand coordination, partnerships and dialogue with a wider range of stakeholders, beyond the project level, can leverage the scaling up of successful experiences and results. This also requires close monitoring, systematic donor coordination and the development of a clear agenda for establishing stronger, strategic partnerships at the country level and better policy dialogue in support of national priorities for rural development as identified by host governments.
41. Finally, the 2015 CPEs highlight the special value of grants in supporting research partnerships and policy engagement, and in generating and sharing knowledge to advance smallholder farming, rural transformation and the fight against rural poverty. Yet opportunities exist to ensure more robust, tangible linkages on the ground between loans and grants, and to enhance the potential for learning from grant activities.
42. In sum, non-lending activities are crucial to IFAD in leveraging and enabling the deeper impact of its programmes on both policy and operational/financial fronts, including prospects for South-South and triangular cooperation.
43. As mentioned earlier, CPEs also assess the COSOP in terms of relevance, effectiveness and overall performance. COSOP relevance is moderately satisfactory or better in 87 per cent of IFAD country strategies, effectiveness in 75 per cent and overall performance in 83 per cent. The majority of the ratings fall in the moderately satisfactory zone, and none of the country strategies is found to be highly satisfactory for any criteria.
44. The 2015 CPEs identified several cross-cutting issues that merit attention if ongoing and future IFAD country strategies are to be improved. First, methodology, processes and instruments to measure the achievements of non-lending activities at the country level are not yet fully developed in the context of the results frameworks of COSOPs.
45. Second, COSOPs do not lay out a clear and actionable agenda for non-lending activities and do not provide an indication of the estimated administrative resources needed to achieve country programme objectives. Third, non-lending activities and IFAD lending operations are not adequately linked. This is important, as the latter generate the experiences and lessons that inform the organization's work in policy dialogue, partnership-building and KM.
46. Fourth, the CPEs underlined wide geographical coverage within a country as a constraint on better effectiveness and direct increased attention to non-lending activities. Finally, COSOPs are not based on a "theory of change" – with outputs, outcomes and objectives at the strategic level, few but well-chosen indicators, and clear integration of contributions from both lending and non-lending activities. In this regard, the CLE on IFAD's PBAS highlights the need for better linkage between the PBAS allocation, project pipeline, sequencing of interventions and corresponding theory of change, so as to leverage the impact of IFAD-financed operations.
47. 2016 learning theme on knowledge management: how can operations learn to improve performance? As agreed by the Executive Board in December 2015, the learning theme for this year's ARRI is knowledge management, with particular emphasis on how operations can learn to improve performance. IFAD's strategy defines KM as the process of "capturing, creating, distilling, sharing and using know-how". This provides a useful working definition for purposes of this paper, and is in line with most of the literature in the field.

48. KM must be systematic; that is, it needs to involve purposive activity designed to carry out the functions of knowledge capture, creation, distillation, sharing and use through a set of deliberate processes, rather than ad hoc interactions. This is an important point, because, without a system, there may be idiosyncratic knowledge-sharing, but there is no real KM. Thus, underlying the analysis in the present learning theme is the question of the extent to which KM processes in IFAD are organized and applied systematically.
49. The learning theme analysis identified several factors that constrain systematization of KM at IFAD, such as insufficient integration of KM into country strategies, limited time and budget availability, few efforts to align human resources and incentives, weaknesses in M&E systems and lack of sound empirical impact assessment in most projects. Thus the analysis proposes the following cross-cutting lessons, which could strengthen learning loops to improve IFAD's performance and its overall development effectiveness.
50. First, KM performance would greatly benefit from the development and measurement of relevant performance indicators in COSOPs and from the provision of resources commensurate with the KM strategy. At project and country levels, budgeting for KM often relies on grants or on the administrative budget. There is no institution-wide allocation for KM, meaning that it has to compete with other priorities, so funding is uncertain.
51. Second, the enhancement of staff KM skills merits consideration moving forward. A better alignment of the staff incentive system with the KM strategy would help to provide clarity to staff on their accountability for learning, and positive motivation to participate actively in KM efforts.
52. Third, the ultimate challenge for any KM system, including IFAD's, is to create a culture of knowledge, in which the strategy, systems, financial and human resources, and incentive structure are aligned in a way that facilitates the gathering, dissemination and use of knowledge to improve the organization's effectiveness in reaching its objectives.
53. Conclusions. The 2016 ARRI showed improved performance during IFAD9 on operational priorities such as rural poverty impact, human and social capital empowerment, innovation and scaling up, gender equality and women's empowerment. The performance of IFAD and governments as partners has also been improving over time. This is key, not only for ensuring good project performance, but also for improving partnerships and dialogue beyond the project level and furthering the development agenda towards achievement of the SDGs.
54. On the other hand, the 2016 ARRI identified areas of operational performance that merit further attention moving forward in order to raise the project performance bar from moderately satisfactory to satisfactory and highly satisfactory. First, insufficient attention and efforts are devoted to IFAD's targeting strategies at design and during implementation in order to ensure that operations reach all target beneficiaries, in particular the poorest of the poor and other marginalized groups. Second, notwithstanding the positive impact that IFAD-supported operations are having on food security and agricultural productivity, independent evaluations did not find systematic evidence of nutrition-sensitive agricultural practices in the projects examined. Third, recurrent constraints on the management of fiduciary aspects hinder improvements in the performance of IFAD's portfolio. Moreover, despite recent improvements, efficiency, environmental and natural resource management, and sustainability of benefits continue to be persistent challenges to the organization's operational effectiveness.
55. At the country level, the 2016 ARRI underlines the importance of expanded coordination and partnership with a wider range of stakeholders (e.g. the private sector, Rome-based agencies [RBAs], technical ministries) in the context of COSOPs and beyond the project level to leverage the scaling up of successful

- experiences and results. This also requires close monitoring, systematic donor coordination and the development of a clear agenda for stronger, strategic partnerships at the country level and better policy dialogue in support of national priorities for rural development as identified by host governments.
56. Finally, the 2015 evaluations found limited attention to the mobilization of resources and promotion of incentives to systematize KM in IFAD, establish stronger horizontal and vertical knowledge-sharing and KM, and promote further convergence among project, country and institutional levels, instead of seeing projects as separate “islands of excellence”.
 57. The above areas for improvement need to be addressed if IFAD wants to raise the project performance bar from moderately satisfactory to highly satisfactory, and to be at the forefront of the rural transformation envisaged in the context of Agenda 2030 and the SDGs. Thus the 2016 ARRI offers the following recommendations to address the most urgent challenges.
 58. Recommendations. The Board is invited to adopt the following strategic recommendations, which reflect the findings and conclusions of the 2016 ARRI. Four of them are addressed to IFAD Management and include: two recommendations deriving from the analysis of project performance (targeting and nutrition), one recommendation originating from the analysis of CPEs (partnership-building at the country level) and one from the 2016 learning theme on KM.
 59. Targeting. Evaluations found that project activities are often not sufficiently refined to meet the needs of all intended beneficiaries, in particular those at risk of being excluded, such as indigenous peoples, pastoralists, landless people, migrants and other vulnerable groups. In this respect, it is important that future operations: (i) adapt their approaches and activities to the complexity of contexts and target groups; (ii) further enhance targeting in terms of scope and accessibility to project benefits by poor rural people, paying increased attention to those at risk of being left behind; and (iii) ensure more disaggregated indicators to track the participation of and benefits for different groups and eventually to demonstrate the effectiveness of project initiatives.
 60. Food security and nutrition. In line with the Agreement Establishing IFAD, whose core objective is “Improving the nutritional level of the poorest populations in developing countries”, and in the context of the 2016-2018 Action Plan to Mainstream Nutrition-Sensitive Agriculture at IFAD, the 2016 ARRI recommends that all new projects, when relevant, should be nutrition-sensitive, with explicit nutritional objectives, activities and indicators. Moreover, to maximize the contribution of IFAD projects and programmes to better food security and nutrition and the achievement of SDG2, the 2016 ARRI recommends that supervision missions should look at opportunities to accommodate specific actions to ensure that, when appropriate, projects contribute to improved nutrition.
 61. Partnerships at the country level for learning and scaling up of results. Evaluations have found that there is scope to improve partnerships with a wider range of actors at the country level in the context of COSOPs. This will leverage better results and complement IFAD’s scaling up agenda, including in promoting a better policy and institutional environment in the agriculture sector. Strong partnerships with RBAs, the private sector and technical ministries at the national level should be clearly articulated in COSOPs and implemented through country programme activities. Performance in partnership-building should be closely monitored and reported on in the Report on IFAD’s Development Effectiveness (RIDE).
 62. Knowledge management. IFAD should invest resources, time and effort more proactively in systematizing KM at all levels, and should align the strategy, systems, financial and human resources, and incentive structure so as to facilitate the gathering, dissemination and use of knowledge. This will entail: (i) aligning the

incentive system better with the KM strategy to provide clarity to staff on their accountability for learning, and positive motivation to participate actively in KM efforts; (ii) improving M&E systems and developing and measuring performance indicators for KM; and (iii) enhancing staff KM skills.

63. Moreover, IFAD should increase its investment in documenting innovative solutions in rural poverty reduction that emerge in the context of IFAD operations – valorizing the work IFAD does at the country level and making it available as a public good. This process should be more clearly anchored in COSOPs and projects.
64. ARRI 2017 learning theme. The Board is invited to adopt financial management and fiduciary responsibilities as the single learning theme in ARRI 2017. Although there have been improvements in government performance in recent years, the analysis contained in the 2016 ARRI suggests that financial management and fiduciary responsibilities remain constraining factors in raising the performance results of IFAD's portfolio to highly satisfactory.

Annual report on results and impact of IFAD operations evaluated in 2015

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	2
I. Introduction	3
A. Background	3
B. Context of the 2016 ARRI	5
C. Independent evaluation database and data sources	6
II. IFAD's performance 2000-2015	7
A. Project performance	7
B. Country programme evaluations	40
C. Benchmarking the performance of IFAD-financed projects	47
III. Learning theme on knowledge management	51
A. Background	51
B. Lessons Learned	52
IV. Conclusions and recommendations	60
A. Conclusions	60
B. Recommendations	63

Annexes

I. Project evaluation and country programme evaluation methodology
II. Evaluations included in the 2016 ARRI
III. Objectives of projects and programmes
IV. List of country programme evaluations completed and published by IOE 1992-2016
V. Definition of the evaluation criteria used by IOE
VI. Project performance trends 2002-2015
VII. Project performance ratings 2002-2015
VIII. Number of projects per each rating in the PCRV/PPA series
IX. IOE-PMD peer-to-peer comparison

Abbreviations and acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
ARRI	Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations
ADB	Asian Development Bank
CLE	corporate-level evaluation
COSOP	country strategic opportunities programme
CPE	country programme evaluation
CPM	country programme manager
CLEAR	Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results
ENRM	environment and natural resources management
ESR	evaluation synthesis report
IFI	international financial institution
ICO	IFAD country office
IDEV	Independent Development Evaluation unit of AfDB
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
IQR	interquartile range
KM	knowledge management
MICs	middle-income countries
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
PBAS	performance-based evaluation system
PCR	project completion report
PCRv	project completion report validation
PMD	Programme Management Department
PPA	project performance assessment
RBA	Rome-based agency
RIDE	Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness
RMF	Results Management Framework
SD	standard deviation
SKD	Strategy and Knowledge Department
SSC	South-South cooperation
TrC	Triangular cooperation

Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations evaluated in 2015

I. Introduction

A. Background

1. The Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRI) is the flagship report of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE). In line with the requirements of the IFAD Evaluation Policy,⁴ IOE has prepared this report on an annual basis since 2003, making this the fourteenth edition of the ARRI.
2. When the ARRI was first produced, IFAD was one of the very first development organizations to produce a report of this type. In fact, the Fund remains one of the very few multilateral and bilateral organizations to produce an annual evaluation of this kind.⁵ The production of the ARRI is a reflection of IFAD's continued commitment towards strengthening accountability and transparency in reporting on results, as well as learning for better impact on the ground.
3. Objectives. The ARRI consolidates and summarizes the results and impact of IFAD-funded operations on the basis of independent evaluations conducted during the previous year.⁶ The report has two main objectives: (i) present a synthesis of the performance of IFAD-supported operations based on a common evaluation methodology; and (ii) highlight systemic and cross-cutting issues, lessons and challenges that IFAD and recipient countries need to address to enhance the development effectiveness of IFAD-funded operations.
4. Audience. The primary audiences of the ARRI are IFAD Management, staff and consultants, and the Fund's Evaluation Committee and Executive Board. However, the report is also of interest to recipient countries and the wider development community at large, including the United Nations Evaluation Group, the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) Network on Development Evaluation.
5. Comments on the 2015 ARRI. During the preparation of the 2016 ARRI, IOE carefully revisited the main comments of IFAD Management, the Evaluation Committee and the Executive Board on last year's edition of the ARRI (2015). In particular, both IFAD's governing bodies and Management had requested IOE to more adequately analyse fiduciary and procurement-related aspects and their impact on results. Therefore, the 2016 ARRI treats fiduciary aspects as a special topic within the assessment of government performance as a partner.
6. Moreover, this year's report assesses results against the Ninth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD9) while also identifying opportunities and challenges in light of the priorities for IFAD10 and in the broader context of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Agenda 2030). In particular, as requested by the Executive Board in December 2015, the 2016 ARRI contains a section devoted to South-South cooperation (SSC) and triangular cooperation (TrC).
7. Finally, the governing bodies expressed their appreciation for the clear explanation of the data sets used and the quality of the statistical analysis of ratings undertaken in the context of the 2015 ARRI. At the same time, IOE was requested

⁴ See <http://www.ifad.org/gbdocs/eb/102/e/EB-2011-102-R-7-Rev-1.pdf>.

⁵ The Independent Evaluation Department of the Asian Development Bank and the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank produce annual reports similar to the ARRI.

⁶ Some of the evaluations included in this ARRI were finalized in the first part of 2016.

to ensure greater balance between statistics and key messages in the project performance section of the 2016 edition of the report. Therefore, while the averages and measures of dispersion of the ratings are calculated for all the criteria (see annex VII), the results of the statistical analysis are presented in a more concise manner in the main text. Emphasis is placed on explaining the performance of IFAD-funded operations and cross-cutting issues through the use of concrete examples and case studies from project evaluation reports.

8. Learning themes. Since 2007, each ARRI has focused on one or two learning themes. The topics for the learning themes are agreed upon with the Executive Board, with the aim of deepening analysis on selected issues that merit additional reflection and debate in order to enhance the performance of IFAD operations. Chapter III addresses the learning theme selected for the 2016 ARRI, namely knowledge management (KM), with a particular emphasis on how operations can learn to improve performance.⁷
9. Revised timeline for the ARRI. Since 2007, the ARRI and the Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness (RIDE)⁸ by IFAD Management have been presented to the Evaluation Committee meeting in November and the Executive Board session in December. This has allowed for comprehensive discussions on the organization's operational performance and systemic issues and lessons.
10. This year, as decided by the Executive Board in September 2015, both the ARRI and the RIDE will be presented to the September session of the Board. In line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy and Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Evaluation Committee, the Evaluation Committee will continue to consider the document before it is discussed by the Board.
11. Process. The draft ARRI document was internally peer-reviewed by IOE in June 2016. An in-house learning workshop was held on 11 July 2016 to discuss the ARRI's main findings and recommendations with IFAD staff. Moreover, Management had the opportunity to prepare written comments on the document. All major comments received by IOE on the draft 2016 ARRI have been duly considered in the final document.
12. This is the second edition of the ARRI for which the underlying data collection and analysis and report writing has been done entirely by IOE staff. This is a reflection of IOE's intention to increasingly insource its evaluation work, with the ultimate aim of cost savings and improved quality.
13. New features. The 2016 ARRI includes several new features. First, ratings for portfolio performance, non-lending activities and country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs) generated by the CPEs undertaken by IOE since 2006 are made available to the public in the independent evaluation database, thus adding to its comprehensiveness, accountability and transparency.
14. Second, the IFAD agenda for IFAD10 – covering the 2016-2018 period – includes among its priorities the consolidation of IFAD's strategic approach to SSC and TrC. Therefore, for the first time the ARRI includes a specific section in the CPE chapter on the experiences of IFAD-supported SSC and TrC initiatives, as documented in the 2015 evaluations, and identifies key issues and lessons learned for reflection and further action.

⁷ The learning themes addressed by previous ARRIs include: sustainability and innovation (2007); country context and project-level monitoring and evaluation (2008); access to markets, and natural resources and environmental management (2009); efficiency (2010); direct supervision and implementation support (2011); policy dialogue (2012); understanding exceptional projects (2013); project management (2014); and sustainability of benefits (2015).

⁸ The RIDE is prepared by IFAD Management, capturing the performance of the organization against the main indicators in the corporate Results Measurement Framework. As such, the report is an instrument to promote accountability and maximize institutional learning.

15. Cofinancing is another priority under IFAD10. It is expected to increase, leverage and enable deeper impact of IFAD's programmes at policy and operational levels. The 2016 ARRI provides an analysis of IFAD's performance on cofinancing for the most recent loan-funded projects evaluated in the context of the 2015 CPEs.
16. Finally, as mentioned earlier, the 2016 ARRI explores the effects of fiduciary-related aspects on results in the section devoted to the assessment of government performance as a partner.
17. Document structure. Chapter I discusses the background of the report, the various data sources used for the analyses and the context of the 2016 ARRI. Chapter II reports on the performance trends using independent evaluation ratings available from 2002, benchmarks the performance of IFAD operations against other international financial institutions (IFIs) and internal targets adopted by the Fund, and highlights the major issues raised in the 2015 evaluations. Chapter III is devoted to KM, which is the learning theme of the 2015 ARRI. The main conclusions and recommendations are presented in chapter IV.

B. Context of the 2016 ARRI

18. This chapter briefly presents some key issues arising from the broader context and backdrop in which IFAD operates, and the opportunities and challenges thereof. This will allow readers to contextualize the performance of IFAD operations and better discern the areas of strengths and those needing improvement.
19. IFAD was set up as a specialized agency of the United Nations to mobilize additional resources to be made available on concessional terms for agricultural development in developing Member States. In fulfilling this objective, the Fund provides financing primarily for projects and programmes specifically designed to introduce, expand or improve food production systems and to strengthen related policies and institutions within the framework of national priorities and strategies.
20. Enhancing food security and nutritional status of poor rural populations have historically been key dimensions of IFAD's mandate. Given the growing inequality, especially in developing countries, challenges arising from climate change, increased attention to returns on investments spearheaded by an ever-expanding private sector, imbalances within the existing trade regime, the ever-increasing number of migrants escaping conflict and poverty – the relevance of this mandate becomes even more evident. In this complex environment, the rural poor – IFAD's main target group – who are already the most vulnerable segment of populations in developing countries are facing increasing risks.
21. Against the backdrop of these challenges, in September 2015 the international community adopted the SDGs within the broader framework of the Agenda 2030, with the aim to build on the achievements of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The SDGs present an integrated and indivisible set of targets to balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental dimensions. These present a firm commitment of developed and developing countries to eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions, including extreme poverty, hunger and malnutrition.
22. The agenda has an ambitious and bold transformational vision for the next 15 years – the foundation being the principle that no one will be left behind and those furthest behind must be reached first. The poorest rural people, and in particular indigenous people, women and other vulnerable groups, and agriculture are at the centre of this agenda, providing IFAD a key reference for its policies, priorities and development interventions moving forward.
23. IFAD measures its contribution to global objectives through the Results Measurement Framework (RMF) which is a keystone of its results management system. The RMF sets indicators and targets for the Fund's country programmes

and projects and measures performance against them. The RMF also sets targets and indicators for the quality of internal processes and management, which lead to good results on the ground.

24. The 2016 ARRI assesses results against a number of indicators⁹ of the IFAD9 RMF, while also identifying opportunities and challenges in light of the priorities for IFAD10 and beyond. A multitude of new investors is active in the development arena therefore the challenge for IFAD will be to refine its business model by developing innovative and tailored instruments, using new technology to enhance rural development and new comprehensive approaches to targeting. A prompt response to these challenges is essential to demonstrate that the Fund is direct and swift in channelling its resources for better impact, and fit for purpose in the new global context of development financing.

C. Independent evaluation database and data sources

25. In line with the Evaluation Policy, the IOE independent evaluation database,¹⁰ containing ratings from independent evaluations done since 2002, is available online since 2013. This is a practice also followed by the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank. The aim is to enhance transparency and accountability, and make the IOE independent evaluation dataset available to IFAD staff, governing bodies and others interested in conducting further research and analytic work on smallholder agriculture and rural development. As mentioned in paragraphs 13, the independent evaluation database now includes ratings from the CPEs.
26. The 2016 ARRI draws on an overall sample of 327 project evaluations done by IOE using a common methodology since 2002. It is important to underscore that this sample contains ratings for some ongoing projects evaluated and rated as part of CPEs, and are evaluated again separately once fully completed. Therefore, to avoid counting project evaluation ratings twice when conducting the analysis and reporting on performance through the ARRI, only the most recent ratings for each project evaluated by IOE are used in preparing the ARRI.
27. Based on the above, the analysis presented in this year's document is informed by the ratings from 270 project evaluations. The different data sources for project evaluations are summarized in table 1.

Table 1

Types and sample size of project evaluations used in the 2016 ARRI

<i>Type of project evaluations</i>	<i>Sample size</i>
Projects evaluated as part of CPEs	143
Project evaluations	125
Impact (project) evaluations	2
Total projects evaluated	270

Source: IOE evaluation database.

28. The 270 evaluations include ratings from 40 individual project evaluations undertaken by IOE in 2015. The 40 project evaluations are listed in annex II and include: 13 reviews of project performance in the context of six CPEs, 20 project completion report validations (PCRVs), and seven project performance assessments (PPAs). Details on the objectives of the country programmes and individual projects evaluated can be found in annex III. In addition, the corporate-level evaluation (CLE) on IFAD's performance-based allocation system (PBAS) and two evaluation

⁹ Given the nature and focus of independent evaluations, the ARRI is able to report on IFAD development effectiveness against level 2 to 4 of the IFAD9 RMF, namely: development outcomes and impact delivered by IFAD-supported programmes, country programme and project outputs, and operational effectiveness of country programmes and projects.

¹⁰ The database may be accessed at: <http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/arri/database.htm>.

synthesis reports (ESRs) (on South-South cooperation in the context of non-lending activities and environment and natural resources management)¹¹ have been considered in the preparation of the 2016 ARRI.

29. The ARRI also assesses the performance of IFAD country programmes beyond the project level, using the assessments contained in CPEs. Historically, a total of 58 CPEs have been undertaken by IOE since the product was introduced in the 1990s. Of these, 36 CPEs have been conducted since 2006, based on a consistent methodology including the use of ratings, which allows for the aggregation of results across country programmes. This year's ARRI includes six new CPEs carried out in Brazil, Ethiopia, The Gambia, India, Nigeria and Turkey. Annex IV provides the complete list of CPEs conducted by IOE and the overview of the number of ratings available from CPEs that have been used in the 2016 ARRI.¹²
30. Age of the portfolio. Of the 40 new evaluated projects included in this year's ARRI, 6 were approved between 1997 and 2001, 16 between 2002 and 2005, and 18 between 2006-2009. None of these projects are still ongoing: 1 closed in 2006, 7 closed between 2009-2012 and 32 between 2013-2015. Moreover, the average project duration was 8.7 years, with 8 projects having an implementation period of more than ten years. This shows that although these projects were designed 10 years ago or more, a large number of them were under implementation until quite recently.
31. However, given the age of the portfolio of projects analysed in the ARRI, it is important to recognize upfront that the analysis of performance does not take into account recent innovations and improvements (e.g. on environment and natural resources management and climate change, scaling up and design) which are likely to positively affect the performance of operations in the future.

II. IFAD's performance 2000-2015

32. This chapter is divided into three sections. Section A discusses project performance in the period 2000-2015, followed by an analysis in section B of country programme performance. Finally, section C benchmarks the performance of IFAD-financed projects.
 - A. Project performance
 33. Methodology. The project evaluations informing the 2016 ARRI were performed in 2015 and therefore follow the provisions of the 2009 Evaluation Manual. IOE started to apply the new methodology enshrined in the second edition of the Evaluation Manual in January 2016, therefore the revised manual will affect the ARRI starting in 2017.
 34. Each project is assessed and rated across seven internationally recognized evaluation criteria including: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, rural poverty impact, sustainability, gender equality and women's empowerment,¹³ and innovation and scaling up.
 35. IOE also has two composite evaluation criteria, namely: (i) project performance; and (ii) overall project achievement. Project performance is based on the ratings of three individual evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), whereas overall project achievement is based on all seven criteria applied by IOE. Last but not least, each project is also evaluated for IFAD and government performance as partners, in line with the practice at other IFIs. The definitions for each evaluation criteria are found in annex V.

¹¹ CLEs and ESRs generally do not include evaluations/ratings of individual projects financed by IFAD.

¹² CPEs done before 2006 did not follow a common methodology and did not generally include ratings. However, with the introduction of the Evaluation Manual in 2008, all CPEs follow a consistent methodology and normally include an assessment and rating of the evaluation criteria.

¹³ Also referred to as gender in other parts of the document.

36. Ratings scale and data series. In line with the Good Practice Standard of the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks for Public Sector Evaluations, IOE uses a six-point rating scale to assess performance in each evaluation criterion. The rating scale is summarized in table 2.

Table 2
IOE rating system

Score	Assessment	Category
6	Highly satisfactory	
5	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
4	Moderately satisfactory	
3	Moderately unsatisfactory	
2	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1	Highly unsatisfactory	

Source: IFAD Evaluation Manual (2009).

37. The ratings, which are the foundation of performance reporting in IOE evaluations, are thereafter used in the analysis of the ARRI for reporting on IFAD's aggregate operational performance. Therefore, in each independent evaluation, IOE pays maximum attention to ensuring that the ratings assigned are based on clear-cut evidence, following rigorous methodology and a thorough process. Moreover, comprehensive internal and external peer reviews are organized in finalizing the assessments and ratings of each evaluation, also as a means to enhance objectivity and minimize inter-evaluator variability.
38. As in the last three ARRIs, IOE project evaluation ratings are presented in two data series: (i) all evaluation data; and (ii) PCRV/PPA data only.¹⁴ The "all evaluation data" series includes ratings from all types of project evaluations done by IOE since 2002, including CPEs. This data series now includes evaluation ratings from 270 IFAD-funded projects, including the 40 project evaluations done in 2015. One characteristic of this data series is that it includes the evaluation of projects that were not selected randomly, but instead followed other criteria.¹⁵
39. The "PCRV/PPA data" series was introduced for the first time in the 2013 ARRI. It only contains ratings from PCRVs, PPAs and impact evaluations of completed projects and it is used as a basis for calculating the "net disconnect" between independent and self-evaluation ratings by IFAD Management. As mentioned earlier, since 2011, IOE conducts PCRVs for all completed operations, covering the entire portfolio at exit. Therefore, there are no selection biases in the projects chosen for evaluation, distinguishing the PCRV/PPA data series from the "all evaluation data" series. The PCRV/PPA data series currently includes ratings from 127 evaluations out of the total 270 evaluations analysed in the 2016 ARRI.
40. The analysis of trends over time is based on the PCRV/PPA data series because, as mentioned above, its sample does not include any selection biases. Also, in line with previous editions of the ARRI and consistent with most other IFIs, the analysis has been carried out based on the year of project completion.¹⁶ Charts showing the moving averages of performance based on the "all evaluation data" series are included in annex VI, and are also considered as part of the analysis in the main text, as and where appropriate.
41. Finally, as per past practice, the 2016 ARRI analysed independent evaluation ratings grouped by IFAD replenishment periods, starting with the IFAD5

¹⁴ This includes impact evaluations by IOE, even though we only refer to it as the PCRV/PPA data series.

¹⁵ For example, in the past it was mandatory for IOE to undertake an interim (project) evaluation before Management could proceed with the design of a second phase of the same operation.

¹⁶ Reporting by year of project completion is preferred to year of approval as this includes all the inputs and changes to the project, not just project design and appraisal. It is also preferred over presentation by year of evaluation results where there is a wide range of project approval dates, and sometimes very old projects are included. Presentation by year of project completion provides a more homogenous cohort.


replenishment period (2001-2003). The results of the analysis by replenishment periods are used in this chapter in the section dedicated to analyse performance in the IFAD9 replenishment period.

42. Analysis of ratings. As per past practice, the ARRI uses three-year moving averages to smoothen both data series.¹⁷ This is particularly applicable to the “all data series”, which also includes projects evaluated by IOE that are not selected on a random basis. Though the latter is not a concern in the PCRV/PPA dataset, the main reason for using three-year moving averages in this case is to ensure a larger number of available ratings in each three-year period.
43. The main trends in performance are explained through an analysis of the percentages of projects that are rated as moderately satisfactory or better. However, as requested by the Evaluation Committee, the proportion of ratings for each evaluation criteria falling within the full range of the six-point rating scale (i.e. from highly unsatisfactory to highly satisfactory) used by IOE are shown in annex VII.
44. In addition to the charts showing the percentages of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better, a second chart displays the mean and the median rating for selected evaluation criteria, along with the most commonly used measures of dispersion of a distribution, which are the standard deviation (SD) and the interquartile range (IQR). The latter type of charts provides an immediate visual indication of how close or how far performance actually is from an assigned rating, which is not possible to capture in the charts displaying the percentages.
45. The SD takes into account every variable in the dataset. When the values in a dataset are tightly bunched together, the SD is small and the data are concentrated around the mean. On the other hand, when the values are spread apart, the SD will be relatively large. The SD is usually presented in conjunction with the mean.
46. The IQR is the range of data that lies between the first and third quartile of the distribution. Therefore, unlike the SD, this measure of dispersion does not take into account the full data set, it includes only the middle 50 per cent of the ratings, which is closest to the median of the distribution (also called 2nd quartile), thus avoiding the presence of outliers in the distribution.
47. Before proceeding with the detailed analysis on the performance of IFAD's operations, the ARRI presents the results of the distribution analysis of available ratings in the PCRV/PPA data series. This analysis is complemented by a block analysis which provides a summary of the mode, mean and SDs, and median and IQR by evaluation criteria.
48. The distribution analysis of available ratings displayed in chart 1 shows that most of the projects are rated moderately satisfactory (4) and, out of the total 1,904 ratings (in the PCRV/PPA dataset) across all evaluation criteria, there are only 136 outliers,¹⁸ which is 7 per cent of the total dataset.

¹⁷ Three-year moving averages were first used in the 2009 ARRI, before IOE started undertaking PCRVs/PPAs. A three-year moving average allows for the assessment of trends in performance over time, and also overcomes any biases that may result from the sample of projects evaluated, which are not chosen on a random basis. Three-year moving averages are calculated by adding evaluation results from three consecutive years and dividing the sum by three. The reason for introducing moving averages is that they produce statistically more valid results, since they smoothen short-term fluctuations and highlight long-term trends.

¹⁸ Ratings of 1,2 and 6 are considered outliers for the purpose of this analysis.

Chart 1
Distribution of all ratings – PCRV/PPA data series (N=1904)



49. The above is confirmed by the block analysis conducted on the PCRV/PPA dataset and contained in table 3. In fact, the mode and median values show that project performance is moderately satisfactory in all evaluation criteria, with the exception of human and social capital empowerment which presents higher values. However, drawing conclusions using only the mode and median values could be misleading as for some criteria both the mode and median rating are moderately satisfactory, but a large number of projects are actually moderately unsatisfactory or worse (as shown in annex VIII). This is the case for efficiency and sustainability.
50. Therefore, for a more nuanced understanding of performance, it is important to look at the mean together with the SD. The analysis of the means reveals that all criteria are between 3.65 and 4.37. The three criteria below a mean value of 4 are operational efficiency (3.69), sustainability of benefits (3.71), government performance as a partner (3.83), and natural resources and the environment (3.86), which are therefore the four worst performing evaluation criteria in the data series.
51. With regard to the SD, the variability of data is smaller as compared to the analysis done in last year's ARRI. In fact, the SD is never above 1 and ranges from 0.72 (relevance) and 0.97 (efficiency), as compared to 0.75 (natural resources and environment) and 1.10 (overall project achievement) in the 2015 ARRI. The fact that the SD is smaller means that more projects are clustered around the mean value as compared to previous years.

Table 3
Averages and data dispersion per criteria – PCR/PPA data

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Quartile 1</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Quartile 3</i>	<i>IQR</i>
Relevance	4.36	0.72	4	4	4	5	1
Effectiveness	4.02	0.86	4	4	4	5	1
Efficiency	3.65	0.97	4	3	4	4	1
Project performance	3.99	0.77	4	3.7	4	4.6	0.9
Rural poverty impact	4.13	0.75	4	4	4	5	1
Household income and assets	4.20	0.86	4	4	4	5	1
Human and social capital and empowerment	4.37	0.84	5	4	4.5	5	1
Food security and agricultural productivity	4.11	0.83	4	4	4	5	1
Natural resources and environment	3.86	0.74	4	3.25	4	4	0.75
Institutions and policy	4.04	0.93	4	4	4	5	1
Sustainability of benefits	3.71	0.79	4	3	4	4	1
Innovation and scaling up	4.14	0.95	4	4	4	5	1
Gender equality and women's empowerment	4.27	0.84	4	4	4	5	1
Overall project achievement	4.03	0.82	4	4	4	5	1
IFAD performance	4.21	0.73	4	4	4	5	1
Government performance	3.83	0.88	4	3	4	4	1

Source: IOE evaluation database.

52. Project performance. This section of the report presents the analysis of the independent evaluation ratings according to: (i) trends in performance over time by moving averages; (ii) trends in performance of IFAD operations in the IFAD9 replenishment period (2013-2015); and (iii) a peer-to-peer comparison of IOE and Programme Management Division (PMD) ratings.

(i) Analysis of trends in performance over time by moving averages

53. The next paragraphs outline the analysis of trends over time by moving averages for the whole set of evaluation criteria assessed by IOE in its project-based evaluations.

Project performance

54. The analysis of project performance, which is a composite of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, is presented in two parts. The first part discusses the trends in performance for the three individual criteria. The second part outlines the


trends for the composite criterion and describes the key features of good or less good performance.

55. Relevance. IFAD's operations are highly relevant to: the context in which they are implemented, beneficiaries' requirements, institutional priorities and partner and donor policies, as reflected in the overall positive trend of the PCRV/PPA data series (chart 2). Projects exiting the portfolio in 2012-2014 – 89.4 per cent – is rated as moderately satisfactory or better. The percentage of satisfactory or better projects shows an increase starting from 2010 and reaches its highest percentage (59 per cent) in the last cohort.

Chart 2

Project relevance – by year of completion

Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data series)




56. Effectiveness. The performance of projects in achieving development objectives has been improving since 2008. In particular, the last cohort of the PCR/PPA data series reveals the best performance since 2007, with 84 per cent of the projects rated as moderately satisfactory or better and the percentage of satisfactory projects reaching completion showing a steady increase since 2009 (chart 3). However, the variations in performance in the last cohort are minor as compared to the previous moving average and no projects are rated as highly satisfactory in the PCR/PPA data series.

Chart 3


Project effectiveness – by year of completion

Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data series)




57. Efficiency. Operational efficiency has improved from 47.6 per cent for the projects completed in 2007-2009 rated as moderately satisfactory or better to 69 per cent in 2012-2014 (chart 4). However, also in this case, the variations in performance in the last cohort as compared to 2011-2013 are minor and the vast majority of projects remain in the moderately satisfactory zone. Moreover, as mentioned, efficiency remains the worst performing criteria throughout the whole period covered by the PCRV/PPA data series.

Chart 4

Project efficiency – by year of completion¹⁹*Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCRV/PPA data series)*


58. Project performance. This composite criterion is the arithmetic average of the ratings for relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. Chart 5 shows a marginal increase in the ratings in the moderately satisfactory or better zone increased from 75.3 per cent in 2011-2013 to only 76.7 per cent for the projects exiting the portfolio in 2012-2014. No projects are rated as highly satisfactory. Similar trends are visible in the "all evaluation" data series.
59. Chart 5.1 indicates a slight improvement in the mean and median values for project performance, which are both above 4. Moreover, the SD in the last cohort is the smallest in the data.

Chart 5

Project performance – by year of completion*Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCRV/PPA data series)*

¹⁹ Total sample of 55 projects as PCRV Cabo Verde did not rate efficiency.

Chart 5.1

Project performance – by year of completion*Averages and dispersion in the distribution of ratings (PCR/PPA data series)*

60. The 2015 evaluations identify some key features that explain the good and less good results in project performance. Projects rated moderately satisfactory are by and large well-aligned to government priorities and the needs of rural poor and they adopt demand-driven approaches that contribute to build beneficiary ownership and to better project design and implementation.
61. Satisfactory and highly satisfactory projects in addition feature flexible designs that enable projects to adapt to complex and evolving contexts, and implementation arrangements that are conducive to satisfactory project implementation, as in the case of the Agricultural Investments and Services Projects in the Kyrgyz Republic.
62. Good performance on the ground is determined by well-defined targeting strategies. In this regard, it is no coincidence that targeting is one of IFAD's central principles of engagement in delivering on its mandate of rural poverty reduction. Box 1 zooms in on the cross-cutting issues related to IFAD's targeting approach as emerging from selected evaluations conducted in 2015.

Box 1

Zooming-in: cross-cutting issues related to IFAD's targeting approach

The reference document for the assessment of targeting strategies adopted by IFAD is the 2006 IFAD policy on targeting, which articulates the principles and operational guidelines for a solid targeting approach by projects.

Comprehensive targeting approaches enable operations to reach the poorest of the poor by combining solid livelihood and poverty analysis, based on context-specific circumstances, and dynamic and participatory processes. A well-defined and implemented targeting approach is likely to improve the relevance and effectiveness of a project and is thus an important factor contributing to the performance of these criteria.

In particular, good poverty analysis at design that acknowledge the socio-economic differentiation within the large group of the poor and the need to adopt differentiated strategies to cater for the specific needs of different groups of the rural poor, makes projects more relevant. A dynamic strategy to target the poor will lead to better effectiveness on the ground. In this regard, the 2015 evaluations show mixed results in terms of relevance and effectiveness of the targeting strategies adopted by IFAD-supported operations.

The Environmental Conservation and Poverty-Reduction Programme in Ningxia and Shanxi in China offers an excellent example of different approaches to analyse poverty. The geographic poverty targeting relied to a great extent on the good poverty analysis done at the design stage which included a baseline on a comprehensive set of socio-economic indicators and identified the main causes of poverty. The approach used the World Food Programme's Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping techniques to identify new project areas. The selection of the target area and the focus on the rural poor and on ethnic minority people was relevant. This approach was an important improvement in IFAD's China programming at that time. It also demonstrated the value of poverty mapping at a time when China was refining its poverty-reduction efforts.

On the other hand, the above project is also an example of how the benefits of good targeting at design do not translate into better project effectiveness when the targeting strategy is not dynamic and able to adapt to changing contexts, especially for projects that have long implementation periods. Due to the long time span of 12 years between design and completion, at the time of the midterm review the programme concept and approach had by and large lost their relevance and some activities became obsolete and had to be revised. The project was not able to refine its targeting strategy in line with the increasing socio-economic differentiation in the rural areas which resulted from the massive economic transformation and outmigration. The changes undertaken at the midterm review were limited in scope and the resulting activities could only to some extent match China's highly dynamic pace of rural development. Important issues such as the increasing feminization of agriculture were not adequately addressed. Any effects of IFAD's support were crowded out by the massive inflow of Government funding which resulted in the remarkable reduction of poverty and conservation of natural resources.

To conclude, evaluations found that targeting strategies and project activities are often not adequately tailored to meet the needs of all intended beneficiaries, in particular the poorest of the poor and other marginalized groups that are at risk of being excluded. Therefore, more can be done to design and adopt innovative and effective targeting strategies that can reach the farthest behind first, in line with the core pillar of the new global agenda for development.

63. The features of moderately unsatisfactory performance are not new and concern complex design, low convergence with national programmes, and big time lags between project approval and entry into force, which may result in delaying project implementation and benefits to the rural poor people. In addition, as underlined by the Brazil CPE, delays for some projects to become effective also impinge on efficiency as they entail an increase in expenditure on management and supervision.


Rural poverty impact

64. This section is devoted to the assessment of the five sub-domains (household income and assets, human and social capital and empowerment, food security and agricultural productivity, natural resources and environment and climate change, and institutions and policies) and rural poverty impact. Given that the reduction of rural poverty is IFAD's most important objective, the key features of positive and less positive rural poverty impact are provided within each sub-domain.
65. Household income and assets. IFAD operations exiting the portfolio in 2012-2014 achieved the highest impact on household income and assets, as compared to other impact sub-domains (chart 6). In fact, 92 per cent of the projects completed in 2012-2014 are rated moderately satisfactory or better as compared to 86 per cent in 2011-2013. Moreover, the increase in the percentage of projects rated as satisfactory accounts for the majority of this improvement. However, no projects are rated as highly satisfactory in the data series.

Chart 6

Household Income and Assets – by year of completion

Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data series)



66. It is important to recognize upfront that IOE faces similar limitations in measuring the impact on income and assets as outlined by IFAD Management in the Synthesis Report of the IFAD9 Impact Assessment Initiative. These limitations are mainly related to the weaknesses of project-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, including the lack of project's theory of change, inadequate indicators, unavailability of baseline and panel data throughout implementation, and external factors that might influence results and attribution of impact.
67. Within these caveats, efforts have been made to improve reporting and measurement in this domain. IFAD Management will continue its Impact Assessment Initiative in IFAD10 by conducting impact evaluations of IFAD-funded projects, using quantitative and qualitative methods in partnership with several external agencies. Moreover, the Research and Impact Assessment Division of the Strategy and Knowledge Department is preparing a development effectiveness framework which is critical for measuring results and conducting impact assessments.
68. Taking into account the above-described constraints and efforts to measuring impact in this domain, the 2015 evaluations found that IFAD projects made a positive contribution to raise incomes and diversify income sources, and helped build assets for the targeted population. This has happened mainly through: (i) support to agriculture productivity, employment opportunities and secured access to land; (ii) diversification and establishment of microenterprises;

(iii) improved access to financial services; (iv) support to investments in productive assets including improvements in animal husbandry such as fencing, fodder production and fodder silos; and (v) improvement to beneficiaries dwellings, in particular through increased provision of community electricity and water supply.

69. Box 2 provides the example of the Lao Rural Livelihoods Improvement Programme in Attapeu and Sayabouri which was rated 5 for income and assets.

Box 2

Example of a project rated 5 for income and asset

The PPA of the Lao Rural Livelihoods Improvement Programme in Attapeu and Sayabouri highlighted the following achievements with regard to income and assets:

- Improved quality of housing (more houses with permanent flooring and access to safe water sources) and ownership of assets (such as televisions, motorbikes and electricity) have contributed to better life in rural areas;
- Many other common services, such as water supply schemes, primary schools, dormitories, marketplaces and rural roads have contributed indirectly to the enhancement of household assets;
- The establishment of the village banks, through which the poor gained easy access to credit for health care, education, improvement of housing and income-generating activities contributed positively to standards of living and gave rise to a culture of saving.


70. However, there are opportunities to further enhance the impact on income and assets for example by adopting differentiated approaches tailored to different socio-economic contexts. In this regard, the India CPE notes that the traditional self-help group paradigm will continue to be relevant for areas and groups where basic needs, building of grass-roots organizations and subsistence agriculture are still the priority. Instead, in areas where communities are already organized and there is potential for marketing of surplus production, project designs should continue to explore additional approaches to community and group building with a focus on collectively linking to private-sector commercialization and markets.
71. The 2015 evaluations underline the importance of three additional factors that could help raise the performance bar to "highly satisfactory" with regards to impacts on income and assets.
- (i) Better engagement with a wider range of private-sector actors, which seems important because implementing partners do not always have a competitive advantage in the provision of marketing and business services or technical advice for the development of high-value commodities and off/non-farm activities. Engaging the private sector could provide IFAD target groups not only with market outlets but also with more specialized packages of technical and business services.
 - (ii) Improving connectivity to markets and value chains. In this regard, The Gambia CPE highlights the need for a more structured approach to value chains development which entails follow-up support along the chain to ensure that smallholders can actually benefit from the profit generated by increased production.
 - (iii) Building upon the existing complementarities between farm and off-farm activities which the evaluations consider key to better diversification of rural incomes and value addition in agricultural commodity supply chain moving forward.
72. Human and social capital and empowerment. Participatory approaches promoted by IFAD operations have a positive impact on the empowerment of individuals and they enhance the quality of grass-roots organizations and institutions, as the PCR/PPA data series shows (chart 7). Nearly 91 per cent of the

projects completed in 2012-2014 are moderately satisfactory or better, out of which 7.3 per cent are rated 6 by independent evaluations. This is the highest percentage of highly satisfactory projects ever observed for this criteria.

Chart 7

Human and social capital empowerment – by year of completion

Averages and dispersion in the distribution of ratings (PCR/PPA data series)



73. Empowerment is one of the key principles of engagement of IFAD and a crucial requirement to the long-term reduction of poverty and hunger. The 2016 ARRI confirms the positive contribution that the Fund has made over the years in enhancing the capabilities of rural poor people, by bringing together smallholder farmers into grass-roots institutions and organizations and improving their access to basic amenities and productive resources, as well as fostering their participation in local governance processes. These are distinguishing features of the majority of IFAD-funded projects rated as satisfactory by the 2015 evaluations.
74. Highly satisfactory projects are those that promoted farmers' willingness to learn and improve, and contributed to creating strong bonds within the communities and a sense of ownership and responsibility of project results, thus creating better prospects of sustainability of the empowerment and capacity-building processes set up by IFAD interventions.
75. The evaluation of the Agricultural Investments and Services Project in the Kyrgyz Republic provides an excellent example of long-term sustainable human and social capital building, empowerment, and inclusiveness. The project supported the implementation of an inclusive pasture reform which fostered enhanced equality in access to pastures and in pasture users' participation in decision-making. Social mobilization and capacity-building activities underlying the reform set in motion a vigorous and irreversible process which resulted in the coordination of pasture management planning processes by community-level organizations which are still used today. The overall enabling framework and community empowerment, there is a good basis for sustainability of the benefits of enhanced community-based pasture management.
76. On the other hand, in several instances, the groups created by the projects lacked a sustainable long-term strategy and, as a result, they ceased operating after project completion. In some cases, these groups were not federated into apex institutions so as to generate "critical mass" which would give them enhanced legitimacy as village institutions and create better linkages with banks, markets and mainstream institutions.
77. Finally, the 2015 evaluations raise three additional systemic issues impinging on the highly satisfactory performance in this impact sub-domain. First, the limited


sensitization of beneficiaries in their collective responsibility of routine maintenance of the infrastructures created with the support from IFAD projects, which also negatively affects the sustainability of impact. Second, the need to better tailor capacity-building approaches to the poorest rural people in order to ensure prolonged impact on the ground. Finally, the poor quality of data and evidence base of impact in the areas of social capital and human empowerment which constrains the attribution of impact.

78. Food security and agricultural productivity. The contribution of IFAD's operations in this domain, which is the keystone of the Fund's mandate, has been substantive and positive in terms of both improving the availability of and access to food, as well as in enhancing agricultural productivity. Chart 8 shows that 86 per cent of the projects are assessed as moderately satisfactory or better in the most recent cohort of the PCRV/PPA data series, which is the highest percentage since 2007. However, none of the operations completed between 2007 and 2014 is rated as highly satisfactory.

Chart 8

Agricultural productivity and food security – by year of completion

Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCRV/PPA data series)



79. The introduction of improved low-cost production and processing technologies, increased availability of water for irrigation and greater diversification of income-generating activities, were instrumental in the performance of IFAD's operations in food security and agricultural productivity.
80. For instance, increased productivity and cropping intensity resulted in a 2.5 times increase in the production of chick peas, which in turn had a positive impact on food availability in the Post-crisis Rural Recovery and Development Programme in Eritrea. Another good example is offered by the Al-Dhala Community Resource Management Project in Yemen, which had a positive impact on the diversification of beneficiaries income through the production of honey and beekeeping and transformed apiculture in Al-Dhala governorate into a modern industry.
81. However, in spite of the above, other 2015 evaluations identify four main challenges that constrain the impact of IFAD operations on food security and agricultural productivity and its measurement. First, IFAD-funded operations did not sufficiently explore and build upon the potential contributions of improved agricultural productivity to food security, and project results do not adequately reflect any achievements on nutrition. It is therefore welcome that in IFAD10 the Fund has committed to strengthening nutrition in its portfolio in the context of the 2016-2018 Action Plan to Mainstream Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture, by ensuring


that at least one third of new projects will be designed with a nutrition focus. This is a positive step forward in light of the ambitious SDG2 targets.

82. Second, the attention to nutrition knowledge and education and the sensitization of beneficiaries to the importance of ensuring the appropriate balance between food security and nutrition and income generation are often underestimated. In this regard, the focus on nutrition knowledge and education as a priority thematic area for IFAD in the Strategic Framework 2016-2025 will be key to promote improved practices and behaviours and effectively link agricultural productivity, food security and nutritional outcomes.
83. Third, as concluded by the CLE on IFAD's PBAS, IFAD's resource allocation system also needs to adequately reflect food security and nutrition considerations. Finally, as already mentioned above, the measurement and attribution of impact to IFAD-funded operations remains a challenge as a result of inadequate baselines and indicators and the evidence base remains weak due to limited data availability.
84. Natural resources and environment. The impact of IFAD's operations on this criterion keeps improving since 2010-2012 (chart 9), with 84.2 per cent of projects rated as moderately satisfactory or better in the last cohort, which is the largest proportion of ratings in the moderately satisfactory or better zone in the timeline. However, the vast majority of projects are only moderately satisfactory, as both the PCRV/PPA and the "all evaluation" data series show.

Chart 9

Natural resources and environment – by year of completion

Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCRV/PPA data series)



85. Satisfactory or better projects are the ones that present an integrated design and holistic approach to protecting, enhancing and rehabilitating natural resources through awareness-raising, governance, participatory planning and incentives for the uptake of sustainable practices. The Environment Conservation and Poverty Reduction Programme in Ningxia and Shanxi increased vegetation cover and reduced soil erosion. It promoted integrated pest management and reduced the use of chemicals to a minimum. Introduction of cut-and-carry livestock production (zero-grazing) reduced pressure on natural pastures. While these activities certainly had a significant and positive environmental conservation impact, it is challenging to attribute environmental impact to the project due to the large conservation programmes successfully promoted by the Government.
86. Notwithstanding the visible improvements, the performance of IFAD's operations on environment continues to be relatively low as compared to other criteria. It should be noted that the sample of projects analysed in the 2016 ARRI does not yet fully reflect the important steps that IFAD has undertaken in the last six years

towards enhancing the environmental sustainability of its operations.²⁰ Future ARRIIs will be able to provide a fuller account of the results of these efforts.

87. The 2015 ESR on Environment and Natural Resource Management confirmed the steady strengthening of the commitment to better integrate environmental and natural resources management concerns in IFAD operations. At the same time, it emphasized key areas of attention moving forward which are summarized in box 3.

Box 3

Key areas of attention raised by the Synthesis Evaluation Report on Environment and Natural Resource Management


The 2015 ESR on Environment and Natural Resource Management underlined the following areas of attention to improve IFAD's performance in environment and natural resources management (ENRM) moving forward:

- Low coordination with relevant Government and technical partners involved in ENRM;
- Inadequate budgets for ENRM activities compromise implementation;
- Need for greater linkages between ENRM, poverty and livelihood. There is more evidence of direct results of ENRM activities, such as soil and water management, but much less on how diversification of production or adoption of more sustainable options have contributed to better use of natural resources thereby to better livelihoods of farmers;
- Despite the increased prominence of ENRM in the current IFAD Strategic Framework and replenishment consultations, ENRM remains an area that IFAD systems have difficulty in tracking reliably. Therefore greater attention is needed for environmental assessment, monitoring process and data collection which should be incorporated into IFAD projects where necessary.
- Even if recommendations on integrating ENRM issues more strongly in future COSOPs are generally followed up, alignment with ENRM policies in IFAD country strategies is mixed. A small number of COSOPs show a clear progression to a stronger focus on ENRM; others reveal a shift in the direction to other priority strategic areas, such as value chain investments.
- There is a risk that increased focus on climate change objectives could lead to less focus on persistent natural resources management issue. In some cases, for example, climate change appears to have displaced a strategic ENRM focus in newer COSOPs. Also, a large proportion of current ENRM funding is directed to climate change adaptation.

88. Institutions and policies. The contribution of IFAD operations to the quality and performance of institutions, policies and regulatory frameworks that influence the lives of the poor, is assessed as moderately satisfactory or better in 84.3 per cent of the projects exiting the portfolio in 2012-2014 (chart 10). The trend shows a significant improvement since 2010, even though 54.9 per cent of the projects in 2012-2014 are still only moderately satisfactory.

²⁰ Examples of recent IFAD efforts towards improving its environmental impact are: the establishment of the IFAD Environment and Climate Change Division in 2010; the 2011 environmental policy; the Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP) and the collaboration with the Global Environment Facility (GEF); the inclusion in the IFAD10 RMF of a dedicated indicator to assess "support for smallholder adaptation to climate change"; and the introduction in 2015 of the social, environmental and climate assessment procedures (SECAP).

Chart 10
Institutions and policies – by year of completion
Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data series)



89. The positive trend in performance confirms that IFAD projects have the potential to generate changes in public institutions, policies and programmes. This happens mainly through capacity-building of national and local institutions, adoption of participatory approaches that ensure that the most vulnerable groups are involved in decision-making, and the effective engagement in non-lending activities.
90. The Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme in India has been instrumental in operationalizing and implementing the existing land and forest rights regulations to facilitate the granting of land titles and rights for access to forests. The project facilitated the formation of Forest Protection Committees to enable community-driven conservation and access to forests. These committees have signed memoranda of understanding with the forest department, thus formalizing the recognition of their role and in turn the role of the communities.
91. Projects have a lower impact on institutions and policies when clear roadmaps and strategies towards informing policies and converging with national development programmes are missing. Also, insufficient attention to sustainability, limited budgets and low prioritization of agriculture emerge as factors constraining performance. An example in this respect is the Marine and Agricultural Resources Support Programme in Mauritius, where upon completion activities were not prioritized into Government programmes. In addition to the low performance and early closure, the programme design failed at understanding the rapidly transitioning economic situation of the country, which resulted in a preference for the growing manufacturing and service sectors over the agriculture sector.
92. Rural poverty impact. This criterion provides an integrated overview of the rural poverty impact of IFAD operations based on the ratings of the five impact sub-domains. Chart 11 shows that the percentage of moderately satisfactory or better projects increased from 87 per cent for operations completed in 2011-2013 to 92.3 in 2012-2014. The improvement in performance, which is driven by the increase of satisfactory projects, is also visible in the "all evaluation" data series. Yet, no projects are rated highly satisfactory for rural poverty impact overall in any of the data series analysed.
93. Chart 11.1 further confirms the improvement in performance. In fact, the mean value has increased from 4.05 in 2009-2011 to 4.27 in 2012-2014 with a lower dispersion of ratings around the mean value, as confirmed by the SD which is the smallest observed in the data series.

Chart 11



Rural poverty impact – by year of completion*Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/V/PPA data series)*

Chart 11.1

Rural poverty impact – by year of completion*Averages and dispersion in the distribution of ratings (PCR/V/PPA data series)*

94. Significant contributions have been made in the domains of household income and assets, human and social capital empowerment as well as food security and agricultural productivity. However, as discussed in previous paragraphs, there are opportunities for performance improvements to ensure that projects are able to realize their full potential and achieve the envisaged impacts, especially in poverty targeting, nutrition, environment, access to markets and private-sector engagement, and in ensuring the sustainability of grass-roots institutions.
95. Moreover, the weak performance of M&E systems requires enhanced attention for the way forward. Previous ARRIs had already underlined the importance of effective and efficient country and project-level M&E systems, which are at the core of assessing and attributing impact for accountability, learning and scaling-up of successful approaches. However, independent evaluations continue to find several constraining factors in overall M&E activities, as further detailed in box 4.

Box 4

Assessment of the M&E system by the 2015 PPAs

Nigeria – Community-based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme. Although the programme conducted both a baseline and impact study, the data could not be used to determine the project impact because different questionnaires and sampling methods were used. Moreover, the surveys do not present an analysis of data quality or of statistical accuracy. Finally, the impact survey report used a data set of around half of the original sample, implying that there were considerable data cleaning problems.

Mauritania – Oasis Sustainable Development Programme. The review of the various survey and impact studies demonstrates the poor performance of M&E. The reports lack analyses focused on results, outcomes and impacts. Conceptual shortcomings, multiple changes of line managers, the lack of visibility and control on the M&E mechanisms and database appear to be the main reasons for the shortcomings in this area.

Djibouti – Microfinance and Microenterprise Development Project. The delays in the conduct of surveys (baseline survey was conducted three years after implementation, while the impact survey was conducted one year after completion) as well as failures in the selection of the control sample and in the survey data constrained the measurement of impact.

China – Environmental Conservation and Poverty-Reduction Programme in Ningxia and Shanxi. Despite the fairly extensive M&E system and the comprehensive set of economic indicators in the baseline, the programme failed to produce useful impact data. This was mainly due to adoption of the Results and Impact Management System (RIMS), which led to a new baseline conducted at a late stage of implementation. Programme management then found it too cumbersome to conduct both a RIMS survey and an impact survey at completion, and dropped the latter.

Kyrgyz – Agricultural Investments and Services Project. This project recorded an overall scarcity of data, especially beyond the output level. Despite the availability of a baseline, the project missed a careful assessment of project impact; inter alia due to the absence of a counterfactual.

Ethiopia – Pastoral Community Development Project, Phase II. The project had an effective participatory M&E system and **automated management information system data**. **Baseline data were compiled using secondary data at start up, but were not used at completion for which another 'baseline' was drawn by an external consultant mandated for an 'end evaluation'.** There is therefore an issue of time and incongruity between the baselines and constraints in the assessment of impact.

Lao – Rural Livelihoods Improvement Programme in Attapeu and Sayabouri. Both sub-programmes failed to fully use the logframe as a management tool and the monitoring system was not adequately developed to support programme management for impact. Furthermore, in Sayabouri the monitoring data and analysis undertaken by the German Agency for International Cooperation were not shared, and no regular assessment or communication of the outcomes or progress was carried out. This lack of sufficient data hampered the assessment and attribution of impact.

96. None of the projects evaluated in 2015 had a solid M&E system with a good baseline and end-line to determine and attribute impact. Furthermore, there are examples of projects which have well-designed logframes with key outcome and impact indicators related for example to nutrition or gender. Yet, often these indicators are not properly measured, thus constraining the ability of an evaluation to judge success.
97. Finally, the commitment of government and project staff to ensuring due attention to M&E activities is key to ensure well-functioning M&E systems. Independent evaluations show that several factors are constraining better M&E, such as rapid turnover of M&E officers, weak understanding of M&E methods and insufficient attention to capturing outcomes and impact. Therefore, more attention needs to be devoted to strengthening government M&E capacity in the future. This would also

be consistent with the requirements of the Agenda 2030 which calls for strengthening data collection and capacity-building to develop national baselines where they do not yet exist.

98. This said, it is important to recognize and commend IFAD Management for the recent increased focus on strengthening its results culture and paying attention to improving its internal corporate performance monitoring and reporting instruments, by embarking upon impact assessments of IFAD operations, creating incentives for results-based management through RB-COSOPs and non-lending work, and improving the selection and monitoring of indicators.
99. Moreover, a grant to the Centers for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR) will be presented shortly to the Executive Board for approval. The aim of the grant is to strengthen the capacity of staff at the project level and others in-country and sharpening data collection systems and instruments. Finally, the preparation of the development effectiveness framework is expected to further strengthen the attention to results throughout the project cycle, enhance self-evaluation, improve country-level M&E capacity and facilitate the link between project M&E and corporate results reporting.


Other performance criteria

100. This section of the chapter analyses the sustainability of the benefits of IFAD's operations, the innovation and potential for replication and scaling-up and the attention to gender equality and women's empowerment.
101. Sustainability of benefits. The prospects of sustained benefits generated by IFAD's operations have improved since 2009-2011. Sixty-nine per cent of the projects completed in 2012-2014 are moderately satisfactory or better as compared to 63 per cent in 2011-2013 (chart 12). The improvement is confirmed by the 2013-2015 cohort of the "all evaluation" data series. However, the enhancement in performance is only moderately satisfactory.

Chart 12

Sustainability – by year of completion


Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data)



102. The projects reviewed in 2015 illustrate that benefits are more likely to be sustained when projects do not only focus on productive activities, but more broadly on human, social and institutional development. This increases the prospect of achieving community empowerment and the sustainability of the interventions and processes put in place. In India, the combination of Government and community-based support to the initiatives and the engagement of communities in collective action suggests that the sense of emancipation and quest for better livelihoods is likely to continue even in the absence of external support.

103. The Ethiopia CPE assessed as satisfactory the sustainability of the portfolio of projects reviewed. The good prospects that investments will be sustained over time are based on three main factors: (i) the continued policy attention from the Government which included the projects in its long-term investment plan; (ii) the strong stake that beneficiary communities have in the programmes; and (iii) the fact that the same communities are responsible for operation and maintenance of the facilities created by the projects.
104. In general, however, sustainability is still an area that requires attention across projects and country portfolios as already highlighted by last year's ARRI learning theme on the sustainability of benefits of IFAD operations.²¹ In particular, the most recurrent issues in the 2015 evaluations relate to the discontinuation of government support and the limited availability of well-articulated exit strategies, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of IFAD, government and other partners after project completion. Moreover, The Gambia CPE found that, although exit strategies are increasingly incorporated into the design of projects, sustainability has been limited by lack of engagement and ownership by beneficiaries in the planning, implementation, maintenance and oversight of project activities and infrastructure, which are essential factors in order to sustain any project gains.
105. Innovation and scaling up. IFAD's contribution in promoting innovations and scaling up successful experiences for expanded and sustainable impacts has been improving since 2009 as both the PCR/V/PPA and the "all evaluation" data series show. The percentage of projects rated as moderately satisfactory or better increased from 79.7 per cent in 2011-2013 to 87.5 per cent in 2012-2014, out of which 44.6 per cent are satisfactory or better (chart 13). This is the highest proportion of satisfactory and highly satisfactory projects in the period covered by the PCR/V/PPA data series.

Chart 13

Innovation and scaling up – by year of completion*Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/V/PPA data)*

106. Innovation and scaling-up was a priority in IFAD9 and remains as such in IFAD10. It is one of the core principles of engagement of IFAD as enshrined in the Strategic

²¹ The 2015 ARRI learning theme identified the drivers and limiting factors to sustainability. Key drivers are: (i) need for adequate integration of project objectives into national development strategies; (ii) attention to investment in activities that enhance communities' human and social capital through inclusive development; (iii) clear and realistic strategies for gender mainstreaming are crucial in promoting sustainability; (iv) promotion of community-level ownership and responsibility. The factors limiting sustainability are: (i) weak assessment and management of risks; (ii) weak financial and economic analysis; (iii) lack of exit strategies; (iv) poor communities' and households' resilience to withstand external shocks; (v) wide geographic and thematic selectivity within IFAD-supported projects.

Framework 2016-2025 and this reaffirms the strategic priority that the Fund attaches to increase the impact of its investments.

107. The assessment of innovation and scaling-up by IOE focuses on the extent to which IFAD development interventions have: (i) introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction; and (ii) been or are likely to be scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and others agencies. The main reference document in assessing innovation and scaling up is the 2007 IFAD's innovation strategy,²² which clearly underlines that innovations are context-specific.
108. In terms of support to innovation, the 2015 evaluations found that projects were successful in introducing participatory and innovative approaches to rural development and improved agricultural and non-agricultural technologies and methodologies previously unknown in the intervention areas. The Nigeria Community-based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme is a good example of grass-roots mobilization championed by groups and community development associations that provided the structure and principles for how community-driven development would work at village level. This innovative participatory approach was later institutionalized and scaled up by the Government.
109. The India CPE highlights the introduction of innovative techniques that are pertinent to climate change adaptation in the context of water saving, watershed management, soil erosion control, investments involving renewable energy as well as initiatives on information and communication technology, commodity value chains and insurance products.
110. In terms of scaling up, the Brazil Dom Hélder Câmara I project is one of the best examples, given the significant contribution of the Government of Brazil to the second phase of the project, as further detailed in box 5.

Box 5

A successful example of scaling-up: the Brazil Dom Hélder Câmara II

The Brazil Dom Hélder Câmara I project has been scaled up into a second phase for a total project cost of US\$125 million. This can be considered a successful example of scaling up, as the Government is contributing US\$82 million and the beneficiary contribution is US\$25 million (86 per cent of total funding). IFAD's financial contribution is only US\$3 million from its core resources and US\$15 million from the Spanish Food Security Cofinancing Facility Trust Fund. The contribution of IFAD in the first phase was US\$25 million from its core resources.

Phase I of the project experimented with several innovations, such as the introduction of women's identity cards (which was scaled up across Brazil by the Ministry of Agrarian Development) and the targeting of quilombolas – marginalized communities of African descent – (which was replicated by the World Bank in the Projeto de Desenvolvimento Sustentável do Estado da Bahia – Bahia Produtiva – with a budget of US\$260 million to be implemented throughout the state over a six-year period). Many other innovative features of the project (e.g. participatory and bottom-up processes for planning and resource allocation, water management) are being scaled up into state- and national-level policies and programmes through strong engagement in policy platforms.

111. Exemplary experiences of scaling-up in terms of both expanding project coverage and scaling from project to policy are offered by the India CPE. In the case of the Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme (OTELP), the state government is funding a third phase, called "OTELP+" for US\$100 million, with an IFAD contribution of US\$15 million. Convergence with central government schemes is being successfully pursued. In the case of the North-eastern Region Community

²² The IFAD innovation strategy is found at <http://www.ifad.org/gbdocs/eb/91/e/EB-2007-91-R-3-Rev-1.pdf>.


Resource Management Project for Upland Areas (NERCORPM), a third phase was launched in 2014 as a six-year project funded exclusively by the Government of India (central level) to expand NERCORMP II activities to new districts. NERCORMP I model is being expanded by the World Bank Project (North-East Rural Livelihoods Project) in four new states of north-eastern India.

112. Still, further effort is needed to ensure successful approaches and innovations promoted through IFAD operations can be scaled up by Government, development partners and the private sector, beyond individual project areas or provinces, for wider impact on rural poverty across specific countries and beyond. In particular, as also emphasized in this year's learning theme on KM, the evaluations highlight the limited achievements in analysing and systematizing innovations and good practices for dissemination and uptake. Both project and country-level evaluations identify the attention to non-lending activities, including SSC, as a key factor to further enhance prospects for scaling up. In this regard, IFAD introduced an operational framework in 2015 which guides country programmes on how lending and non-lending activities can be combined to trigger the desired systemic changes in the institutional, policy, and economic environment.
113. IOE is currently preparing an ESR on IFAD's support on scaling-up of results which will highlight lessons, good practices, factors of success and identify risks and potential limitations in IFAD's support to scaling up of results.
114. Gender equality and women's empowerment. IFAD has traditionally paid attention to the positive impact on gender equality and women's empowerment. The performance shows an upward trend driven by an increase in the percentage of satisfactory or better projects starting from 2010. In the last cohort of the PCRV/PPA data series nearly 53 per cent of the projects are satisfactory or better out of the 91 per cent that are in the moderately satisfactory or better zone (chart 14).
115. The "all evaluation data" series shows a similar trend. This good result is watered down by the low percentage of highly satisfactory projects which stands at only 3.8 per cent and 1.5 per cent in the last cohorts of the PCRV/PPA data series and "all evaluation data" series, respectively.

Chart 14

Gender equality and women's empowerment – by year of completion

Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCRV/PPA data)



116. The promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment is a keystone of IFAD development approach. As such, gender equality is a priority in both IFAD9 and IFAD10 and remains a principle of engagement in the 2016-2025 Strategic Framework.

117. The main reference documents in assessing gender equality and women's empowerment is the 2003 Gender Action Plan²³ which comprises the following objectives: (i) expand women's access to and control over fundamental assets – capital, land, knowledge and technologies; (ii) strengthen women's agencies – their decision-making role in community affairs and representation in local institutions; and (iii) improve women's well-being and ease their workloads by facilitating access to basic rural services and infrastructures.
118. The 2015 evaluations find that projects by and large contributed to expand women's access to and control over fundamental assets, strengthen their participation and decision-making role at all levels and representation in local institutions, and facilitated their access to basic rural services and infrastructures. Recent projects are devoting increasing attention to training men to sensitize them to broader issues of the relationship between men and women, and the transformational role women can play in broader social and economic development activities.
119. The Ethiopia, India and Nigeria CPEs highlight the commitment of the Governments in promoting gender equality and women's empowerment and the importance devoted to gender in the respective IFAD portfolios. Most projects of the India portfolio have adopted the self-help group approach which facilitated a change in attitudes towards more joint decision-making on investments. Also, some projects were successful in addressing problems of abuse of alcohol and domestic violence, of which women and children are the main victims.
120. The Ethiopia Pastoral Communities Development Project – Phase II offers another good example of IFAD's attention to gender issues. First, the project had a good gender focus which improved women's participation in project activities. Second, data collection was done in a gender-disaggregated manner which helped in tracking and reporting on impact. Third, PCDP II responded to both the needs of the rural poor and IFAD strategic priorities as enshrined in the Gender Plan of Action (2003) by contributing to the advancement of equality, increasing women's access to income and assets, improving the voice and presence of women in rural institutions and ensuring a more equitable workload balance between men and women.
121. However, the 2015 evaluations found that a substantive increase in the percentage of highly satisfactory projects could be achieved through gender strategies that cater for complex and heterogeneous contexts and through the development of gender action plans as part of the whole annual planning and reporting processes. Finally, more attention should be given to the provision of gender orientation/ sensitization and training to project management staff and technical assistance service providers.

Overall project achievement

122. This is a composite evaluation criterion which provides an assessment of IFAD-funded projects drawing upon the ratings for project performance, rural poverty impact, innovation and scaling-up, gender equality and women's empowerment, and sustainability.
123. As shown in chart 15, overall project achievement shows a marginal improvement from 82.2 per cent of moderately satisfactory projects in 2011-2013 to 85.7 per cent in 2012-2014, out of which 34 per cent are satisfactory. No projects are rated highly satisfactory and the performance is largely only moderately satisfactory in both the PCRV/PPA and "all evaluation" data series.

²³ IFAD adopted a gender strategy in 2012 whose objectives are similar to the 2003 Gender Action Plan. However, the evaluations informing the 2016 ARRI were done on projects designed before 2012.

124. The above marginal improvement is also reflected in a slight increase in the mean value from 4.08 in 2011-2013 to 4.18 in 2012-2014, with a smaller SD (chart 15.1).

Chart 15


Overall project achievement – by year of completion*Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data)*

Chart 15.1

Overall project achievement – by year of completion*Averages and dispersion in the distribution of ratings (PCR/PPA data series)***Performance of partners**

125. The following paragraphs assess the contribution of two key partners (IFAD and the government) to project design and execution, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation.
126. IFAD's performance as a partner. IFAD's performance as a partner was evaluated as moderately satisfactory or better in 87 per cent of the projects completed in the period 2012-2014 (chart 16). Nearly half of the projects are satisfactory. The "all evaluation" data series shows similar results. This is a very positive trend even though none of the projects is rated as highly satisfactory in any of the data series. The mean and the median remained unvaried at 4 in 2012-2014 as compared to the previous cohort (chart 16.1).

Chart 16



IFAD performance as a partner – by year of completion*Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data)*

Chart 16.1

IFAD performance as a partner – by year of completion*Averages and dispersion in the distribution of ratings (PCR/PPA data series)*

127. The 2015 evaluations confirm that IFAD is valued and trusted by governments for the quality and timeliness of its support, and for its focus, flexibility and responsiveness. One of the key factors underpinning this good performance is that the organization is continuing its decentralization efforts and experimenting with alternative models for IFAD country offices (ICOs). The ongoing CLE on decentralization will explore this particular topic in more details.
128. However, as mentioned, there are opportunities to strengthen further IFAD's self-evaluation system for better accountability and learning at project level, and to translate the positive results of IFAD's performance into improved policy dialogue with governments and enhance partnership-building. Moreover, increased attention should be devoted to providing training of project staff in financial management and in reducing the processing time for withdrawal applications. This will facilitate the management of fiduciary aspects as further detailed under government performance.
129. A key indicator in the assessment of IFAD's performance as a partner is cofinancing. In this regard, under IFAD10 the Fund set a target ratio of 1:1.2

cofinancing, which means that for each US\$1 of IFAD financing, US\$1.2 would come from external sources.

130. Therefore, the 2016 ARRI introduces a new analysis to assess the performance of IFAD in cofinancing as part of the broader assessment of IFAD's performance as a partner. The cofinancing ratios have been calculated and analysed across the portfolio of new projects approved in the timeframe covered by each of the 2015 CPEs.
131. The results of the analysis in table 4 show that IFAD surpassed the cofinancing ratio in four countries out of six. The highest level of cofinancing was mobilized in India, where the total counterpart funding for the eight new projects covered by the CPE is US\$669 million, 66 per cent of the total project cost. Cofinancing efforts are also positive in Brazil and Ethiopia. On the other hand, IFAD mobilized the lowest level of cofinancing in Nigeria, which has the lowest cofinancing ratio.

Table 4
Cofinancing ratios in the 2015 CPEs
(Millions of United States dollars)

Country	CPE coverage		Total nr projects	Nr of projects with 1:1.2 cofinancing ratio	IFAD	International cofinancing	* Government	Total cofinancing	Project cost	Co-financing ratio
Brazil	2008	2015	6	4	141.2	0.0	288.29	288.29	429.49	1:2
Turkey	2003	2015	5	1	102.7	10.9	43.5	54	156.90	1: 0.52
India	2010	2015	8	5	331	350.0	318.72	669	1004.00	1:2.02
Ethiopia	2008	2015	4	3	237.02	336.5	48.81	385	622.33	1:1.7
Nigeria	2009	2015	2	0	160.36	3.7	30	34	198.28	1:0.21
The Gambia	2004	2014	4	1	42	53.0	12.00	65	107	1:1.54

* Including cofinancing from beneficiaries.

132. While independent evaluations recognize the inherent challenges of designing and implementing cofinanced projects, they also emphasize the importance of cofinancing, such as opportunities for wider coverage of beneficiaries, knowledge exchange among the cofinancing institutions, joint policy dialogue with the governments and opportunities to scale up successful experiences for better impact.
133. Opportunities for cofinancing depend on several factors such as the government's fiscal space, the presence of other donors that invest in rural development and the role of government in encouraging coordinated donor funding. The evidence provided by independent evaluations suggests that a strong country presence may be conducive to IFAD's coordination and dialogue with governments, donors and others who can be potential cofinanciers of IFAD operations. However, the existing evidence does not indicate a direct correlation between country presence and cofinancing. For example, the cofinancing ratio is low in Nigeria despite the presence of an ICO for several years, whereas in The Gambia, where IFAD does not have an ICO, the ratio is relatively encouraging. The CLE on decentralization will explore these issues to a greater extent.
134. Another driver to enhancing cofinancing is performance in non-lending activities. For instance, the Brazil CPE reveals that though there is room for improvement, IFAD has devoted much attention to policy dialogue and KM in the country. This has allowed IFAD to showcase the innovations and successful project experiences, and more widely, the importance of investing in smallholder agriculture and family farming for better rural livelihoods.

135. Notwithstanding the positive performance in cofinancing, it is important to note that the cofinancing ratio has been reduced from 1.6 in IFAD9 to 1.2 in IFAD10. More systematic efforts will be needed in the future to garner greater cofinancing for rural transformation. In this regard, the Fund is developing a more strategic and targeted operational approach for mobilizing cofinancing during IFAD10.24
136. Government performance. The performance of governments improved considerably from 60 per cent of the projects rated moderately satisfactory or better in 2009-2011 to 82.2 per cent in 2012-2014 (chart 17). The trend is confirmed by the "all evaluation" data series. However, most of the projects are only moderately satisfactory and none of them is rated highly satisfactory in any of the data series. Moreover, while the median rating is 4, the mean rating remains below 4 throughout the period (chart 17.1).

Chart 17


Government performance as a partner – by year of completion*Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data)*

Chart 17.1

Government performance as a partner – by year of completion*Averages and dispersion of the distribution of ratings (PCR/PPA data series)*

²⁴ See the Report of the Consultation on the Tenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (C38/L.4/Rev.1).

137. The 2015 evaluations confirm several key features of good government performance. First, several project-level evaluations and both the Brazil and India CPEs point to government commitment and support to IFAD's mandate, which result into high co-funding levels, policy changes and scaling-up efforts. In particular the Brazil CPE highlights that strong leadership at country level contributes to better policy and institutional environment in the agricultural and rural sectors.
138. Second, the Turkey CPE highlights the creation of a conducive policy environment, the contribution to planning exit strategies and continued government support which are key to ensuring sustainability. Finally, the majority of the 2015 evaluations identify the strong ownership of projects and active support and participation by governments in M&E and supervision missions as key to ensuring timely and efficient project implementation.
139. On the other hand, project and CPEs such as those undertaken for The Gambia and Nigeria point to the management of fiduciary aspects – the responsibility of the government – as a major constraint to government performance. In particular, fiduciary aspects is potential risky in the following areas: (i) quality of financial management; (ii) disbursement rate; (iii) counterpart funding; (iv) compliance with procurement; (v) quality and timeliness of audits; and (vi) compliance with financing covenants. These aspects are thoroughly assessed during annual supervision missions by IFAD.
140. The understanding and rigorous management of fiduciary aspects by governments depends largely on national capacities and the complexity of the country programmes, and ensuring efficiency and good governance of loans and grants is key, as detailed further in box 6.

Box 6

Financial management and fiduciary responsibility

Quality of financial management. Sound financial management is essential to ensure proper oversight and achieve efficient project execution. The evaluations identified a number of issues that require attention, such as the weak accounting and reporting systems and the absence of financial manuals to guide project staff in their financial management activities. Moreover, training and capacity-building on key aspects for the management of IFAD-funded operations and regular support by financial management experts are key to ensuring good financial management. Several evaluations point out that the difficulties in maintaining accurate financial accounts are linked to low staff capacities in record keeping, especially when accounting systems reflect multiple funding sources.

Disbursement rate. Evaluations found several cases where slow disbursement rates in the initial years of implementation were mainly the result of the extensive time spent on processing withdrawal applications, procurement of goods and services, and on the submission of the Statements of Expenditures. For example, in the Nigeria Community-based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme, where fund management was decentralized to the seven participating states, each state was consequently accounting for and submitting withdrawal applications individually. This resulted in a total of 465 applications being made over the entire life of the project, which represented a high transaction cost for both IFAD and the Government. As a result, the average processing time was 39 days, with 32 days for IFAD processing. Variations stand out though: the lengthiest overall processing time for a withdrawal application was 161 days, and the shortest 7. For IFAD processing, the lengthiest processing time was 81 days, while the shortest was 1 day. Despite the constraints affecting the disbursement rate, the evaluated projects managed to disburse between 93-108 per cent. Improvements in disbursement rates are mostly attributed to the adjustment of disbursement and procurement rules (Nigeria), the transition to IFAD direct supervision (China) and IFAD's country presence, which in some cases (e.g. Brazil) ensured swifter processing of withdrawal applications to replenish the projects' special accounts.

Counterpart funds. Timely provision of government's counterpart funds, together with the commitment to pre-finance key activities is a vital factor for smooth project implementation, especially in cases where disbursement of IFAD funding may be lagging behind. However, the 2015 evaluations found several cases where counterpart funding did not materialize in a timely manner. For example, in the Al-Dhala Community Resource Management Project in Yemen, project implementation was delayed by the late release of counterpart funds and this impinged on project progress and performance.

Procurement. Loan agreements stipulate the specific provisions for the procurement of goods, works and consulting services in the projects. The evaluations found cases where projects had difficulties in following the IFAD guidelines for contracting service providers and procuring goods. For example, in the China Environmental Conservation and Poverty-Reduction Programme in Ningxia and Shanxi, some difficulties resulted from errors in translation and from misunderstandings after a new IFAD procurement template had been introduced without further training of local programme staff. Projects that develop their own procedures and manuals for procurement based on IFAD guidelines perform better and ensure the smooth implementation of rigorous procurement processes.

Audits. By and large the evaluations found good compliance with IFAD standards and practices. In Nigeria for example, where problems had been recorded earlier, the quality and timeliness of auditing improved over time, once the issues of bottom-up information flow was addressed and state-level auditors were trained in line with IFAD standards.


Compliance with financing covenants. The 2015 evaluations find that governments are compliant overall with financing covenants. The Moldova Rural Financial Services and Marketing Programme offers an excellent example of satisfactory government performance in managing fiduciary aspects. The Government showed strong ownership of the programme and systematically and actively participated in all supervision missions. All loan covenants were respected and the Government of Moldova provided relevant and timely support to project implementation in line with the loan agreement.

Summary of project performance

141. Chart 18 provides an overview of the trends in project performance, overall project achievement, rural poverty impact, and performance of partners. The chart confirms the dip in performance in projects completed in 2009-2011, especially for project and government performance, which was already highlighted by the 2015 ARRI.

Chart 18


Combined overview of the main evaluation criteria, percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better in PCRV/PPA data series



142. Last year's report offers two explanations for the dip in performance, which still hold true. First, part of the projects evaluated that completed in 2009-2011 were implemented in states in fragile situations, where the policy and institutional environments are weak as compared to other country contexts. Secondly, the dip is also a reflection of the introduction of IFAD's first comprehensive Evaluation Manual in 2008, which was the basis for the projects evaluated from 2009 onwards.
143. The dip in performance is particularly sharp for efficiency and government performance. Fifty-three per cent of the projects completed in 2009-2011 were rated moderately unsatisfactory or worse for efficiency and 39 per cent for government performance. Most of the projects were negatively affected by poor ownership, accountability and responsibility by the governments, weak capacity and limited experience in implementing projects, and underestimation of management/operating costs.
144. The performance for the five criteria improves starting from 2010-2012 and the 2012-2014 cohort records the best performance in the timeline. The percentage of projects rated as moderately satisfactory or better is above 80 per cent for all evaluation criteria, with the exception of efficiency (69 per cent) and sustainability (70 per cent). In addition to analysis and examples of good and less good performance illustrated in previous paragraphs, this positive result can also be attributed to the fact that the significant changes in IFAD's operating model since 2007 (e.g. ex ante review, direct supervision and decentralization) are starting to feed through the ARRI data.
145. Chart 19 shows the performance of IFAD-financed projects by evaluation criteria, when only considering satisfactory or better ratings. The analysis reveals that projects score best in terms of relevance, and worse in terms of sustainability and government performance.

Chart 19

Ranking of evaluation criteria – percentage of projects completed in 2012-2014 rated as satisfactory or better (PCR/PPA data only)



- (ii) Analysis of performance of IFAD operations in the IFAD9 replenishment period
146. This section of the report provides an account of the performance of IFAD by replenishment periods, with a particular focus on the achievements covering the IFAD9 period (2013-2015). Given that the chapter outlining the performance of IFAD's operations in the period 2000-2015 provides an assessment across all evaluation criteria by both PCR/PPA and "all evaluation" data series, the analysis in this section of the report is conducted only for the following selected key evaluation criteria: the two composite criteria (project performance and overall project achievement), rural poverty impact, and the performance as partners of IFAD and of the government concerned. In addition, the analysis of ratings has also been conducted for gender equality and women's empowerment, and innovation and scaling-up, which were priority areas in IFAD9.
147. The "all data" series has been used for the analysis and reporting on performance by IFAD replenishment periods. This is because the ARRI reports on performance trends since the IFAD5 replenishment period (2001-2003) onwards, and PCR/PPA data is not available from that period.
148. The charts displaying the ratings by replenishment period, contained in annex VI, show good performance of IFAD operations exiting the portfolio in the IFAD9 period across the above key evaluation criteria. Over 80 per cent of the projects are rated moderately satisfactory or better for most of the criteria in 2013-2015, with the exception of project performance for which this percentage is slightly below 80 per cent. The best performance of IFAD operations is registered in reducing rural poverty, for which 87.7 per cent of the projects are moderately satisfactory or better, and in supporting gender equality and women's empowerment, for which 88.4 per cent of projects are moderately satisfactory or better.
149. Furthermore, an overall improvement can be observed when comparing IFAD9 with the other replenishment periods. In particular, it is worth noting two positive findings: (i) the enhancement in the performance of partner governments from 66.6 per cent of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better in the IFAD8 replenishment period, to 83 per cent in IFAD9; and (ii) a steady increase in the percentage of projects for which IFAD performance as a partner is rated as satisfactory from 20 per cent in IFAD5 to 45.7 per cent in IFAD9.

150. In sum, IFAD performed well in the IFAD9 replenishment period, devoted attention to operational priorities such as the reduction of rural poverty, and put more emphasis on results measurement. These positive results pave the way to a smooth transition to IFAD10 and will position the Fund to face the challenges posed by the new global agenda for sustainable development.
151. At the same time, the 2016 ARRI identifies areas that will require attention moving forward to operationalize the priorities set for the IFAD10 period. In fact, the performance of a large number of projects remains mainly moderately satisfactory in all key evaluation criteria and only a few projects are highly satisfactory for innovation and scaling up (2.8 per cent) and gender (2.9 per cent). Therefore, as already highlighted in the 2015 ARRI, there is scope for “raising the performance bar” from moderately satisfactory to satisfactory or better projects. Moreover, efficiency remains an area of concern moving forward with flat performance as compared to previous replenishment periods with only 59 per cent of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better.
- (iii) Peer-to-peer comparison
152. Following the practice introduced in last year’s report, the 2016 ARRI presents the results of the peer-to-peer comparison between IOE and PMD ratings for all evaluation criteria using the mean and mode values. The peer-to-peer comparison aims at assessing the “net disconnect” between PMD and IOE ratings for each criteria included in PCRs and PCRVs to get a better understanding of where differences lie in reporting on performance.
153. In addition to the above, in annex IX the ARRI presents the list of the 32 projects completed in 2013, together with the corresponding ratings for the main evaluation criteria used by IOE and PMD. The year 2013 was chosen for this analysis given that it is the year in which the largest number of PCRVs/PPAs were available for completed operations. The same annex also contains the comparison between IOE and PMD ratings for all evaluation criteria using only PPAs for the analysis.
154. As detailed in the following paragraphs, the results of the peer-to-peer comparison are largely similar to last year. However, the analysis draws from a larger sample of 126 projects completed in the period 2007-2014, as compared to 97 in the 2015 ARRI.
155. Table 5 shows that for the 126 projects assessed in this analysis, the PMD ratings were higher on average for all criteria. As last year, relevance presents the largest disconnect, where the PMD ratings tend to be 0.42 higher on average. A review of PCRVs find that this is because – in analysing and rating relevance of a project – the PCRs primarily assess the relevance of project objectives and do not focus sufficiently on the relevance of design. IOE assessments and ratings for relevance cover both aspects – review of project objectives and design – which are both critical in ensuring effectiveness. Another explanatory factor is that many PCRs only assess relevance of the project as embedded in design documents, while IOE assessments include an analysis of relevance both at the time of design as well as at project completion.
156. Also the difference in the mode ratings is the same as last year. The IOE mode rating is four for every criterion except human and social capital and empowerment, for which the mode is 5. The mode of PMD ratings is 5, as presented by 9 criteria, with a mode of 4 for the remaining. This demonstrates that the frequency of satisfactory ratings is higher in PMD assessments.

Table 5
Comparison of IOE's PCR/PPA ratings and PMD's PCR ratings for all evaluation criteria

Criteria	Mean ratings		Disconnect of mean rating	Mode ratings	
	IOE	PMD		IOE	PMD
1. Relevance	4.36	4.78	-0.42	4	5
2. Effectiveness	4.02	4.22	-0.20	4	4
3. Efficiency	3.66	3.92	-0.26	4	4
4. Project performance	3.99	4.3	-0.31	4	4
5. Rural poverty impact	4.13	4.24	-0.11	4	5
6. Sustainability	3.71	4.01	-0.30	4	4
7. Innovation and scaling-up	4.15	4.44	-0.29	4	5
8. Gender equality and women's empowerment	4.27	4.44	-0.17	4	4
9. IFAD performance	4.22	4.5	-0.28	4	5
10. Government performance	3.83	4.04	-0.21	4	4
11. Overall project achievement	4.04	4.25	-0.21	4	5
12. Household income and assets	4.2	4.37	-0.17	4	5
13. Human and social capital and empowerment	4.38	4.53	-0.15	5	5
14. Food security and agricultural productivity	4.11	4.35	-0.24	4	5
15. Environment	3.86	4.1	-0.24	4	4
16. Institutions and policy	4.04	4.35	-0.31	4	5

157. Project completion reports (PCRs). In PCRVs, IOE assesses and rates PCRs using four evaluation criteria. These are: (i) scope (e.g. whether the PCR has adhered to IFAD guidelines for PCRs); (ii) data (e.g. robustness in terms of the evidence base used in forming evaluative judgements); (iii) lessons (e.g. whether the PCR includes lessons on the proximate causes of satisfactory or less than satisfactory performance); and (iv) candour (e.g. in terms of objectivity in the narrative, and whether ratings in the PCR are supported by evidence included in the document). Ratings for each of these criteria is aggregated in the PCRVs to provide an overall rating of the PCR document.
158. As seen in table 6, the overall assessment of PCR in 2012-2014 shows a slight improvement as compared to 2011-2013, since 82 per cent of the PCRs validated by IOE are moderately satisfactory or better. PCRs tend to be strong in terms of "lessons learned" and "candour", but weaker with regard to "quality". However, the percentage of satisfactory or better PCRS decreased as compared to 2011-2013 and only less than 30 per cent of the PCRs produced in the last cohort are considered satisfactory or better.

Table 6
Quality of PCR documents (PCR/PPA data series)

Evaluation criteria for assessing PCRs	Percentage satisfactory or better		Percentage moderately satisfactory or better	
	2011-2013	2012-2014	2011-2013	2012-2014
Scope	45.2	40	81	84
Quality	16.4	14.3	70	77
Lessons	55.6	53.6	90	93
Candour	46.6	41	86	88
Overall rating for PCR document	35.5	29	79	82

Source: PCRVs by IOE.

159. As highlighted in previous ARRI, there is often a one and a half to two-year time lag between project completion, preparation of the PCR and ratings by PMD and the submission of the PCRs with ratings to IOE. This delay has important implications in the preparation of PCRVs by IOE, which in turn affects the PCR/PPA data series used in the ARRI. In fact, in this year's ARRI, the last sub-period analysed is 2012-2014.
160. Therefore, it is imperative that the time lag in submitting complete PCRs with ratings to IOE be shortened, so that each year the ARRI can provide a more contemporary update on IFAD's operational performance. In this regard, it is important to acknowledge that PMD undertook in end-2015 an important reform of the guidelines and procedures to streamline the process and improve the quality and timeliness of PCRs.

B. Country programme evaluations

161. Background. CPEs provide a broader assessment of the IFAD-government partnership in the reduction of rural poverty, and serve to inform the development of new country strategies and IFAD-supported activities in the country.
162. Since 2010, the ARRI contains a dedicated chapter on CPEs, to analyse and report on performance beyond the project level and to identify lessons that cut across IFAD country programmes. In line with such practice, this chapter outlines IFAD's performance in relation to: (i) non-lending activities (i.e. policy dialogue, KM, and partnership-building); and (ii) country strategies (i.e. the COSOP) in terms of relevance and effectiveness. It also includes a section on cross-cutting issues of importance to ongoing and future IFAD country strategies.
163. Historically, a total of 58 CPEs have been undertaken by IOE since the product was introduced in the 1990s (see annex IV for the complete list). Of these, 36 CPEs have been conducted since 2006 based on a consistent methodology including the use of ratings, which allows for the aggregation of results across country programmes. This year's ARRI includes six new CPEs carried out in Brazil, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, The Gambia and Turkey.
164. Twenty-three out of the 36 CPEs by IOE were conducted in MICs. In particular, four of the 2015 CPEs were done in MICs (Brazil, India, Nigeria and Turkey). As stated by the IOE 2014 ESR on IFAD's engagement in MICs,²⁵ IFAD continues to play a relevant role in supporting MICs to reduce rural poverty given its mandate and the

²⁵ The ESR is found at: <https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/1297cd6c-d40d-4580-8909-e588291c6940>.

significant number of rural poor people and inequality in such countries. A continued engagement in MICs is also important for IFAD's financial model as MICs are providing increasing financial contributions to IFAD's periodic replenishments as compared to the past.

165. While loan-funded projects are still a priority in many MICs, others need IFAD's wider involvement in non-lending activities such as KM, policy dialogue and partnership-building or IFAD support in the area of SSC and TrC and technical assistance. These are aspects in which IFAD has made progress but more can be achieved in the future, as further detailed in the following paragraphs which discuss the assessment of non-lending activities.

(i) Non-lending activities

166. Trends in performance 2006-2015. Policy dialogue, KM and partnership-building are mutually reinforcing actions to complement IFAD's investment projects. They are increasingly recognized as essential instruments to promote institutional and policy transformation at country level and scale up the impact of IFAD operations for deeper results in rural poverty reduction.
167. Table 7 presents the consolidated results from the 36 country programmes evaluated since 2006. In a nutshell, the data reveal that nearly 64 per cent of the country programmes were moderately satisfactory and 5.6 per cent satisfactory for overall non-lending activities, over 30 per cent are moderately unsatisfactory and none highly satisfactory.
168. Half the CPEs assessed IFAD and government combined performance as mainly moderately satisfactory in both KM and partnership-building. The latter has been the best among non-lending activities in the period 2006-2015, whereas policy dialogue has been the least satisfactory. However, the average rating is below 4 for the three non-lending activities throughout the period.
169. Non-lending activities have historically been the weakest area of IFAD support. The main reasons for the limited achievement as emerging from previous ARRI are the lack of a strategic approach, the limited resources and incentives for this purpose, and insufficient M&E.

Table 7
Performance of non-lending activities 2006-2015

<i>Rating</i>	<i>Policy dialogue</i>	<i>Knowledge management</i>	<i>Partnership building</i>	<i>Overall non-lending activities</i>
Highly satisfactory	2.8	2.8	0	0
Satisfactory	2.8	8.3	13.9	5.6
Moderately satisfactory	47.2	50	55.6	63.9
Total satisfactory	53	61	69	69
Moderately unsatisfactory	38.9	36.1	30.6	30.6
Unsatisfactory	8.3	2.8	0	0
Highly unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0
Total unsatisfactory	47	39	31	31
Average rating	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.8


170. Trends in performance 2013-2015. The next paragraphs discuss the trends in the performance of non-lending activities by three-year moving averages (chart

20) starting from 2006. The analysis focuses on the period 2013-2015 and the factors of good and less good performance as emerging from the 2015 CPEs.

Chart 20

Performance of non-lending activities 2006-2015

Percentage rated moderately satisfactory or better by criteria



171. Chart 20 shows that the plateau in performance in the period 2011-2014 analysed in the 2015 ARRI evolved into an improvement of KM and a decline in the performance of policy dialogue and partnership-building in 2013-2015.
172. KM shows an encouraging upward trend from 67 per cent in moderately satisfactory country programmes since 2010-2012 to 78 per cent in 2013-2015. An in-depth analysis of performance and conducive and limiting factors to KM will be treated in the learning theme chapter of the report. However, since this section of the chapter focuses on the 2013-2015 evaluations which were mainly undertaken in MICs, it is worth recalling that these countries have a growing interest to pursue an active knowledge-sharing programme and also a higher level of expectation from IFAD as a knowledge broker to help address an expanded range of issues confronting rural poverty. The increasing demand from these countries for IFAD's experience, lessons and good practices, including in the context of SSC and TrC, is a salient ingredient of the improvement in performance in KM.
173. The performance of policy dialogue declined from 73 per cent of the country programmes rated moderately satisfactory or better in the period 2009-2011 to 58 per cent in 2011-2014, to 54 per cent in 2013-2015. None of them is satisfactory or highly satisfactory. The downward trend is even sharper for partnership-building. In this case performance diminished from 91 per cent of country programmes assessed as moderately satisfactory or better in 2009-2011 to 75 per cent in 2011-2014, to 62 per cent in 2013-2015.
174. As anticipated by the 2015 ARRI, in both cases performance is below the targets of 70 per cent and 90 per cent set in the IFAD9 RMF for policy dialogue and partnership-building, respectively. The decline in performance raises concerns in view of the substantive contribution that the Fund is expected to make to the achievement of SDG17²⁶ as well as in view of the IFAD10 targets for 2018, which was increased to 85 per cent for policy dialogue.
175. The 2015 CPEs report successful examples of policy dialogue and partnership-building. In Brazil, the Ministry of Agrarian Development and IFAD have managed to bring to the table the priorities of Brazilian family farmers and included their

²⁶ SDG17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

representatives in the dialogue alongside Government officials and other policy- and decision-makers. In India, some projects usefully contributed to policy-related inputs, such as the laws on tribal groups' access to forests. In The Gambia IFAD and the Government engaged in fruitful policy dialogue, which led to the reform of the microfinance sector in the country. In terms of partnership-building, the partnerships with NGOs and community-based organizations as well as with the Government are considered generally positive by the 2015 CPEs.

176. However, most of the policy dialogue and partnership-building at country level remained confined to the context of IFAD-funded projects, and IFAD's role in policy processes at the national level has been limited, as in the case of Turkey. Furthermore, private-sector partnerships that are flagged as an important aspect of IFAD's strategy are found to be, in many cases, underexploited or at an emerging stage, as for example in India.
177. Expansion of IFAD's engagement with the private sector, including large private companies in the agriculture and food sector, especially at the country level is a priority for improved partnership-building moving forward. Along the same lines, partnerships with multilateral and bilateral organizations, including the United Nations Rome-based agencies (RBAs), are increasingly being pursued and remain a priority, yet the 2015 CPEs concur that there is scope for further enhancement.
178. Therefore, more opportunities are to be explored to expand the coordination, partnership and dialogue with a wider range of agencies involved in agriculture and rural development, international development partners, donors and the private sector, which could leverage the scaling up of successful experiences and results, as detailed in the following paragraphs.
179. Key factors for good performance in non-lending activities. The 2015 CPEs draw attention to some enabling factors which are key to enhance IFAD's capacity to significantly engage in non-lending activities moving forward. First, a more systematic allocation of resources, accompanied by realistic agendas defined in the COSOP, backed by clear and appropriately documented roadmaps for implementation, is key to capitalize on the knowledge and lessons from successful project approaches. This would pave the way to a more meaningful and structured role for IFAD in policy dialogue and partnership-building.
180. Second, a reinforced IFAD country presence together with an outposted country programme manager (CPM) positively contribute to better KM and enhance IFAD's brand, visibility and capacity for national policy dialogue and partnership-building. The role of ICOs and outposted CPMs in promoting policy dialogue at the country level will be analysed in the context of the ongoing formative CLE on IFAD's decentralization experience, which will draw from the evidence provided by the CPEs.
181. The 2015 CPEs provide useful insights on the importance of IFAD country presence through an ICO. For example, in Nigeria, the setting up of an ICO in 2008 triggered the conditions for cost-effective opportunities to engage in policy discussions and enabled IFAD to actively pursue policy linkages and jointly follow up on actions with the Government and other donors.
182. However, the India CPE notes that even with the strong country presence of an outposted CPM, the size, geographical spread and complexity of the programme make it extremely difficult for the country office to perform equitably in all areas of their responsibility. Most time is spent in project back-stopping and implementation missions, while critical non-lending dimensions receive less priority in the agenda. Therefore, more attention needs to be devoted to financial and human resources that are deployed at country level.
183. Third, a more programmatic approach, including more systematic donor coordination, and the development of strategies at the country level with a clear

- agenda would enable the establishment of stronger partnerships at the strategic level and better policy dialogue and cofinancing.
184. Fourth, the CLE on the PBAS underlines another important factor that could trigger better performance, especially in policy dialogue. In fact, the rural sector performance scoring process, if conducted in a participatory manner with government authorities and other in-country partners, may serve as a useful opportunity for policy dialogue and could promote a more conducive policy and institutional environment that favours the reduction of rural poverty.
 185. Finally, the 2015 CPEs highlight that grants have a special value for supporting policy engagement, research and partnerships, and for generating and sharing knowledge to advance smallholder farming, rural transformation and the fight against rural poverty. Yet, as also discussed by the learning theme on KM, opportunities exist to ensure more robust linkages between loans and grants, and to enhance the potential for learning from grant activities.
 186. In particular, the Nigeria CPE observed that although the (potential) links between grants and loans are alluded to in most grants documents, it is difficult to detect tangible linkages on the ground, with the result that the links between grants and loans remain weak or yet to be operationalized. In India, the potential of grants to initiate policy dialogue initiatives at the state or even national level has not been built upon in a consistent manner.
 187. Finally, the CPE Brazil found that grants have been an important part of IFAD's programme in Brazil. They have particularly been instrumental in furthering non-lending activities in the country programme. There is, however, limited information to assess outcomes or contribution to the objectives of some grants, although IFAD's on-going knowledge management grant, the Seear programme, is currently developing an innovative way of carrying out M&E activities with the participation of the rural youth through video/audio footages.
 188. Most of the aforementioned can be traced back to the regional or global nature of the grants discussed in the 2015 CPEs. Even if the grant proposals have the potential to create the requested knowledge and engagement for rural transformation, their fit within the country programmes has been mixed. In particular, when a grant covers a large number of countries, it is more difficult to track its progress and intended impact to a specific in-country programme as mentioned in both the Ethiopia and Nigeria CPEs.
 189. To summarize, non-lending activities are crucial to IFAD to leverage and enable deeper impact for its programmes on both the policy and the operational/financial fronts, including prospects for SSC and TrC which are discussed in the next section.
 190. South-south and triangular cooperation (SSC and TrC). This is the first time that the ARRI devotes a specific section to this topic which builds upon the findings of the 2015 ESR on non-lending activities in the context of SSC, which are described in the following paragraphs.
 191. The importance of SSC and TrC in the context of international cooperation for development has been underlined in the Agenda 2030, as a means of implementing the SDGs. Reflecting the growing interest and demand, a number of multilateral and bilateral organizations have endeavoured to upgrade their support to SSC and TrC. In this context, SSC and TrC have increasingly been recognized as a key priority for IFAD to achieve its mandate of rural poverty reduction in the final reports on the Ninth and Tenth Replenishment Consultation processes concluded in December 2011 and December 2014. According to the latter report, "under IFAD10, the Fund plans to strengthen its comparative advantage and expand its work in this area in terms of both knowledge-based cooperation and investment

promotion, seeing it as an integral part of its business model." IFAD has not developed a specific policy or strategy on its support to SSC²⁷.

192. SSC first appeared as an explicit corporate agenda at IFAD in 2008, but it is a generally shared view that IFAD was already de facto supporting some SSC initiatives (without necessarily labelling them as such) mainly in the form of knowledge-sharing and mutual learning even before. The ESR confirmed that the main features and strengths of IFAD-facilitated SSC include: (i) the focus on rural poverty reduction and smallholder agriculture based on IFAD's accumulated experience with global outreach; (ii) a central role of the rural poor and grass-roots organizations as main providers and receivers of development solutions; (iii) its long-term partnerships with multiple stakeholders, in particular grass-roots organizations (e.g. farmers' organizations); and (iv) the prominence of a regional perspective.
193. However, the ESR notes that the Fund did not clearly articulate the main objectives, pathways to achieving the objectives and approaches for supporting different types of SSC during the time period covered by the ESR. One of the recommendations of the ESR for IFAD, therefore, was to provide conceptual clarity and practical guidance at corporate level for IFAD's support to SSC. It is important to clarify what is considered to be SSC in the IFAD context and which support options the Fund will offer, to articulate what sort of SSC can enhance the impact of its portfolio and contribute to its mandate in what way. In recent years, enhanced efforts have been made to provide conceptual clarity as articulated in the final report of the Consultation on the Tenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources and IFAD's Strategic Framework 2016-2025. Moreover, enhanced guidance is provided in the context of the quality assurance process and the Operational Strategy and Policy Guidance Committee, where all new COSOPs and project design documents are reviewed.
194. Furthermore, although the revised COSOP template includes a section for articulating the SSC and TrC approach, there are opportunities for strengthening strategic mainstreaming of SSC into country programmes. Relatively programmatic SSC initiatives have often been financed through mostly regional grants, but their linkages with overall country programmes are often not evident. Therefore, more efforts are needed for more systematic and proactive assessments of countries' interest in sharing knowledge, as well as learning from others, in the context of country strategy or project development.
195. According to the ESR, in general, results orientation in planning and monitoring SSC activities tends to be weak, with outputs (e.g. number of workshops, number of participants) often being the main focus of planning and reporting. This is evident in SSC-centred grants (i.e. specifically promoting SSC as the main orientation), or also when SSC activities take place in the context of (or in relation to) larger projects where there is no structured approach to documenting the specific contributions of SSC. Bearing in mind that SSC is a means and not an end in itself, planning for, and measuring the contributions of SSC to development objectives will be vital for future scaling up of SSC as part of IFAD's business model. Along these lines, the Fund plans to strengthen internal mechanisms for ensuring tracking and the coordinated application of SSC across IFAD operations during 2016-2018.
196. Finally, opportunities for collaboration with RBAs around SSC have not been fully exploited at the corporate or country level. Although each organization has its own mandate and comparative advantage, there are opportunities for better coordination of efforts in specific areas to avoid overlap with the aim of enhancing

²⁷ It is worth noting that IFAD produced the 2010/2011 paper "SSC in IFAD's business model" which provides a high-level articulation of SSC and TrC.

collective results and improving transaction costs for governments. This is of particular importance also in consideration of the strategic priority that the 2016-2025 Strategic Framework attaches to collaboration among the RBAs..

(ii) COSOP performance

197. COSOPs are fundamental instruments to determine IFAD's strategic positioning in the country and to articulate the mix of interventions that will contribute to rural poverty reduction. Results-based COSOPs were introduced in 2006, which helped sharpen their results orientation. Each CPE includes an assessment and ratings for COSOP performance, which entails the review of relevance and effectiveness of IFAD country strategies. Based on these ratings, CPEs also generate an overall rating for COSOP performance.
198. Table 8 summarizes the ratings from the 36 CPEs done between 2006-2015. COSOP relevance is assessed as moderately satisfactory or better in 87 per cent of IFAD country strategies, effectiveness in 75 per cent and COSOP performance in 83 per cent. The majority of the ratings falls in the moderately satisfactory zone, none of the country strategies is found to be highly satisfactory for any criteria.

Table 8

Results of COSOP relevance, effectiveness and performance (percentage of country programme rated moderately satisfactory or better)^a

<i>Rating</i>	<i>COSOP relevance</i>	<i>COSOP effectiveness</i>	<i>COSOP performance^b</i>
6 Highly satisfactory	0	0	0
5 Satisfactory	31	11	29
4 Moderately satisfactory	56	64	54
Total moderately satisfactory or better	87	75	83
3 Moderately unsatisfactory	13	25	17
2 Unsatisfactory	0	0	0
1 Highly unsatisfactory	0	0	0
Total moderately unsatisfactory or worse	13	25	17
Average rating	4.2	3.9	4.1
Country programmes rated	36	28	28

Source: CPE by IOE from 2006-2015.

^a The seven CPEs completed before 2009 did not contain ratings for COSOP relevance, effectiveness and overall performance, since this rating was not required by the IOE methodology at that time. IOE thus decided to assign ratings on the basis of the evidence available in the seven CPEs. This was possible for county strategy relevance in all seven cases, but there was insufficient evidence to provide reliable ratings for country strategy effectiveness and overall COSOP performance.

^b COSOP performance is a composite rating based on the individual ratings for COSOP relevance and COSOP effectiveness. This composite rating is not an arithmetic average of the individual ratings for relevance and effectiveness, but rather a round number based on the available evidence and the objective judgement of the evaluations.

199. Cross-cutting issues. The 2015 CPEs identified several cross-cutting issues that merit attention for improving ongoing and future IFAD country strategies. First, processes and instruments to measure the achievements of non-lending activities at the country level are not yet fully developed in the context of the results frameworks of the COSOPs. Under IFAD10, the Fund committed to monitoring its performance on KM and report on it in the RIDE. However, as further explored in the learning theme chapter, KM is lacking conceptual clarity and missing a specific indicator in the IFAD10 RMF. Along the same lines, no provisions are made to monitor progress and evaluate achievements in SSC and TrC.

200. Second, more effective COSOPs should lay out a clear and actionable agenda for non-lending activities and provide an indication of the estimated administrative resources that are needed to achieve country programme objectives and specific resources that would be required for translating COSOP objectives and planned activities related to non-lending activities into action. This is critical to avoid overly-ambitious goals that later cannot be realized.
201. Third, better linkages between non-lending activities and IFAD lending operations are needed, since the latter generate the experiences and lessons to inform the organization's work in policy dialogue, partnership-building and KM. In this respect, as mentioned earlier, the CPEs recommended a better use of grant-financed activities to facilitate the enhancement of institutional partnerships and advance the policy agenda.
202. Fourth, the CPEs have revealed opportunities for IFAD to better focus its geographic coverage within a country to achieve better effectiveness and provide increased attention to non-lending activities. The size, geographical spread and complexity of the programmes can pose challenges to the effectiveness of supervision, M&E activities and make it extremely difficult for the small country offices to perform effectively in both project support and non-lending activities. As a consequence, the latter receive less priority in the agenda.
203. Finally, CPEs recommend that COSOPs be based on a Theory of Change with outputs, outcomes and objectives at the strategic level, few but well-chosen indicators, and clear integration of contributions from both lending and non-lending activities. In this regard the CLE on IFAD's PBAS highlights the need for a better articulation between the PBAS allocation, the project pipeline and the corresponding Theory of Change to leverage the impact of IFAD-financed operations.

C. Benchmarking the performance of IFAD-financed projects

204. As per past practice, the ARRI benchmarks the performance of IFAD operations externally with the performance of the agriculture sector operations of other development organizations. Moreover, internal benchmarking is done against the targets included in the IFAD9 and IFAD10 RMFs, and across the five geographic regions²⁸ covered by IFAD operations.
205. External benchmarking. This section of the report benchmarks IFAD performance with the performance of other IFIs and regional development banks, in particular the African and Asian Development Banks and the World Bank.²⁹ These organizations have been selected because, like IFAD, they are members of the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks and therefore broadly use similar evaluation methodologies and have independent evaluation offices and independent evaluation databases.
206. Although each organization is different in size and has a different geographic focus, they have similar operating models as IFAD. That is, unlike the United Nations specialized agencies, programmes and funds, the African and Asian Development Banks and the World Bank also provide loans for investment operations with sovereign guarantees.
207. While the 2015 ARRI did the benchmarking in the period 2005-2014, this year IOE was able to perform the external benchmarking exercise for the period from 2002-

²⁸ Asia and the Pacific, East and Southern Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, Near East, North Africa and Europe, and West and Central Africa.

²⁹ The Inter-American Development Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development are not included in the benchmarking analysis because the former does not use a rating system, while the nature of focus and coverage of the latter is significantly different from IFAD.

2015, as the three banks were able to share more historical project performance data.

208. Table 9 summarizes the results of the benchmarking done in this year's ARRI. Overall it can be concluded that IFAD's project performance remains at the forefront and is most similar to that of the agriculture sector operations of the World Bank, with 80 per cent of all operations evaluated as moderately satisfactory or better.

Table 9

Project performance - Percentage of agriculture and rural development projects completed 2002-2015 rated moderately satisfactory or better (all evaluation data series)

<i>Time period</i>	<i>IFAD 2002-2015</i>	<i>IFAD Africa 2002-2015</i>	<i>IFAD Asia and the Pacific 2002-2015</i>	<i>ADB 2002-2014</i>	<i>WB 2002-2015</i>	<i>AfDB 2002-2013</i>
2002-2015 (percentage)	80%	75%	90%	65%	78%	56%
Number of agriculture projects evaluated	255	113	71	88	592	129

Source: Independent evaluation rating databases of the Independent Development Evaluation Unit of AfDB, Independent Evaluation Department of the Asian Development Bank (ADB), Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank and IOE.

209. Even when the project performance ratings of IFAD-funded projects in Africa and Asia and the Pacific region are compared to AfDB and ADB respectively, IFAD retains the highest share of moderately satisfactory or better rating for the given period. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the ADB's project performance rating is based on the ratings of four evaluation criteria, namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, whereas IFAD's project performance does not include the sustainability rating.
210. IDEV, the Independent Development Evaluation unit at the AfDB follows the same format as ADB since 2013. However, because up until 2013 their agricultural projects were only evaluated by IDEV, IOE manually calculated their project performance rating using comparable relevance, effectiveness and efficiency ratings.
211. Hence, due to the different sample size and composition of the performance ratings between the banks, the data needs to be interpreted with some caution. As of January 2016, IOE follows an updated evaluation methodology³⁰ and includes sustainability in the project performance rating. This will further enhance the comparability of the benchmarking exercise in next year's ARRI.
212. Finally, even though the ARRI compares IFAD's project performance with the agriculture sector operations of the other three banks, it is important to note that IFAD-funded projects have some distinguishing characteristics, such as enhanced focus on remote rural areas, targeting of disadvantaged populations (e.g. indigenous peoples, pastoralists and artisanal fishers), grass-roots institution building, bottom-up participatory resource allocation methods, and work in fragile situations. All these factors make the design, implementation, supervision and evaluation of IFAD-funded projects rather challenging.
213. Internal benchmarking. Table 10 benchmarks the internal performance against selected indicators and targets in the IFAD9 and IFAD10 RMFs. As mentioned, the 2016 ARRI is able to provide a more accurate picture of performance against the IFAD9 targets as compared to last year. The reason for including the IFAD10 targets, which are for end-2018, is to draw attention to those areas that might be

³⁰ As per the second edition of the IOE Evaluation Manual (2016): <https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/bfec198c-62fd-46ff-abae-285d0e0709d6>

particularly lagging and in need of special efforts in the future. Actually, most of the targets for 2018 in the IFAD10 RMF are the same as in IFAD9, given that the aim is to consolidate achievements rather than set new targets beyond what experience suggests is practically achievable.

Table 10
Internal benchmarking – Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better against RMF targets

<i>Outcome indicators (percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better) at completion</i>	<i>All evaluation data 2013-2015</i>	<i>PCR/PPA 2012-2014</i>	<i>2015 Targets From the 2013-2015 IFAD 9 RMF</i>	<i>2018 Targets From the 2016-2018 IFAD 10 RMF</i>
Relevance	90	89	100	-
Effectiveness	83	84	90	90
Efficiency	59	69	75	75
Rural poverty impact	88	92	90	90
Sustainability	71	69	75	75
Innovation & scaling up	80	88	90	90
Gender equality and women's empowerment	88	91	90	90
Environment and natural resources management	82	84	90	90
Government performance	83	82	80	80

214. The table illustrates that only three out of the nine illustrated outcome indicators reached the IFAD9 RMF target, namely rural poverty impact, gender and government performance as a partner (green). The other six indicators – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, innovation and scaling up and environment and natural resource management – remained just below the expected target and will require particular attention during the IFAD10 period (red). In particular, efficiency has the lowest targets. And, in light of the relatively low performance of relevance as compared to the target set for the IFAD9 period, the reintroduction of this criterion with an appropriate target in the IFAD10 RMF merits serious consideration.
215. To provide a more differentiated assessment of performance, the internal benchmarking exercise has been further developed since last year's ARRI. Table 11 benchmarks project performance, rural poverty impact and overall project achievement across the five geographical regions covered by IFAD operations. It is important to note that benchmarking performance across regions should not be considered tantamount to assessing the performance of the corresponding IFAD

regional division. This is because the regional divisions' performance is only one, although important, factor affecting project performance.

Table 11
Internal benchmarking – Comparison across geographic regions from 2000-2015 (all evaluation data series)

Project performance	<i>Asia and the Pacific</i> N=74	<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i> N=40	<i>East and Southern Africa</i> N=55	<i>Near East, North African and Europe</i> N=44	<i>West and Central Africa</i> N=54
Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better	85	78	78	80	59
Percentage of projects rated satisfactory or better	47	18	24	11	19
Rural poverty impact	<i>Asia and the Pacific</i> N=71	<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i> N=37	<i>East and Southern Africa</i> N=48	<i>Near East, North African and Europe</i> N=42	<i>West and Central Africa</i> N=51
Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better	90	84	85	81	57
Percentage of projects rated satisfactory or better	47	30	31	29	20
Overall project achievement	<i>Asia and the Pacific</i> N=74	<i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i> N=38	<i>East and Southern Africa</i> N=55	<i>Near East, North African and Europe</i> N=44	<i>West and Central Africa</i> N=54
Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better	88	77	80	82	61
Percentage of projects rated satisfactory or better	47	28	24	16	17

216. As in previous years, Asia and the Pacific region (APR) shows the best results in all evaluation criteria analysed. Between 2000-2015, APR has the highest proportion of projects that are moderately satisfactory or better, and also the highest proportion of projects that are satisfactory or better. One key factor is that 85 per cent of the projects evaluated by IOE in APR show a moderately satisfactory or better performance for government performance,³¹ confirming that the latter is one of the single most important determinants of successful outcomes. The performance of IFAD operations in the West and Central Africa region continues to be the weakest.
217. As compared to last year, the share of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better for project performance went up, while unfortunately the share for satisfactory or better ratings went down. The same trend counts for rural poverty

³¹ 76 per cent in Latin America and the Caribbean, 71 per cent in East and Southern Africa, 67 per cent in Near East, North African and Europe and 53 per cent in West and Central Africa.

impact, with the exception of the Near East, North African and Europe region, which shows a slight increase in the share of satisfactory ratings. With regard to overall project achievement, the Latin America and the Caribbean, the East and Southern Africa, and the Near East, North African and Europe regions show an increase in the share of satisfactory or better ratings, which is a positive development.

III. Learning theme on knowledge management: How can operations learn to improve performance?

A. Background

218. As agreed by the Executive Board in December 2015 the learning theme for this year's ARRI is KM, with particular emphasis on how operations learn to improve performance. It is important to clarify up front that the learning theme should not be considered equivalent to an evaluation as it is based only on a review of previous IOE evaluation reports and other evaluative documents, and discussions with IFAD Management and staff.
219. Objectives of the learning theme. The main objective of this year's learning theme is to identify cross-cutting good practices and lessons that strengthen IFAD's learning loops for better operational performance and development effectiveness.
220. Approach. This paper takes as its starting points IFAD's 2007 Knowledge Management Strategy which provides a meaningful time point to define the temporal scope of the work. Thus, all of the information examined for this paper comes from the period following the issuing of the strategy. The results presented in this chapter draw from the findings of:
- (i) A review of literature on KM, IFAD strategic documents, and reports from other development organizations;
 - (ii) An analysis of IOE CPEs, which generate the ratings on KM, but also CLEs and ESRs covering the years 2009-2015; and
 - (iii) Interviews with IFAD Management and staff to gather insights into KM processes.
221. Definition of knowledge management. While there has been an active movement to promote KM across many fields, there is no generally-accepted definition of the term, nor are there agreed-upon standards for what constitutes a good KM system. IFAD's strategy defines KM as the process of "capturing, creating, distilling, sharing and using know-how". This provides a useful working definition for purposes of this paper, and is in line with most of the literature in the field.
222. This definition comprises both explicit and tacit knowledge. Explicit knowledge is found in documents, reports, data bases, and similar forms that can be codified and catalogued, making them readily available, for example on IT platforms. The major issue is to ensure that such explicit knowledge is readily accessible to those who need it, when they need it, and in a form that they find useful.
223. Tacit knowledge, however, is much more difficult for most organizations to manage. Such knowledge is rooted in individual experience, practice, and values, and tends to be context-specific. It resides in people's heads rather documents, data bases, or similar forms. Although often regarded as the most valuable knowledge for an organization, it is difficult to codify, and therefore not well-suited to IT systems for storage and retrieval, but more likely to be tapped through mentoring, consulting, partnering and training.
224. What is less clear from the definition is that KM must be systematic. That is, it needs to involve purposive activity designed to carry out the functions of knowledge capture, creation, distillation, sharing and use through a set of

deliberate processes, rather than ad hoc interactions. This is an important point, because without a system there may be idiosyncratic knowledge-sharing, but there is no real KM. Thus, underlying the analysis in this learning theme section is the question of the extent to which KM processes in IFAD are organized and applied systematically.

225. Moreover, for such a system to work in practice requires the development of a culture of learning that encourages staff, management, clients and partners to collaborate on learning from both successes and failures, as well as from internal and external experiences. This includes incorporating research, monitoring and evaluation as sources of knowledge, and communications systems as means of disseminating learning. One of the most difficult issues confronting organizations trying to implement KM programmes is that the internal culture – generally-accepted practices, routines, and values – often is hostile, or at best indifferent, to KM itself. This is an issue for IFAD, as it is for nearly all organizations attempting to implement KM systems.

B. Lessons learned

226. This section provides the main lessons learned of the 2016 learning theme on KM in particular in relation to: (i) the evolution and key features of IFAD's KM system; (ii) cross-cutting lessons that strengthen IFAD's learning loops for better operational performance and development effectiveness; and (iii) challenges to be addressed moving forward.

Evolution of KM in IFAD

227. Along with other development institutions, led by the World Bank, IFAD began to take a serious interest in KM during the late 1990s and early 2000s. This was driven by an evolution in development work from simply financing projects to supporting much more knowledge-intensive and innovation-based programmes aimed at institutional and policy transformation.
228. KM strategy. IFAD's first KM efforts tended to be isolated activities or add-ons to existing programmes or projects, without a clear strategic focus. As a result, KM was fragmented and poorly integrated into IFAD's work, with resources and responsibilities spread thinly, and a coherent sourcing, planning, reporting, and results framework lacking. Recognizing this, IFAD developed a KM Strategy in 2007,³² taking into account lessons learned from these early efforts. The strategy guided KM activities for the period 2008-2010, with annual reporting on the implementation progress. It grew out of a recognition that IFAD's development effectiveness required learning from experience, including its own operations, to improve its own performance and effectiveness. The strategy provided a basis for a number of changes in how IFAD approached KM. First, it led to the strengthening of IFAD's information technology infrastructure and KM tools, including a web portal, content management tools, virtual workspace platforms with collaborative authoring and editing applications, and improved communications solutions.
229. Second, it also led to a number of changes in how KM was managed. Requirements for KM and learning were incorporated into business processes such as project design, quality enhancement and quality assurance. At the Senior Management level, the Vice-President provided leadership, acting as KM's institutional champion. At a more operational level, IFAD established a KM core team that led a KM community of practice with members from various divisions and had responsibility for reporting on implementation progress to the Executive Board. Regional divisions and the Policy and Technical Advisory Division appointed KM officers

³² The strategy has four objectives: (i) strengthening knowledge-sharing and learning processes; (ii) equipping IFAD with a more supportive knowledge-sharing and learning infrastructure; (iii) fostering partnerships for broader knowledge-sharing and learning; and (iv) promoting a supportive knowledge-sharing and learning culture.

charged with implementing the strategy in IFAD operations. A number of other changes were designed to promote KM activities throughout the organization. In 2011, IFAD created the Strategy and Knowledge Management Department (SKD) to institutionalize KM within the organization.

230. Internal reviews carried out in 2012-2013 found some evidence of success in implementing the strategy. In particular, they reported widespread adoption of methods and tools to support learning and sharing, as well as establishment of knowledge management officer positions, and efforts to provide resources specifically for KM activities. Among the KM activities identified were learning fairs, meetings of project managers at the country and sometimes regional level to share experiences, expansion of regional networks, integration of KM into COSOPs and some project designs, and CPM forums for engaging CPMs in learning processes. Existing mechanisms, such as portfolio reviews held annually in various regions for discussing implementation results and lessons with all staff, also served as KM tools. In addition, the internal reviews noted improvements in documentation and provisions of electronic access to some key documents to staff, such as PCR's.
231. However, the reviews cited a number of shortcomings. Knowledge products that were expected to be key outputs under the strategy (i.e. learning notes and technical advisory notes) were produced only sporadically after 2008. Thematic groups and communities of practice did not progress far beyond where they were when the strategy was adopted in 2008. Most importantly, there was limited evidence of sustainability or impact from the KM effort. As a result, while there was some progress towards achieving the objectives of the strategy, the results fell far short of creating the kind of learning culture needed to sustain and expand those gains and produce the improved operational and development outcomes envisioned.
232. KM Framework. To address the above shortcomings, IFAD prepared a Knowledge Management Framework in 2013 to update IFAD's strategy.³³ Each of the objectives in the Framework is tied to a specific set of key result areas that provide, at least potentially, measurable outputs, outcomes and impacts to hold the institution accountable for progress on KM. The Framework includes a section on monitoring, reviewing and reporting on progress in implementation.
233. The Framework was endorsed by the Operational Management Committee (OMC). The OMC requested an action plan that has been delayed because of a reconfiguration of SKD, and as a result, KM in IFAD has not yet evolved into a clear work programme, with outputs, outcomes, indicators and targets. However, the action plan will be presented to the OMC this year.

IFAD's KM system

234. IFAD did not create a knowledge system de novo to achieve the objectives of the strategy, rather it built on existing systems to create, capture and distil knowledge. These include project M&E systems, independent evaluations, funded research, and management information systems. Moreover, the Fund had long promoted knowledge-sharing through publications of analytical work, workshops, conferences, training programmes and regular interactions with other development organizations, member countries, and beneficiaries.
235. The main purpose of the strategy and Framework was to take these existing processes and make their use for KM more focused and systematic, rather than idiosyncratic and sporadic, and to enhance the capacity of IFAD to learn, adapt, and improve by building KM and learning into business processes, encouraging a

³³ The KM framework has three objectives: (i) strengthening country-level knowledge and uptake of effective approaches; (ii) strengthening IFAD's strategic positioning, relevance, and visibility; and (iii) strengthening IFAD's capabilities to embed knowledge management in work processes and organizational culture.

high-performance culture and improving information management. The result expected was a more integrated and systematized KM system which would enable the flow of knowledge and learning to create knowledge loops at different levels of the KM system, from the project to the country and institutional levels, and back to the project, as explained in the next paragraphs.

236. Project level. Learning from projects takes many forms. Much of that learning comes from the mostly tacit knowledge gained through the day-to-day work of project management. The 2013 CLE on IFAD's supervision and implementation support policy (SIS) highlights the role that SIS plays in generating learning. CPMs responsible for direct supervision had not only learned more about supervision processes and project implementation, but more importantly about rural development issues in the countries concerned. This learning was linked to subsequent project design, as shown by rising quality-at-entry ratings. Another mechanism is cross-supervision, by which CPMs supervise projects on behalf of their colleagues. CMPs cited this as an effective means for sharing cross-country knowledge, benefiting both IFAD and partner governments.
237. Tacit knowledge is also tapped and shared routinely through formal and informal learning events, and by structured methods, such as the Learning Route. The CLE on SIS reported that CPOs have been effective in sharing knowledge gained from projects through such mechanisms as bringing together IFAD project managers, government officials, and civil society to share and learn from their experiences. Indeed, many borrowers gave IFAD high marks for this kind of knowledge sharing as compared to the efforts of other IFIs.
238. At the same time, IFAD has employed other mechanisms to develop explicit knowledge. Two important sources, discussed more in detail in the next section, are the project M&E systems and independent evaluation systems already in place. Beyond that, impact evaluations are especially useful not only to assess impact of specific development interventions but especially to learn what does or does not work, although typically they are expensive so can cover only a small percentage of projects.
239. Country and thematic levels. The knowledge gained through IFAD's projects is aggregated, distilled and communicated to the rest of the organization and the development community at the country level, which is the centre of IFAD KM. A range of activities, such as knowledge-sharing fairs, information exchanges among project managers, and communication of knowledge gained from IFAD work within the countries or regions, is organized at the country level. A fundamental building block of the system is the COSOP which is a major source of direction and support for KM activities. COSOPs are expected to include a KM component that is explicitly linked to the overall country strategy, as well as to the individual projects in the portfolio.
240. Also, they are expected to draw on experience from previous country programmes and projects, lessons and findings from evaluations as well as relevant country and sector research. Finally, COSOPs should tap tacit knowledge through consultations with experts, government officials, development partners and beneficiaries.
241. Cutting across countries are a series of thematic groups or networks that help to bring together knowledge from across countries and regions on specific areas of interest to IFAD's development mission. Topics range from community-directed development to food and nutrition security, gender to indigenous people, livestock and rangeland to climate change, and many more. These knowledge networks help to pull together and disseminate a great deal of knowledge through a range of activities, including direct communications, knowledge fairs and formal publications.

242. The combination of knowledge built up at country level, and knowledge developed across countries by topic, provides the potential for a powerful knowledge base for IFAD and its development partners. As noted elsewhere, the KM system is not yet fully systematized, but improvements in that area, with the knowledge bases being developed, could make IFAD substantially more visible and important as a knowledge source within the rural development community.
243. Institutional level. At the institutional level SKD plays a central role in positioning IFAD as an effective, global, knowledge-driven rural development institution. For example, SKD distils evidence-based knowledge from IFAD's programme interventions through, inter alia, conducting impact assessments.
244. SKD recently undertook an internal review with the aim of ensuring the department is "fit for purpose", with the required organizational architecture to support IFAD in achieving its mandate of sustainable and inclusive rural transformation. The department rests on two operational divisions: (i) the Research and Impact Assessment Division, which focuses on research, impact assessment and analysing and providing input on internal processes to ensure effective development; and (ii) the Global Engagement, Knowledge and Strategy Division, which will bring IFAD's global engagement and strategic planning under one umbrella, together with KM and SSC and TrC, thus enabling the Fund to leverage mutually reinforcing synergies for greater development effectiveness.
245. The Policy and Technical Advisory Division (PTA) of PMD and IOE also play a key role within the KM system. PTA integrates knowledge into projects and programmes, for example through its development of a "How-to Notes" toolkit that distils lessons on specific issues, such as how to include smallholders in agricultural value chains. These notes are expected to be done only where there is demand for them. An issue is how to disseminate these notes effectively to ensure learning; current efforts include training sessions embedded in regular workshops. It is planned to shift this work to a country focus, which would allow these products to be linked more directly to country programmes and placed in a country context.
246. IOE plays an important role within the IFAD KM system by conducting independent evaluations of IFAD operations and processes, particularly through project performance evaluations, impact, synthesis, country programme and corporate-level evaluations. Moreover, IOE produces the ARRI every year, which is a reflection of the Fund's commitment to promoting accountability, learning and transparency in reporting on results. Accountability and learning are the key principles that govern the undertaking of each evaluation by IOE, which capitalizes on the knowledge generated through the evaluation process and shares evaluation findings and results with the wider audience.

Lessons from KM practices in IFAD

247. As mentioned, this review of KM at IFAD is intended to identify cross-cutting good practices and lessons that can strengthen learning loops to improve IFAD's performance and its overall development effectiveness, as described in the following paragraphs.
248. First, integrating KM into country strategies is crucial to success. As discussed above, the country level is the cornerstone of IFAD's KM system. However, the evidence suggests that often COSOPs do not thoroughly address KM at the country level, if at all. The KM strategy sometimes remains confined to the project level, making it less strategically relevant and, even when there is a clear country-based KM strategy, it often is not carried to fruition. The consequence is that at the country level IFAD sometimes is falling short in making KM a strategic advantage.
249. Addressing such weaknesses can pay off for the organization. Brazil is an example where, after an unsatisfactory rating of KM in the 2007 CPE, the 2008 COSOP

included KM as one of four strategic objectives, and called for setting up knowledge-sharing networks, disseminating knowledge about measures for adapting to climate change, establishing partnerships with relevant science and technology institutes, and strengthening the capacity to learn from experience.

250. In the subsequent period IFAD adopted these goals, particularly in its project for the North-eastern Semi-arid Region of Brazil. The project supported the strengthening and/or the establishment of collaborative networks related to technological innovations, natural resource management and adaptation to climate change, and rural business. While the 2015 CPE found continuing areas of weakness, it rated KM as moderately satisfactory, a marked improvement over the 2007 report.
251. Another example of good practice is offered by the Madagascar experience in linking project-level KM to the country strategy (box 7).

Box 7

Linking country and project KM in Madagascar

The 2013 CPE rated Madagascar highly satisfactory with regard to KM, the only case with such a rating. In 2007, the country team launched the Improvement in the Monitoring and Evaluation and Knowledge Management System platform which linked the indicators for individual projects to those in the COSOP logical framework. This facilitated M&E, the flow of information through the system and data analysis. IFAD and its partners also shared knowledge by capitalizing on, scaling-up and communicating experiences from projects through brochures and video documentaries, two books and websites. Each project's M&E unit also ran a communication component targeting farmers through various media, including rural radio and a quarterly magazine that share the knowledge gained.

252. Second, time and budget availability are key to enhance learning and KM. Studies of KM efforts in both the public and private sectors uniformly highlight the extent to which budget limitations loom large. In most cases the main problem is that KM activities are treated as additional, rather than integral, to programmes and projects.
253. In this regard it is noteworthy that neither the 2007 Strategy nor the 2013 Framework discuss the financing of KM directly. The estimates for the overall costs of the activities to be undertaken are not provided, but more importantly, there is no guidance on how country departments are to fund KM actions. This leaves those activities in competition for the scarce resources with other operational necessities.
254. Many IFAD KM activities were financed through grants. For example, in Jordan the main support for KM activities was regional grants, especially through the region-wide Knowledge Access in Rural Interconnected Areas Network (KariaNet), funded by IFAD and the International Research Development Centre (IRDC). This network provided opportunities for knowledge-sharing across projects throughout the region, and reported feedback has been positive.
255. However, the 2014 CLE on IFAD's then-extant Policy for Grant Financing found that "links between global/regional grants...and individual country programmes are weak, and the results and learning from such grants are not adequately benefiting IFAD country programmes." Thus, while such grant funding might have promoted knowledge generated through IFAD programmes as a public good, they might not always have met IFAD's own KM needs. The new Grants Policy calls for a stronger focus on managing grants, including a requirement for KM plans and indicators on KM in the policy's results framework.
256. Even when KM is budgeted, it still has to compete for management attention with other aspects of programme delivery that are more tangibly associated with measurable results. In China, for example, the 2008 Dabeishan Area Programme included assigned budgets for knowledge-related activities. However, in 2012 the

midterm review found that, “knowledge management had not been managed as planned,” mostly because, “knowledge management was not a priority for the PMO.” The central issue for IFAD is how much the organization should prioritize KM over competing priorities, and what level of resource commitment is appropriate to support that level of priority.

257. Third, aligning human resources and incentives strongly supports the promotion of KM. The benefits of assigning staff to KM activities are provided by the example of the East and Southern Africa Division (ESA) that has appointed a full-time KM officer based at headquarters, who is coordinating KM for the regional division, including Kenya, as detailed in box 8.

Box 8

Dedicated ESA staff support to KM in Kenya

The support of a staff member dedicated to KM across the ESA region has facilitated IFAD’s efforts to establish communities of practice. In the Kenya, these have focused on country programme themes such as water development, rural finance and financial management. ESA also organized regional KM workshops to enhance knowledge-sharing within Kenya and across countries in the region. The Kenya country office also has a dedicated website for IFAD operations in Kenya, and a Rural Poverty Portal accessible through the Fund’s corporate website, while ESA has developed an internet site (IFADAfrica), which serves as a platform for sharing knowledge and information throughout the region. Overall, IOE rated Kenya’s KM programme as satisfactory.

258. However, human resource issues run throughout the KM programme. At the institutional level, SKD has a small staff, which limits its ability to provide guidance and support to the rest of IFAD. At an individual level, human resource constraints loom even larger. One of the consistent themes running through IOE’s interviews with IFAD Management is that operational staff generally are overburdened, which limits their ability to engage in KM activities.
259. This issue is exacerbated by IFAD’s incentive system. IFAD’s staff performance assessment system, like that at other development institutions, is a key component in decisions on such financial incentives as promotions and pay raises. The form used for rating staff performance does include KM as part of one criterion, but it is mixed in with a number of other dimensions, so that its weight is highly diluted. This means that contributing to KM is unlikely to have much of an impact on staff members’ performance rating, and therefore on the key decisions affecting their career advancement.
260. The Framework recognizes this issue, and suggests a number of ways to address it. Most directly, it mentions “reporting mechanisms that are more focused on knowledge; development of knowledge products as part of job descriptions, and performance assessment recognition for contributions to knowledge networks and peer groups.” However, there appears to have been little movement in this direction since the Framework was endorsed.
261. Fourth, M&E systems at the project level which can capture experiences and lessons are key to ensure a solid KM function. The first requisite for a KM system is that it involve the creation, capture and distillation of knowledge. These are very different ways of accumulating knowledge. What they have in common is that they are more than simply the collection of data. Indeed, data, both quantitative and qualitative, explicit and tacit, are the building blocks of knowledge, but are not knowledge in themselves. Data must be transformed into knowledge.
262. Knowledge creation typically comes from original analyses of data, whether newly collected or repurposed through secondary analysis. The most readily available source of data and knowledge at IFAD is the M&E system. A number of interviewees specifically cited M&E as potentially a highly useful source of

knowledge. Several noted that strengthening M&E would have the benefit of building on processes already in place, so that staff would not be confronted with new (additional) processes to feed the KM system, but instead would be building on an already familiar and routine aspect of their work.

263. M&E systems should provide a wealth of knowledge across a range of programmes and projects funded by IFAD that could make significant knowledge contributions. However, as discussed in previous sections of the ARRI, M&E systems are still underperforming. This is an important area that deserves attention moving forward. IFAD has the potential to bring immense field experience into the policy discourse, based on systematic collection of evidence from operations. Yet, given the data gaps and lack of sound empirical impact assessment in most of the projects, programme M&E data can only be used with caution for dissemination of results and leverage of cofinancing to scale up successful practices.
264. Fifth, capturing and communicating tacit knowledge is important. By far most of the knowledge IFAD and other organizations seek to tap is tacit knowledge, which generally is not documented, but passed on person to person, mostly through informal interactions, mentoring, training and the like. Tacit knowledge tends to be highly contextualized, based on experience, and most relevant to operational work. However, it is hard to capture it in a systematic way, an issue that has bedevilled most organizations implementing KM programmes.
265. The most commonly-cited examples of activities directed at tapping into and sharing tacit knowledge are country or regional workshops. Examples include annual portfolio review workshops in China that bring together multiple stakeholders to exchange experiences and knowledge across projects. Another mechanism, cited in the Zambia CPE, involves exchange visits among projects within the country or region. Tacit knowledge also is disseminated through interactions among members of groups such as country programme management teams, project teams and thematic groups.
266. An initiative coordinated by IFAD Africa sought to provide project and country staff with an understanding of how to use KM as a way to build continuous learning into project management and implementation so as to improve performance, results and impact. It used an action-learning process through workshops on how to integrate information management, M&E, communication and innovation functions into one strategy and system.
267. The workshops were followed up with in-country coaching, in effect extending the learning beyond a one-off event by providing the sharing of tacit knowledge on KM itself, thereby raising staff competency and capacity development. IOE's 2013 CPE on Uganda reports positive results from this effort in terms of project staff "awareness about the importance of learning for improved performance, and the need to document lessons and focus on demonstrating results and impact." Other initiatives include IFAD's work with Procasur, which led to the publication of a guide for implementing the Learning Route method for capturing knowledge from local actors as a way to develop innovative solutions to current issues.
268. Finally, knowledge partnerships enhance the reach of KM. The 2015 CPEs, particularly those for Brazil and Nigeria, recognize that IFAD's project-based intervention model has some limitations in terms of KM. Widening knowledge partnerships and anchoring knowledge in national and local institutions is key to strengthening the analytical base of IFAD's KM work at country level. This means that knowledge-sharing is not a one-way street between IFAD and developing countries, but rather a system of exchanges among IFAD and other international institutions, member countries, local organizations and individual beneficiaries. Such partnerships facilitate not only North-South but also South-South collaboration and knowledge-sharing as a way of tapping into the knowledge – especially tacit knowledge – that all participants in development have to contribute.

Challenges to be addressed moving forward

269. The discussion of lessons above makes clear that IFAD needs a systematic approach to KM. This does not mean that the KM efforts have failed. There are examples of progress in using knowledge resources more strategically, in incorporating lessons of past operations into present work, and in expanding knowledge-sharing inside the organization and with external partners at all levels.
270. Thus, to make additional progress, continuing and expanded efforts are needed to systematize KM in IFAD based on M&E systems that are the back bone of the KM architecture, establish stronger horizontal and vertical knowledge-sharing and KM, and promote further convergence among the project, country and institutional levels instead of seeing projects as separate 'islands of excellence'.
271. The recent SKD functional review represents a step in the right direction to ensure the development, systematization and dissemination of IFAD's knowledge outputs. However, more efforts at all levels are needed to tackle a number of challenges moving forward, as described in the following paragraphs.
272. First, more attention is needed to providing resources commensurate with the KM strategy. As discussed above, at the project and country levels, budgeting for KM often relies on grants or the administrative budget. There is no institution-wide allocation for KM, meaning that it has to compete with other priorities, so that funding is uncertain. As a result, it is impossible to know how much is being spent on KM, much less determine whether those costs are justified by the results in terms of organizational effectiveness and results for clients.
273. Second, there is a need to develop and measure performance indicators for KM. It is difficult to discern how well aspects of IFAD's KM programme are implemented or how they contribute to IFAD's effectiveness because there are no indicators available other than IOE ratings. The saying "what gets measured gets done" may over simplify it somewhat, but the management literature is replete with research that demonstrates how failure to measure often means failure to implement.
274. Third, the enhancement of staff KM skills merits consideration moving forward. Expertise in KM at IFAD is thin. This is not a new issue, and in part it is related to the question of resource allocation discussed above: it costs money to hire and/or train knowledge managers, and to train and incentivize staff to participate effectively in the KM programme.
275. The final challenge is related to the alignment of incentives with the KM strategy. While IFAD has committed itself to KM over a number of years, the incentive systems for staff are not well aligned with the strategy. From a staff perspective, this may appear as ambivalence by Management about the relative importance of KM vis-à-vis other priorities, making them uncertain whether KM really is central to IFAD's work. A better alignment of the incentive system with the KM strategy would help to provide clarity to staff and motivation to participate actively in KM efforts.
276. Moreover, because individual performance measures focus on results achieved, staff do not have strong incentives to identify learning opportunities from programme or project failures, even though these often provide important lessons that can support future success. A better alignment of the incentive system with the KM strategy would help provide clarity to staff on their accountability for learning, and positive motivation to participate actively in KM efforts.
277. To conclude, the ultimate challenge for any KM system, including IFAD's, is to create a culture of knowledge, in which the strategy, systems, financial and human resources, and incentive structure are aligned in a way that facilitates the gathering, dissemination, and use of knowledge that improves the organization's effectiveness in reaching its objectives.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

A. Conclusions

278. After careful analysis of independent evaluation ratings, the 2016 ARRI provides the following conclusions, taking into account the cross-cutting issues and lessons from the previous chapters.
279. The broad picture of performance in the IFAD9 period emerging from the 2016 ARRI is positive. The 2016 ARRI assessed the performance results against the IFAD9 RMF while at the same time identifying the emerging opportunities and challenges in light of the IFAD10 priorities. The report confirms that IFAD performed well in the IFAD9 replenishment period. It devoted attention to improving operational effectiveness and laid more emphasis to results measurement. The 2015 evaluations found evidence of clear improvements across many of the criteria assessed by IOE against most targets set in the RMF for the IFAD9 period. Overall, 80 per cent of the projects are rated moderately satisfactory or better for most of the criteria in 2013-2015.
280. This good performance provides a solid basis for the transition to IFAD10 and it positions the Fund well to face the challenges set by the ambitious SDGs adopted by the international community which place agriculture and rural development at the heart of the sustainable development process.
281. The centrality of agriculture and rural development in the global agenda underlines the relevance and importance of IFAD's mandate and provides a key reference for its policies, priorities, and development interventions in IFAD10 and beyond. The emphasis laid on the key dimensions of the Fund's mandate of reducing rural poverty and improving food security and nutritional status of rural poor people during IFAD9 is the foundation of the Strategic Framework 2016-2025 and at the centre of IFAD's operational priorities for IFAD10. The relevance of these priorities in today's context is even more compelling, given the growing inequality, especially in developing countries and the central role that smallholder farmers have as active drivers of development.
282. In this regard, IOE evaluations show that IFAD has made a positive contribution to rural poverty reduction. This is mainly a result of the Fund's attention to improving income and assets, empowerment, and enhancing agricultural productivity and food security. IFAD's operations made significant contributions to better agricultural productivity, diversification of income generating activities and access to microfinance.
283. With regard to empowerment, the Fund positive performance went beyond its traditional key role in enhancing the capabilities of rural poor people by bringing together smallholder farmers into grass-roots institutions. In fact, projects rated as highly satisfactory for human and social capital and empowerment were successful in creating a sense of ownership and responsibility of project results, which is the basis for better prospects of sustainability of the empowerment and capacity building processes established by the Fund.
284. The positive impact of IFAD-funded operations is also driven by IFAD's good performance in innovation and scaling-up and gender equality and women's empowerment, which are central operational priorities in both IFAD9 and IFAD10 and key principles of engagement in the 2016-2025 Strategic Framework. IFAD-supported operations have been successful in empowering poor rural communities and vulnerable groups, including women, to participate in decision-making processes at all levels and access rural services, basic amenities and productive resources. Recent projects are devoting increasing attention to training men to sensitize them towards the transformational role women can play in broader social and economic development activities.

285. The Fund's performance in recent years in promoting innovative solutions to rural poverty reduction has generally been satisfactory and in line with the main pillars of the 2007 strategy and innovation agenda of the 2016-2025 Strategic Framework. However, further efforts are needed to ensure that successful approaches and technical innovations from IFAD operations can be replicated elsewhere and can ultimately be scaled up by governments, development partners and the private sector, beyond individual project areas or provinces, for a wider and more significant impact on rural poverty.
286. Development effectiveness is closely linked to the performance of IFAD and governments as partners, which has been improving over time. This is key not only to ensure good project performance, but also to improve partnerships and dialogue beyond the project level and to further the development agenda towards the achievement of the SDGs. In particular, the increased emphasis of country ownership will place a big onus on governments to perform and deliver.
287. The performance of governments surpassed the target of 80 per cent of moderately satisfactory or better projects in the IFAD9 and IFAD10 RMFs. An important finding of the 2016 ARRI is that strong leadership at country level contributes to better policy and institutional environment in the agricultural and rural sectors.
288. Notwithstanding the above good performance in key areas of operational effectiveness, the 2016 ARRI found that, albeit recent improvements, efficiency, ENRM, sustainability of benefits and financial management and fiduciary responsibilities of governments continue to be a persistent challenge for better operational effectiveness. These areas of challenge are not new to IFAD. Operational efficiency remains the weakest area of project performance followed by sustainability, which continues to be limited by poor engagement and ownership by beneficiaries in the planning, implementation, maintenance and oversight of project activities and infrastructure.
289. With regard to ENRM, which is an operational priority in IFAD10, performance still lags behind the target of 90 per cent moderately satisfactory projects set in IFAD9 and IFAD10 RMFs. Adequate budgets, improved linkages between ENRM, poverty and livelihood, data collection, and better coordination at country level are salient elements of any decisive improvement in future performance. Finally, financial management and fiduciary responsibilities of governments are major constraint to government performance and to the overall efficiency and effectiveness of IFAD's portfolio.
290. Besides these recurrent areas of challenge, the 2016 ARRI highlighted that the majority of the projects are still only moderately satisfactory. In this regard the annual report identifies three main areas that merit attention moving forward in order to raise the performance bar and make the leap from moderately satisfactory, to satisfactory and highly satisfactory projects.
291. The first area concerns IFAD's targeting approach. Agenda 2030 is driven by the principle of "No one will be left behind and reach the furthest behind first". Along the same lines, targeting is one of IFAD's principles of engagement, which is central to its mandate of rural poverty reduction. Comprehensive targeting approaches enable operations to reach the poorest of the poor by combining solid livelihood and poverty analysis, based on context-specific circumstances, and dynamic and participatory processes. Good poverty analysis at design makes projects more relevant, while a dynamic strategy to target the poor will lead to better effectiveness on the ground.
292. The 2015 evaluations found that poverty analyses conducted at design do not sufficiently capture the differences among groups of rural poor. As a result, project activities often do not reach all target beneficiaries, in particular the poorest of the

- poor and other marginalized groups that are most difficult to reach. Moreover, they are often not flexible enough to adapt to changing contexts. Therefore, the 2016 ARRI concludes that IFAD's targeting strategies need more attention at design and they need to be closely monitored during implementation.
293. The second key area is related to food security, nutrition and mainstreaming of nutrition-sensitive agriculture in the IFAD portfolio. While nutritional security is fundamental for better rural livelihoods the evaluations found that IFAD-funded operations could have done more to explore and further improve the contribution that improved agricultural productivity can make to improved food security. Project results are mainly focused on productivity and have yet to reflect achievements on nutrition. With the increased urgency to address malnutrition, it is therefore commendable that for IFAD10 the Fund has adopted the 2016-2018 Action Plan to Mainstream Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture, which aims to ensure that at least one third of new projects will be designed with a nutrition lens. Still, the ARRI concludes that more attention and efforts can be devoted to ensure that all projects having focus on food security are nutrition-sensitive in line with the organization's core mandate and the requirements of the new global agenda.
294. The quality of monitoring and evaluation is the third area of attention that emerges from the 2015 evaluations. In line with previous annual reports the 2016 ARRI concludes that the weak project M&E systems and results measurement impinge on the assessment and attribution of impact to IFAD operations on rural poverty, and in particular on income, food security and nutrition. It is important to recognize and commend IFAD Management for its responsiveness to the challenges posed by results and impact measurement and the increased focus on strengthening its results culture and paying attention to improving its internal corporate performance monitoring and reporting instruments.
295. However, more systematic efforts will be needed moving forward as M&E systems in general have not received the required level of resources and attention. IFAD has the potential to bring immense field experience into the policy discourse, based on a systematic collection of evidence from operations. Yet, given the data gaps and lack of sound empirical impact assessment in many projects, M&E data are of limited use if it comes to the dissemination of results and scaling-up of successful practices.
296. Moving beyond the project level, the overall performance in non-lending activities (e.g. KM, partnership-building, policy dialogue) is only moderately satisfactory, with partnership-building at country level showing a sharp decline in performance. This is a somehow surprising finding, given IFAD's ongoing efforts to strengthen country presence and partner engagement at country level. The ARRI concludes that more strategic approaches are needed to ensure that non-lending activities are well integrated and that positive results from operations feed into wider processes of institutional and policy transformation.
297. There are opportunities for strengthening the linkages between lending and non-lending activities, to ensure synergies and improve development effectiveness. Prospects to expand coordination, partnership and dialogue with a wider range of stakeholders beyond the project level are to be explored to leverage the scaling up of successful experiences and results.
298. This also requires systematic donor coordination and the development of a clear agenda for the establishment of stronger and strategic partnerships at country level and better policy dialogue in support of national priorities for rural development as identified by hosting governments. This is of particular importance because of the strategic priority that the 2016-2025 Strategic Framework attaches to the collaboration among the RBAs and the overall substantive contribution that

the Fund is expected to make to the achievement of SDG17 which focuses on strengthening and revitalizing the global partnership for sustainable development.

299. Finally, the challenge for IFAD to rapidly respond within an increasingly complex and demanding development context will be to systematically learn from its experience and share the knowledge acquired. However, continued and expanded efforts in terms of resources and incentives are needed to systematize KM in IFAD, establish stronger horizontal and vertical knowledge-sharing and KM, and promote further convergence among the project, country and institutional levels, instead of seeing projects as separate 'islands of excellence'.
300. To conclude, it is clear that there are many areas where the performance of IFAD operations is strong, and that the organization effectively contributes to improved livelihoods of the rural poor in line with its mandate. Still, there are some recurring challenges which need to be overcome if IFAD wants to raise the performance bar from moderately satisfactory to satisfactory and highly satisfactory projects and be at the forefront of the rural transformation envisaged in the context of the Agenda 2030 and the SDGs. Therefore, the 2016 ARRI offers the following recommendations to address the most urgent challenges.


B. Recommendations

301. The Board is invited to adopt the following five recommendations which reflect the findings and conclusions of the 2016 ARRI. Four of them are addressed to IFAD Management and include: two recommendations deriving from the analysis of project performance (targeting and nutrition), one recommendation originating from the analysis of CPEs (partnership-building at country level) and one from the 2016 learning theme on KM. The fifth recommendation concerns the 2017 learning theme.
302. Targeting. Evaluations found that project activities are often not sufficiently refined to meet the needs of all intended beneficiaries, in particular those that are at risk of being excluded, such as indigenous people, pastoralist, the landless and migrants. In this respect, it is important that future operations: (i) adapt their approaches and activities to the complexity of contexts and target groups; (ii) further enhance targeting in terms of scope and accessibility to project benefits by the rural poor while paying increased attention to those in risk of being left behind, such as indigenous people, pastoralists, the landless and other vulnerable groups; and (iii) ensure better development of M&E systems to identify at the design phase who will benefit from the intervention and how; this requires more disaggregated indicators to track the participation and benefits for different groups and to eventually demonstrate the effectiveness of the project initiatives.
303. Food security and nutrition. Independent evaluations did not find systematic evidence of nutrition-sensitive agricultural practices in the projects examined. In line with the Agreement Establishing IFAD, whose core objective is to "Improving the nutritional level of the poorest populations in developing countries" and in the context of the 2016-2018 Action Plan to Mainstream Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture at IFAD, the 2016 ARRI recommends that all new projects, when relevant, should be nutrition-sensitive, with explicit nutrition objectives, activities and indicators. Moreover, to maximise the contributions of IFAD projects and programmes to better food security and nutrition and the achievement of SDG2, the 2016 ARRI recommends that supervision missions and midterm reviews of ongoing operations that have not yet reached the mid-point of implementation should look at opportunities to accommodate specific actions to ensure that projects contribute to improved nutrition when appropriate.
304. Partnerships at country level for learning and scaling-up of results. Evaluations have found that there is scope to improve partnerships at country level in the context of the COSOPs with a wider range of actors to leverage better results


and complement IFAD in its scaling-up agenda, including in promoting a better policy and institutional environment in the agricultural sector. Strong partnerships with RBAs, the private sector and technical ministries at the national level should be clearly articulated in the COSOPs and implemented through country programme activities. Performance in partnership-building should be closely monitored and reported in the RIDE.

305. Knowledge management. IFAD should more proactively invest resources, time and effort in systematizing KM at all levels and align the strategy, systems, financial and human resources, and incentive structure in a way that facilitates the gathering, dissemination and use of knowledge. This will entail: (i) a better alignment of the incentive system with the KM strategy to provide clarity to staff on their accountability for learning, and positive motivation to participate actively in KM efforts; (ii) enhance M&E systems and develop and measure performance indicators for KM; and (iii) enhance staff KM skills.
306. Moreover, IFAD should increase its investments in documenting innovative solutions to rural poverty reduction which emerge in the context of IFAD operations as a means to valorising the work that IFAD does at country level and making it available as a public good. This should be more clearly anchored in COSOPs and projects.
307. 2017 ARRI learning theme. The Board is invited to adopt the recommendation for IOE to treat financial management and fiduciary responsibilities as the single learning theme in the 2017 ARRI. Although there have been improvements in government performance in recent years, the management of fiduciary aspects remains a constraint to raise the performance of governments to highly satisfactory results.

Project evaluation methodology



Country programme evaluation methodology



Evaluations included in the 2016 ARRI

Type	Country/region	Title	Executive Board approval date	Project completion date	IFAD loan ^a (US\$ million)	Total project costs ^a (US\$ million)
Corporate-level evaluations	All	CLE on IFAD's Performance-based allocation system				
Evaluation synthesis reports	All	South-South cooperation				
	All	Natural Resources				
Country strategy & programme evaluations	Brazil	*Sustainable Development Project for Agrarian Reform Settlements in the Semi-Arid North-East	03 Dec 1998	31 Dec 2009	25	99.3
		*Rural Communities Development Project in the Poorest Areas of Bahia	20 Apr 2006	31 Dec 2012	30.0	60.5
	Ethiopia	Participatory Small-scale Irrigation Development Programme	18 Apr 2007	31 Mar 2015	40	57.7
	Gambia	Rural Finance and Community Initiatives Project	02 Dec 1998	30 Jun 2006	9.24	10.64
		Participatory Integrated-Watershed Management Project	21 Apr 2004	30 Jun 2014	7.08	17.5
		Rural Finance Project	14 Sep 2006	30 Jun 2014	6.5	8.73
		Livestock and Horticulture Development Project	17 Dec 2009	31 Mar 2015	8	15.9
	India	Post-Tsunami Sustainable Livelihoods Programme for the Coastal Communities of Tamil Nadu	19 Apr 2005	10 May 2014	30	68.6
		Women's Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme in the mid-Gangetic Plains	14 Dec 2006	31 Jan 2015	7.2	52.2
		Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme	23 Apr 2002	31 Mar 2015	35	106.15
	Nigeria	Roots & Tubers Expansion Programme	09 Dec 1999	26 Jun 2012	23.05	36.1
	Turkey	Sivas-Erzincan Development Programme	11 Sep 2003	31 Mar 2013	13.1	30
		*Diyabakir, Batman & Siirt Development Project	14 Dec 2006	31 Dec 2014	24.1	36.9
Project completion report validations	Republic of Armenia	Farmer Market Access Programme	12 Sep 2007	30 Jun 2013	12.28	34.8
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Rural Enterprise Enhancement Project	20 Apr 2006	31 Dec 2012	12.6	29.15

Type	Country/region	Title	Executive Board approval date	Project completion date	IFAD loan ^a (US\$ million)	Total project costs ^a (US\$ million)
Project completion report validations	Republic of Burundi	Transitional Programme of Post-Conflict Reconstruction	09 Sep 2004	31 Dec 2013	16.37	35.85
	Cambodia	Rural Livelihoods Improvement Project	18 Apr 2007	30 Sep 2014	11.99	13.64
	Cameroun	Roots and Tubers Market-Driven Development Programme	10 Apr 2003	30 Sep 2012	13.4	20.73
	Cape Verde	Rural Poverty Alleviation Programme	08 Sep 1999	31 Mar 2013	13.5	36.09
	People's Republic of China	Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region Modular Rural Development Programme	14 Dec 2006	30 Jun 2014	25.19	56.80
	The State of Eritrea	Post-Crisis Rural Recovery and Development Programme	14 Dec 2006	31 Dec 2013	10.1	29.85
	The Republic of Kenya	Southern Nyanza Community Development Project	18 Dec 2003	30 Sep 2013	23.7	22.11
	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Northern Regions Sustainable Livelihoods through Livestock Development Programme	15 Sep 2006	30 Sep 2013	2.20	18.31
	Republic of Madagascar	Rural Income Promotion Programme	18 Dec 2003	31 Dec 2013	15.7	29.4
	The Republic of Mauritius	Marine and Agricultural Resources Support Programme	24 Apr 2008	30 June 2013	1.85	3.45
	Republic of Moldova	Rural Financial Services and Marketing	11 Sep 2008	31 Mar 2014	12.25	23.35
	Kingdom of Morocco	Rural Development Project Mountain Zones of Errachidia Province	12 Sep 2007	30 Sep 2014	18.3	27
	Paraguay	Empowerment of Rural Poor Organizations and Harmonization of Investments Projects	18 Apr 2005	30 Sep 2013	15	24.3
	Kingdom of Swaziland	Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project Phase 1	06 Dec 2001	30 Sep 2013	16.79	253
	Republic of Uganda	Community Agricultural Infrastructure Improvement Programme	12 Sep 2007	31 Mar 2013	31.5	81.9
		Rural Financial Services Programme	05 Sep 2002	30 Jun 2013	20.97	33.25
	Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	Sustainable Rural Development Project for the Semi-Arid Zones of Falcon and Lara States Phase II	18 Dec 2003	30 Sep 2013	15.52	41.43
Republic of Yemen	Al-Dhala Community Resource Management Project	09 Sep 2004	31 Mar 2014	15.15	29.6	

Type	Country/region	Title	Executive Board approval date	Project completion date	IFAD loan ^a (US\$ million)	Total project costs ^a (US\$ million)
Project performance assessments	People's Republic of China	Environmental Conservation and Poverty-Reduction Programme in Ningxia and Shanxi	11 Dec 2002	31 Dec 2011	33.84	100.3
	Republic of Djibouti	Microfinance and Microenterprise Development Project	11 Dec 2002	31 Dec 2012	3.597	11.43
	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia	Pastoral Community Development Project Phase II	15 Sep 2009	30 Sep 2015	28.06	139
	Kyrgyz Republic	Agricultural Investments and Services Project	11 Sep 2008	30 Sep 2014	8.59	33.1
	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Rural Livelihoods Improvement Programme in Attapeu and Sayabouri	19 Apr 2005	31 March 2014	16.1	23.9
	Islamic Republic of Mauritania	Oasis Sustainable Development Programme	17 Dec 2003	30 Apr 2014	11.4	33.9
	Federal Republic of Nigeria	Community-based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme	12 Sep 2001	31 Mar 2013	42.9	99.7

* The most recent evaluations conducted for these projects were project performance assessments. Recently completed projects are included in-country strategy and programme evaluations in order to assess the full country portfolio.

Objectives of country programmes and individual projects evaluated

The main objectives of the country strategies can be summarized below:

- (i) Brazil. The 2008 COSOP identified four strategic objectives:
 - a. Strategic objective 1: To increase commercial agricultural production by small farmers, with corresponding access to markets under rewarding and sustainable conditions.
 - b. Strategic objective 2: To improve access by the rural poor to off-farm employment and business activities in rural areas and villages, focusing on women and young people.
 - c. Strategic objective 3: To improve, through knowledge generation and dissemination, the capacity of the rural poor and of relevant institutions in the north-east to co-exist with semi-arid conditions, adapt to climate change and better exploit the development potential of the semi-arid region.
 - d. Strategic objective 4: To deepen the discussion on rural poverty reduction and family farming policies at national and international levels.

- (ii) Ethiopia. The 2008 COSOP is aimed at enhancing access by poor rural households to:
 - a. Natural resources (land and water);
 - b. Improved agricultural production technologies and support services; and
 - c. A broad range of financial services.

Increasing opportunities for off-farm income generation – particularly for the ever growing number of landless youth – cuts across the entire IFAD country programme.

- (iii) Gambia. As stated in the 2003 COSOP, the key strategic thrust of IFAD's intervention in The Gambia will consist of:
 - a. The consolidation and continuation of successful IFAD activities (microcredit, community-initiated self-help, lowland rice development and so on) through new loans,
 - b. The inclusion of innovative components that have been successful during pilot testing,
 - c. The use of pilot activities to test new approaches that have potential for scaling up in The Gambia; and
 - d. The strengthening of farmers organizations and community-based organizations.

- (iv) India. Two strategic objectives have been identified in the 2011 COSOP. These will be focused on vulnerable groups, such as small and marginal farmers and tribal and primitive tribal communities.
 - a. Strategic objective 1: increased access to agricultural technologies and natural resources.
 - b. Strategic objective 2: increased access to financial services and value chains.

- (v) Nigeria. The 2010 COSOP has identified two strategic objectives:
- a. Strategic objective 1: Improve access by rural poor people to economically, financially and environmentally sustainable production, storage and processing technologies, market access, and support services.
 - b. Strategic objective 2: Strengthen community involvement in local planning and development, and promote government support for rural infrastructure.
- (vi) Turkey. The 2006 COSOP identified six objectives for IFAD operations in Turkey:
- a. Maintain the focus on the reduction of poverty in the disadvantaged areas of the eastern and south-eastern regions of the country,
 - b. Adopt an approach that pays greater attention to the income-generating potential of supported activities and to their sustainability, profitability and marketability, within the longer-term vision of rural economic development, consistent with the new strategic policy directions of the Government,
 - c. Ensure that programme-related expenditures can be justified in terms of attracting and expanding private-sector involvement in such areas as the processing and marketing of agricultural produce,
 - d. Maintain a clear and consistent focus on generating incremental income and employment and reducing income disparities in less-favoured areas,
 - e. Recognize that, while support for productivity gains is important, sustainable poverty-reduction initiatives should include a market-based sector-wide perspective; and
 - f. Build effective partnerships with stakeholders in the public and private sector at the national and international levels.

Objectives of projects and programmes

<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	<i>Objectives</i>
Republic of Armenia Farmer Market Access Programme	The goal of the programme is to improve the economic and social status of poor rural people in Armenia. Its specific objectives are to: (i) stimulate the growth of rural enterprises with a comparative advantage for and strong linkages to poor producers and rural people seeking improved employment opportunities; (ii) provide an investment instrument and associated funding that will respond to the need for rural equity finance; and (iii) develop greater financial-sector capacity.
Bosnia and Herzegovina Rural Enterprise Enhancement Project	The overall goal of the proposed project will be to increase the incomes of the poorer rural inhabitants in the project area. The goal strongly accords with the Government's policies and strategies as set out in its Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper. The goal will find expression in farmers' being able to earn greater cash from their farms and in greater off-farm incomes for those with and without holdings of agricultural land. The project's specific objectives will be the sustained growth of rural enterprises and employment opportunities in the project area. Rural enterprises will be supported to improve the linkages among various tiers of the value chains for commodities and services, thus contributing to dynamic local economies linked to dynamic regional and national economies.
Brazil Sustainable Development Project for Agrarian Reform Settlements in the Semi-Arid North-East	The overall project goal is the sustainable improvement of social and economic conditions of poor agrarian reform beneficiaries and neighbouring smallholders in the semi-arid zone of the North-East Region. The project's general objective is to improve the capabilities and involvement in the local market of beneficiary families, to enable them to manage more efficiently and sustainably productive activities in agriculture, marketing, microenterprise and small-scale agro-industry. Additionally, it will permit them to use financial services within the normal market procedures. Specific objectives are to: (i) provide access for families to educational and training programmes, marketing, agricultural and microenterprise support services, and financial resources; (ii) improve the social and production infrastructure of the family and settlements; (iii) promote a gender-balanced approach to project activities, providing equal opportunities and access to women to production support programmes; (iv) consolidate rural development at the municipal level; (v) promote rational use and conservation of natural resources; and (vi) validate strategies for the sustainable socio-economic development of agrarian reform settlements and smallholders in the semi-arid zone.
Brazil Rural Communities Development Project in the Poorest Areas of Bahia	The project's development goal is to significantly reduce poverty and extreme poverty levels in the semi-arid communities of State of Bahia. Its objective is to improve the social and economic conditions of rural poor communities through environmentally sustainable social and economic development that promotes gender equity and the participation of young people in the rural labour force. Specific objectives include: (i) empowering the rural poor and their grass-roots organizations by improving their capacity to participate in local, municipal and territorial social and economic development processes; and (ii) improving the target population's income-generating capacities, transforming subsistence economic activities into profitable agricultural and non-agricultural rural businesses that sustainably use the natural resources of the semi-arid region.

Country and project/programme names	Objectives
<p>Republic of Burundi Transitional Programme of Post-Conflict Reconstruction</p>	<p>The components of the proposed programme are entirely arranged around the goal of regenerating rural livelihoods reconstructing social capital, inclusive of rehabilitation of rural dignity and restoration of food security among poor and vulnerable people. The programme objectives by component are:</p> <p>(a) Support to local governance: (i) to empower local communities to reconstruct social cohesion and sustainable, poverty-reducing rural livelihoods by establishing a system of inclusive, representative, equitable and popularly accountable Community Development Committees for locally-based planning, implementation and monitoring of post-conflict reconstruction and development; (ii) to educate rural communities about the legal rights and responsibilities of citizens, support the restoration through training of traditional forms of autonomous resolution of local dispute in a way consistent with the evolution of the country's legal framework and with the need to enhance the position of women in society, and to make available legal counsel to poor and vulnerable people otherwise unable to access such services; and (iii) to strengthen the social and economic position of poor rural women through measures to increase their participation in civil-society decision-making, to combat HIV/AIDS and to improve their independent economic status.</p> <p>(b) Rehabilitation and development of agriculture: (i) to allow vulnerable groups to re-enter agriculture on a sustainable basis and get out of poverty; (ii) to improve the performance of agricultural technical support services; (iii) to improve agricultural production, productivity, food security and incomes among the less vulnerable but nevertheless very poor smallholder farm households; and (iv) to rehabilitate and conserve the rural environment.</p> <p>(c) Rehabilitation and development of rural infrastructure: (i) to increase the availability of productive land through swamp reclamation and development and hence improve food security and incomes; (ii) to reduce the isolation of farming areas and stimulate the rural economy through increased access to agricultural inputs, other goods and services and markets by rehabilitating feeder roads; and (iii) to improve health, reduce pollution and save domestic labour by rehabilitating and developing potable water sources and complementary sanitation and public health education.</p>
<p>Cambodia Rural Livelihoods Improvement Project</p>	<p>The goal of the project is to improve the livelihoods of the rural poor in the target communes of the three project provinces. The objective is to make a positive and sustainable impact on agricultural development in these communes. The project will promote – at the national and subnational level – the evolving institutional framework for decentralized and deconcentrated agricultural development. It will pilot a service delivery model that increases the involvement of commune councils in supporting the economic development of the local population by contracting personnel for agricultural extension services who are locally-based and accountable to the commune councils. The project will also adopt an approach to enhance gender-mainstreaming in agriculture. In addition, the lessons learned from project operations and aspirations of local communities will inform the Government policy formulation process and help build the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries to develop improved pro-poor policies and decentralized rural poverty reduction programmes.</p>
<p>Cameroun Roots and Tubers Market-Driven Development Programme</p>	<p>The overall goal of the programme will be to contribute to the enhancement of food security and the raising of incomes among the rural poor through the development of the roots and tubers sector. The programme will adopt a market-driven strategy that will strengthen the capacity of small roots and tubers farmers and processors, 90% of whom are women, to organize themselves at the village, basin, regional and national levels and to develop their production and processing activities so as to meet consumer demand. The programme will target the local, national and regional markets. The programme's specific objectives will be to (a) strengthen the capacity of small roots and tubers producers and processors to build strong farmer organizations and plan and manage efficiently the development of the sector in an integrated, inclusive and sustainable manner; (b) improve in a sustainable way the access of roots and tubers producer organizations to local, national and subregional markets; (c) improve in a sustainable way the access of roots and tubers producers and processors to appropriate postharvest and processing technologies so as to respond to consumer demand and (d) contribute in a sustainable way to the expansion of roots and tubers production through the use of improved technologies that respond to market needs and can be widely adopted by poor roots and tubers farmers.</p>

<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	<i>Objectives</i>
<p>Cabo Verde Rural Poverty Alleviation Programme</p>	<p>The programme's overall objective is to improve the living conditions of the rural poor. The purpose is to establish effective and sustainable policy and institutional instruments for rural poverty reduction as a means to implement the Government's Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy. This will be measured by a decrease in the prevalence of poverty and by better food security and nutrition; greater asset ownership; improved access to markets; and higher production and productivity in agriculture, fisheries, livestock and income diversification. A key goal of the programme is to build effective and sustainable policy and institutional mechanisms for rural poverty reduction. The institutions established by the programme (regional partners' commissions and community development associations) and the planning, legal and financial instruments (i.e. the local poverty alleviation plans, framework agreements and programme contracts) will be used throughout the country as a means of combating rural poverty and implementing the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy. Moreover, adding a supplementary loan within the scope of an existing programme will contribute to building a strong IFAD country programme and reducing transaction costs.</p>
<p>People's Republic of China Environmental Conservation and Poverty-Reduction Programme in Ningxia and Shanxi</p>	<p>The goal of the programme is sustainable and equitable poverty reduction for 300,000 vulnerable rural households living in an environment with limited and deteriorating natural resources. The objective is to achieve a sustainable increase in productive capacity, both on- and off-farm, and to offer households increased access to economic and social resources, including financial services, education, health and social networks. Specific programme outputs will be: (a) provision of more farmer-, gender- and poverty responsive extension services, with poor farmers as demonstrators; (b) land and land use improved through increased investment in irrigation for 208,000 mu and improvements in dryland agriculture for about 480,000 mu; (c) environmental management and desertification control strengthened for about 300,000 mu; (d) Rural Credit Cooperative financial services dispensing investment and seasonal loans, and made more sensitive to poverty and gender issues, with lending substantially increased to poor women and men; (e) social service facilities in health and education upgraded, including 547 village schools and a large adult literacy programme for 31,000 trainees; (f) women's support programmes, in particular skills training, implemented for about 45,000 trainees; (g) a rural infrastructure construction, rehabilitation and maintenance programme implemented; and (h) participatory and gender-sensitive village development plans established and operational.</p>
<p>People's Republic of China Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region Modular Rural Development Programme</p>	<p>The programme aims to reduce the incidence of poverty in target villages in a sustainable and gender-equitable way: poor women and men will have improved their social and economic situation in a sustainable manner, with incomes exceeding the poverty line at all times; innovations will have demonstrated their potential for poverty reduction and successful modules will have been scaled up; and women will have benefited from all programme activities in at least equal proportions to men. The programme will contribute to the introduction of innovative approaches in rural poverty reduction. To this end, it adopts a modular approach, allowing local programme management offices to adapt innovations to specific social, economic and market conditions. The programme ensures the establishment of durable grass-roots institutions and the strengthening of relevant support services. Lastly, the programme applies an active scaling-up approach.</p>
<p>Republic of Djibouti Microfinance and Microenterprise Development Project</p>	<p>The aim of the project is to reduce poverty throughout Djibouti by increasing the incomes of poor households through enhanced access to financial and business development services in rural, peri-urban and urban areas. Its main objectives are to establish a sustainable savings and credit association network that would provide financial services to beneficiaries; develop sustainable non-financial services and market-based business development services; develop and adopt a national microfinance and microenterprise strategy and legal framework; and strengthen and diversify a range of income-generating activities for the target group.</p>

Country and project/programme names	Objectives
<p>State of Eritrea Post-Crisis Rural Recovery and Development Programme</p>	<p>The programme aims to promote conservation-based agriculture and natural resource management to raise agricultural productivity while safeguarding the environment. The programme will improve the income, food security and nutrition of 207,460 households. A technology development and dissemination system will ensure technical support for over 200,000 hectares of dryland farming, 450 hectares of irrigation, 40,370 hectares of rangeland improvement, and the rehabilitation of 40,000 hectares of degraded watersheds. Livestock production will be enhanced through communal range improvement. Intensive livestock production support will cover 4,000 dairy cows, 78,000 dairy goats, and about 8,000 sheep. About 1,100 bee-raising packages will be distributed. A participatory system for generating and distributing technology will be developed and used to inform policy at the national level. A system will also be created for the coordination of agricultural and rural development under the country's decentralization policy and will provide the basis for a new national policy for agriculture and rural development. A participatory approach to natural resource management will be the starting point for developing a leasehold policy on land and water conservation in the highlands.</p>
<p>Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Participatory Small-scale Irrigation Development Programme</p>	<p>The programme goal is to improve the food security, family nutrition and incomes of rural poor households. Its primary objective is to develop a sustainable, farmer-owned and -managed model of small-scale irrigated agriculture with scaling-up potential. The programme provides a unique opportunity to reform small-scale irrigation development approaches and practices in Ethiopia. The main institutional objective is to establish a participatory process for small-scale irrigation development that reinforces the sense of ownership critical for the long-term sustainability of such schemes in Ethiopia.</p>
<p>Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Pastoral Community Development Project Phase II</p>	<p>The objectives of the project are to strengthen the resilience of pastoral communities to external shocks and improve their livelihoods through increased access to basic social services. In addition to local capacity-building, the project will mainstream a community-driven development approach in planning, implementation and monitoring of investments in the public sector.</p>
<p>Gambia Rural Finance and Community Initiatives Project</p>	<p>The project's development goal is to help improve Household Food Security and incomes. In pursuance of this goal, it will seek to: (i) boost both on- and off-farm production and incomes by strengthening and expanding the Village-based Savings and Credit Association network; and (ii) promote Household Food Security-positive actions identified through the village-wide men's and women's groups, and implemented and managed by them.</p>
<p>Gambia Participatory Integrated-Watershed Management Project</p>	<p>The goal of this project is to empower poor rural communities to undertake and maintain integrated watershed-management activities that enhance their livelihoods and protect their natural resources. The specific objectives of this project are: (a) to strengthen the capacity of rural communities and service providers to plan, implement, manage and maintain watershed management in a sustainable manner and (b) to provide resources to local communities so that they can implement their watershed development activities.</p>
<p>Gambia Rural Finance Project</p>	<p>The overall development goal of the project is to create an enabling microfinance environment for rural poverty reduction by consolidating and expanding the rural outreach of selected existing microfinance institutions. Its specific objectives are to: (i) foster self-sustaining rural microfinance institutions (Village-based Savings and Credit Associations and non-bank financial institutions); (ii) ensure that they have consolidated access to appropriate and highly qualified support from technical service providers; (iii) forge mutually beneficial partnerships with other projects; and (iv) ensure that the proceeds of IFAD financing are used cost effectively.</p>
<p>The Gambia Livestock and Horticulture Development Project</p>	<p>The development goal of the IFAD grant is to reduce rural poverty sustainably by raising rural incomes through improved production and marketability of livestock and horticultural products. The specific objectives are to: (i) improve returns to group organized horticulture and livestock production; (ii) build up capacities at the grass-root level; and (iii) strengthen monitoring & evaluation. IFAD through the project will provide Ministry of Agriculture staff with support to coordinate activities within the Ministry. The objective of this support is to ensure that ministerial staff acquire the necessary capacities to take over project supervision, thereby adding to the sustainability of the activities initiated by the project.</p>
<p>India Post-Tsunami Sustainable Livelihoods Programme for the Coastal Communities of Tamil Nadu</p>	<p>The goal of the eight-year programme is to rehabilitate the livelihoods of thousands of tsunami victims along the Tamil Nadu coastal areas, thereby enabling them to return to a stable and productive way of life.</p>

<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	<i>Objectives</i>
<p>India Women's Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme in the mid-Gangetic Plains</p>	<p>The programme has three objectives: (i) building and/or strengthening community-level institutions for social and economic empowerment; (ii) enabling the target group to access productive resources and social services; and (iii) building a sustainable livelihood base that is integrated with the wider economy. In accordance with the CUSOP, the programme will ensure that the results achieved during implementation are shared with relevant government authorities, at the central and state levels, so as to identify policy issues and facilitate policy change. During design, the following issues were identified and discussed: (i) women's access to productive resources and credit; (ii) land and pond leasing; (iii) involvement of the private sector and nongovernmental organizations in enterprise development; (iv) strengthening of self-help groups; and (v) effectiveness of linkages between self-help groups and banks.</p>
<p>India Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme</p>	<p>The purpose of the programme will be to ensure that the livelihoods and food security of poor tribal households are sustainably improved by promoting a more efficient, equitable, self-managed and sustainable exploitation of the natural resources at their disposal and by developing off-farm/non-farm enterprises.</p>
<p>Republic of India Mitigating Poverty in Western Rajasthan Project</p>	<p>The project has the following objectives: (i) organize and empower the target group through community-based organizations (self-help groups, marketing groups, producers' companies, village development committees); (ii) promote income and employment opportunities while reinforcing risk-mitigating strategies; and (iii) provide access to financial services and markets. The Government of Rajasthan has requested IFAD's partnership in the design and implementation of a model of convergence with existing government schemes that at present are unable to reach the intended beneficiaries. The stated, ambitious goal of the Government is to replicate this model across the State of Rajasthan.</p>
<p>Republic of India North-Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Area Phase II</p>	<p>The goal of the project is to improve the livelihood of vulnerable groups in a sustainable manner through improved management of their natural resource base in a way that contributes to protecting and restoring the environment.</p>
<p>Republic of Kenya Southern Nyanza Community Development Project</p>	<p>The overall objectives of the project are poverty reduction and improved livelihoods of the communities in the proposed project area. The project's intermediate objective is to enhance gender-balanced empowerment of the rural communities through improved health and more rational use and management of natural resources for sustainable livelihood activities through: (i) improved local-level governance capacity and community-driven processes for local development; (ii) broader and sustained gender-balanced access to essential primary health care services, sustainable access to safe domestic water, and improved environmental sanitation and hygiene practices; (iii) better on-farm labour productivity and stronger human capacity with improved food security, nutrition and livelihood activities; and (iv) heightened community awareness of social behaviours and their consequences.</p>
<p>Kyrgyz Republic Agricultural Investments and Services Project</p>	<p>The project objective is to improve the institutional and infrastructure environment for farmers and herders, with a strong emphasis on the livestock sector. More specifically, the project will increase the productivity of farmers, particularly livestock farmers, in the project areas and reduce animal diseases that have a public health impact (e.g. brucellosis). The project will assist in developing and adopting an adequate legal and institutional framework to govern the management and use of pastures. It will support the development and operation of a market-oriented rural advisory service system. The project will also provide technical assistance for the establishment of a suitable legal and regulatory framework for the delivery of veterinary services.</p>

Country and project/programme names	Objectives
<p>Lao People's Democratic Republic</p> <p>Northern Regions Sustainable Livelihoods through Livestock Development Programme</p>	<p>The overall project goal is to contribute to the improved sustainability of livelihoods of upland smallholders in five selected provinces of northern Lao People's Democratic Republic. The specific objective will be to enhance village livestock systems through improved livestock productivity and profitability under integrated upland farming systems. The project is expected to have an influence on the following key policy and institutional areas: (i) stabilization of shifting cultivation in the upland areas based on the principle of ensuring sustainable livelihoods for the local population and for people resettled from these areas; and (ii) gradual decentralization to the provincial, district and village levels of authority, functions, resources and accountability for the planning, financing and implementation of initiatives.</p>
<p>Lao People's Democratic Republic</p> <p>Rural Livelihoods Improvement Programme in Attapeu and Sayaboury</p>	<p>The overall goal of the programme is economic growth and the sustained improvement of livelihoods among the rural poor (including women and other vulnerable groups) in the eight programme districts. The purpose of the programme components are that: (a) communities manage their own development, including the operation of social infrastructure, in ways that reduce poverty and are sustainable, participatory and gender-sensitive; (b) communities use sustainable farming and natural resource management systems and off-farm income-generating activities to meet their subsistence and income needs with the support of rural microfinance and other services; (c) communities have access to the local roads needed to carry out their development activities; and (d) decentralized and participatory rural development be managed, coordinated and supported by the Government and other service providers in ways that are sustainable, accountable, gender-sensitive and pro-poor.</p>
<p>Republic of Madagascar</p> <p>Rural Income Promotion Programme</p>	<p>The programme's development objective is the reduction of rural poverty in the province of Toamasina by increasing rural income and boosting the capacity of communities to take responsibility for their own development. The overall objective is to increase and sustainably secure the income of small-scale producers in the programme area and ensure their food and nutrition security. The programme has two specific objectives: (i) improved access for small-scale producers to markets and higher value for their products, through: (a) rationalization of crop collection systems; (b) reinforcement of their negotiating position; (c) improvement in the quality of products; (d) development of partnerships between groups of producers and commercial operators, namely to increase the added value at the producer level and introduce new products or labels; and (e) improvement of product transport conditions (increased physical accessibility); and (ii) environmentally sustainable intensification, growth and diversification of the productive base of the rural poor, including for the most vulnerable, through: (a) improvement in local governance, enabling effective participation of vulnerable groups in development process mechanisms; (b) strengthening of producer organizations; (c) improved access to rural financial services; (d) provision of quality agricultural advisory services; and (e) financial support for investment by small-scale producers.</p>
<p>Islamic Republic of Mauritania</p> <p>Oasis Sustainable Development Programme</p>	<p>Within the framework of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, the programme aims to reduce, in a sustainable manner, the high incidence of poverty among rural populations in the five oasis regions. The proposed eight-year programme will pursue this goal through: (i) the development of grass-roots organizations of the target populations; (ii) the promotion of sustainable oasis agricultural systems through the development and dissemination of appropriate technical and managerial know-how and through marketing support; (iii) financial support for essential community-based social and economic infrastructure; and (iv) the consolidation of viable decentralized rural finance systems.</p>
<p>Republic of Mauritius</p> <p>Marine and Agricultural Resources Support Programme</p>	<p>The goal is to support the pro-poor reform agenda within the overall reform process. This will be achieved through three objectives: (i) facilitate the development of pro-poor policies and programmes within the Ministry of Agro Industry and Fisheries and the Rodrigues Regional Assembly and assist the Ministry in managing marine resources sustainably; (ii) improve in a sustainable way the livelihoods of coastal communities threatened by overexploitation of the marine environment; and (iii) assist rural households, including smallholder cane planters, in diversifying their income-generating enterprises and improving their employment prospects. The programme will deepen IFAD's engagement in policy and institutional reform in the realms of agriculture, rural poverty and marine resources, by continuing the implementation support and technical assistance being provided under the current Rural Diversification Programme.</p>

Country and project/programme names	Objectives
<p>Republic of Moldova Rural Financial Services and Marketing Programme</p>	<p>The programme's goal is to reduce rural poverty in Moldova by creating enabling conditions for the poorer and poorest members of rural society to increase their incomes through greater access to markets and employment. The specific objective is to improve the participation and employment of rural poor people in income-increasing activities related to the development of a horticulture value chain in Moldova. Key areas of policy dialogue under the programme include: (i) use of a closely targeted and appropriately scaled system of market-oriented financial, organizational and technical support to achieve poverty reduction through sustainable economic growth; (ii) clarification of the respective responsibilities of commercial banks and microfinance institutions; and (iii) development of a positive enabling environment for economic growth.</p>
<p>Kingdom of Morocco Rural Development Project Mountain Zones of Errachidia Province</p>	<p>The project's overall goal is to improve living conditions and incomes for poor households in targeted villages. The project will focus on: (i) strengthening participatory programming and building the capacities of grass-roots organizations and provincial and local public administrations through the promotion of pro-poor local institutions and training of their staff and board members in participatory development; (ii) creating socio-economic and productive assets, which will involve rehabilitating small-scale irrigation infrastructure, improving accessibility, supplying drinking water, promoting soil and water conservation, and intensifying and diversifying agricultural production; and (iii) diversifying income sources by providing sustainable access to local financial services and business counselling services. The project will support the Government in fostering development in impoverished mountain regions of the country. It will test and validate various instruments and approaches for subsequent replication and scaling up in other mountain areas in Morocco. The project will serve as a platform for continuing policy dialogue on various issues of relevance to the rural poor, including the decentralization of decision-making, the creation of pro-poor local institutions and enhanced access to financial and non-financial services.</p>
<p>Federal Republic of Nigeria Roots & Tubers Expansion Programme</p>	<p>The long-term objective of the programme is to improve the living conditions, income and food security of poor smallholder households in the programme area. Immediate objectives would include: (i) the development of sustainable cropping systems through the testing, multiplication and release of appropriate root-and-tuber varieties; (ii) strengthening of support services in research and extension and the orienting of these towards the priority needs of farmers, especially women farmers; and (iii) the improvement of simple processing techniques and equipment and the provision of marketing support and advice to farmers.</p>
<p>Federal Republic of Nigeria Community-based Natural Resource Management Programme</p>	<p>The goal of the programme is: "Standard of living and quality of life improved for at least 400 000 rural poor people of the Niger Delta states with emphasis on women and youth." The purposes of the programme are: (i) rural community and service provider capacity for community development strengthened; and (ii) community development fund established and effectively disbursing.</p>
<p>Federal Republic of Nigeria Community-based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme</p>	<p>Specifically, the programme works to: (a) promote awareness and build the capacity of public and private-sector service providers to respond to the needs of poor rural women and men; (b) empower poor communities to manage their own development and support vulnerable groups (c) improve agricultural practices, resolve conflicts between farmers and pastoralists, and intensify crop and livestock production; and, (d) develop or upgrade safe water supplies, environmental sanitation, irrigation, and health and education facilities.</p>
<p>Republic of Paraguay Empowerment of Rural Poor Organizations and Harmonization of Investments Projects</p>	<p>The project's overall goal is to greatly reduce rural poverty in the five poorest departments of the Eastern Region of Paraguay. The main objective is to ensure that the rural poor in these five departments and their strengthened organizations have access to productive and financial resources and services already available in the project area and are mainstreamed into the national development process. The project's specific objectives include: (a) empowerment of rural poor organizations and accumulation of their social capital in order to generate an appropriate demand-driven system for productive and financial resources in the project area; (b) promotion of sustainable agricultural and non-agricultural business opportunities based on the diversification and modernization of productive and commercial activities; (c) harmonization of investments and project activities already present in the project area; and (d) implementation of ongoing policy dialogue between the Government and international donors to strengthen a much needed partnership for poverty reduction.</p>

Country and project/programme names	Objectives
<p>Kingdom of Swaziland Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project Phase 1</p>	<p>The overall objective of the project is the reduction of poverty and sustained improvement in the standard of living of the smallholder population in the Lower Usuthu Basin, through commercialization and intensification of agriculture along the lines articulated in the country strategic opportunities paper for Swaziland. The immediate objectives of the project are the provision of: (a) irrigation infrastructure to permit the production of high-value crops by smallholders; (b) a complete package of measures empowering smallholders to benefit from access to valuable water resources; and (c) health and environmental measures that will not only mitigate negative health and environmental impacts, but also to enable the target group to derive the full benefits of the investment.</p>
<p>Republic of Turkey Sivas-Erzincan Development Programme</p>	<p>The objectives of the project are to: (i) increase agricultural productivity and income levels of the rural poor in the less developed parts of Sivas and Erzincan provinces; (ii) expand rural employment opportunities and encourage individual and group initiatives of smallholders; (iii) build and strengthen self-sustaining institutions directly related to the rural poor; and (iv) improve living conditions of the rural poor and especially of women.</p>
<p>Republic of Turkey Diyabakir, Batman and Siirt Development Project</p>	<p>In line with Turkey's national strategy for poverty reduction, the goal of the project is to improve the economic and social status of rural poor people in the provinces of Diyarbakir, Batman and Siirt. Specific objectives are to (i) improve economic efficiency and socio-economic livelihoods in poor rural villages in the project area within the framework of the current production and employment patterns; (ii) where feasible, diversify income sources and increase employment through the establishment of new – and the expansion of existing – profitable businesses, both on- and off-farm, mainly through measures to improve supply chain management; and (iii) optimize employability of members of the target groups through support to enhancing the individual and organizational skills necessary to achieve objectives (i) and (ii). In Turkey, the development agenda has shifted towards increased market liberalization, economic policy and institutional reform, and the proposed project's design fits into and supports these changes. Noting that the policy environment is now much more open-market-oriented, the project places greater emphasis on (i) profitability and marketability in agricultural interventions; (ii) taking advantage of site-specific opportunities in terms of sustainable natural resource use, market linkages and private-sector involvement; and (iii) support for small and medium-sized enterprises to provide market linkages and to increase self-employment and job availability.</p>
<p>Republic of Uganda Community Agricultural Infrastructure Improvement Programme</p>	<p>The overall goal of the programme is to contribute to poverty reduction and economic growth in Uganda through enhanced agricultural commercialization. Its specific objectives are to strengthen farmers' access to markets, improve produce prices and increase incomes through investments in rural infrastructure and its sustainable management by well-mobilized communities. The Government and development partners have been engaged in a harmonization/consolidation process for over a decade. The Poverty Eradication Action Plan provides the overall strategic framework for the Government's poverty-reduction approaches. The plan is supported by the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture, which states that agricultural commercialization is the principal stepping stone for reducing poverty in rural areas.</p>
<p>Republic of Uganda Rural Financial Services Programme</p>	<p>The programme aims to create a healthy and extensive rural finance system that will offer rural populations the opportunity for higher and more stable income, thus alleviating poverty. More specifically, the programme will: (a) fill existing gaps in the support currently available to the microfinance subsector in order to enhance the quality of rural financial services and render them viable, with a high portfolio quality; (b) facilitate expansion of sustainable financial services to reach substantially more of the country's rural population; (c) extend financial services to areas that have been poorly served; and (d) help potential clients of rural microfinance institutions become increasingly business-oriented.</p>
<p>Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela Sustainable Rural Development Project for the Semi-Arid Zones of Falcon and Lara States – Phase II</p>	<p>The overarching goal of the project is to improve the living conditions of poor rural communities located in the semi-arid zones of Falcon and Lara states. The general objective of the project – in accordance with the Millennium Development Goal – is to reduce poverty and extreme poverty significantly in rural communities in semi-arid zones by means of social and economic development that is environmentally sustainable and gender equitable. Specific objectives include: (a) the economic and political empowerment of the social and economic organizations of poor rural communities in semi-arid zones; (b) the rehabilitation, conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in semi-arid zones, with a special focus on soil and water conservation; (c) the transformation of agricultural and non-agricultural subsistence production into a market-oriented, profitable and sustainable business; and (d) greater access of poor rural communities in semi-arid zones to local rural financial services (<i>cajas rurales</i>), as well as to formal state and national financial services.</p>

<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	<i>Objectives</i>
Republic of Yemen Al-Dhala Community Resource Management Project	<p>The overall goal of the project is to enhance family food security for subsistence farmers, raise family incomes and improve the living conditions and development participation of small farm households and village communities in Al-Dhala. To achieve this, the project will: (i) empower communities, including women and the poor, to mobilize and organize themselves to participate in and gain direct benefit from development planning and project execution; and (ii) remove critical physical- and social infrastructure and social constraints on productivity and advancement; and (iii) equip farm households to enhance output, and support them in doing so, in order to secure basic food supply, produce marketable surpluses and pursue income-raising opportunities.</p>

List of country programme evaluations completed and published by IOE (1992-2016)

<i>Number</i>	<i>Division</i>	<i>Country programme evaluation</i>	<i>Publication year</i>
1	NEN	Yemen	1992
2	NEN	Sudan	1994
3	APR	Bangladesh	1994
4	APR	Pakistan	1995
5	LAC	Honduras	1996
6	WCA	Ghana	1996
7	WCA	Mauritania	1998
8	APR	Nepal	1999
9	APR	Viet Nam	2001
10	NEN	Syrian Arab Republic	2001
11	APR	Papua New Guinea	2002
12	APR	Sri Lanka	2002
13	ESA	United Republic of Tanzania	2003
14	NEN	Tunisia	2003
15	APR	Indonesia	2004
16	WCA	Senegal	2004
17	WCA	Benin	2005
18	LAC	Plurinational State of Bolivia	2005
19	NEN	Egypt	2005
20	LAC	Mexico	2006
21	APR	Bangladesh	2006
22	ESA	Rwanda	2006
23	WCA	Mali	2007
24	LAC	Brazil	2008
25	NEN	Morocco	2008
26	APR	Pakistan	2008
27	NEN	Ethiopia	2009

<i>Number</i>	<i>Division</i>	<i>Country programme evaluation</i>	<i>Publication year</i>
28	WCA	Nigeria	2009
29	NEN	Sudan	2009
30	APR	India	2010
31	ESA	Mozambique	2010
32	LAC	Argentina	2010
33	WCA	Niger	2011
34	ESA	Kenya	2011
35	ESA	Rwanda	2012
36	WCA	Ghana	2012
37	APR	Viet Nam	2012
38	NEN	Yemen	2012
39	ESA	Uganda	2013
40	WCA	Mali	2013
41	APR	Nepal	2013
42	WCA	Madagascar	2013
43	APR	Indonesia	2014
44	NEN	Jordan	2014
45	NEN	Republic of Moldova	2014
46	LAC	Ecuador	2014
47	ESA	Zambia	2014
48	WCA	Senegal	2014
49	APR	China	2014
50	LAC	Plurinational State of Bolivia	2014
51	ESA	United Republic of Tanzania	2015
52	APR	Bangladesh	2016
53	NEN	Turkey	2016
54	LAC	Brazil	2016
55	ESA	Ethiopia	2016
56	WAC	Nigeria	2016
57	APR	India	2016
58	WAC	Gambia (The)	2016

Definition of the evaluation criteria used by IOE

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Definition^a</i>
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 design in achieving its objectives.
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.
Rural poverty impact^b	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 grass-roots 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, the environment and climate change 	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 as well as in mitigating the negative impact of climate change or promoting adaptation measures.
<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"> • Innovation 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 other agencies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender equality and women's empowerment 	The criterion assesses the efforts made to promote gender equality and women's empowerment in the design, implementation, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation of IFAD-assisted projects.
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	This criterion assesses the contribution of partners to project design, execution, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation. It also assesses the performance of individual partners against their expected role and responsibilities in the project life cycle.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFAD • Government 	


^a These definitions have been taken from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management* and from the IFAD Evaluation Manual (2009).

^b The IFAD Evaluation Manual also deals with the "lack of intervention", that is, no specific intervention may have been foreseen or intended with respect to one or more of the five impact domains. In spite of this, if positive or negative changes are detected and can be attributed in whole or in part to the project, a rating should be assigned to the particular impact domain. On the other hand, if no changes are detected and no intervention was foreseen or intended, then no rating (or the mention "not applicable") is assigned.

Project performance trends 2000-2015

Relevance

All evaluation data series by replenishment period




All evaluation data series by year of completion




Effectiveness


All evaluation data series by replenishment period



All evaluation data series by year of completion




Efficiency All evaluation data series by replenishment period




All evaluation data series by year of completion




Project performance
All evaluation data series by replenishment period




All evaluation data series by year of completion




Rural poverty impact
All evaluation data series by replenishment period



All evaluation data series by year of completion




Overall project achievement
All evaluation data series by replenishment period



All evaluation data series by year of completion



IFAD performance as partner
All evaluation data series by replenishment period



All evaluation data series by year of completion



Government performance as a partner
All evaluation data series by replenishment period



All evaluation data series by year of completion



Project performance ratings 2000-2015

Relevance

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	1.6	3.3	4.1	5.4
Satisfactory	28.0	23.8	29.5	33.3	46.6	53.6
Moderately satisfactory	68.0	71.4	60.7	50.0	37.0	30.4
Moderately unsatisfactory	4.0	4.8	6.6	11.7	11.0	10.7
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.7	1.4	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5
Standard deviation	0.51	0.50	0.66	0.77	0.79	0.76
1 st Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	23.5	19	31.4	22.2	31.1	20.9	18.6	3.7	0.0	1.4	2.9	3.6	3.8	4.2
Satisfactory	52.9	42.9	40	44.4	35.6	41.9	34.9	37	28.3	31.9	37.7	47	55	53.5
Moderately satisfactory	17.6	28.6	20	26.7	26.7	30.2	39.5	55.6	68.3	59.7	46.4	34.9	31.3	32.4
Moderately unsatisfactory	5.88	9.52	8.57	6.67	6.67	6.98	6.98	3.70	3.33	5.56	11.59	13.25	10.00	9.86
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.39	1.45	1.20	0.0	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Relevance (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.94	4.71	4.94	4.82	4.91	4.77	4.65	4.41	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.39	4.53	4.52
Standard deviation	0.80	0.88	0.92	0.85	0.91	0.86	0.86	0.62	0.50	0.65	0.76	0.80	0.72	0.73
1 st Quartile	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	5	5	6	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	19	31.1	3.7	2.9	4.2
Satisfactory	42.9	35.6	37	37.7	53.5
Moderately satisfactory	28.6	26.7	55.6	46.4	32.4
Moderately unsatisfactory	9.52	6.67	3.70	11.59	9.86
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.45	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.71	4.91	4.41	4.29	4.52
Standard deviation	0.88	0.91	0.62	0.76	0.73
1 st Quartile	4	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	5	6	5	5	5

Effectiveness

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	24.0	23.8	21.3	23.3	31.5	39.3
Moderately satisfactory	56.0	47.6	50.8	50.0	49.3	44.6
Moderately unsatisfactory	12.0	19.0	16.4	16.7	13.7	14.3
Unsatisfactory	8.0	9.5	11.5	10.0	5.5	1.8
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.2
Standard deviation	0.82	0.89	0.90	0.88	0.82	0.75
1 st Quartile	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0	4.8	2.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.9	1.7	0.0	2.9	2.4	3.8	1.4
Satisfactory	29.41	33.30	34.30	31.10	26.70	20.90	25.60	25.90	30.00	25.00	26.10	28.90	35.00	36.60
Moderately satisfactory	52.94	42.90	40.00	33.30	37.80	44.20	51.20	46.30	40.00	47.20	46.40	48.20	43.80	45.10
Moderately unsatisfactory	11.76	14.29	17.14	28.89	26.67	25.58	9.30	18.52	20.00	18.06	14.49	16.87	17.50	15.49
Unsatisfactory	5.88	4.76	5.71	4.44	8.89	9.30	11.63	7.41	8.33	9.72	10.14	3.61	0.00	1.41
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Effectiveness (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.06	4.19	4.11	3.98	3.82	3.77	3.98	3.96	3.97	3.88	3.97	4.10	4.25	4.21
Standard deviation	0.80	0.91	0.92	0.93	0.93	0.88	0.95	0.90	0.95	0.90	0.96	0.83	0.78	0.77
1 st Quartile	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3.25	3	3	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4.25	5	5	5	5

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	4.8	0.0	1.9	2.9	1.4
Satisfactory	33.30	26.70	25.90	26.10	36.60
Moderately satisfactory	42.90	37.80	46.30	46.40	45.10
Moderately unsatisfactory	14.29	26.67	18.52	14.49	15.49
Unsatisfactory	4.76	8.89	7.41	10.14	1.41
Highly unsatisfactory	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.19	3.82	3.96	3.97	4.21
Standard deviation	0.91	0.93	0.90	0.96	0.77
1 st Quartile	4	3	3.25	4	4
3 rd Quartile	5	5	5	5	5

Efficiency

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.8
Satisfactory	16.0	14.3	18.0	15.0	18.1	18.2
Moderately satisfactory	48.0	33.3	29.5	38.3	45.8	49.1
Moderately unsatisfactory	24.0	38.1	37.7	31.7	23.6	21.8
Unsatisfactory	12.0	14.3	13.1	11.7	8.3	7.3
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	1.6	3.3	2.8	1.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.8
Standard deviation	0.88	0.91	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.94
1 st Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
3 rd Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	5.9	14.3	14.3	11.1	8.9	4.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.3	1.4
Satisfactory	11.8	23.8	25.7	24.4	17.8	14	16.3	16.7	15	18.1	18.8	20.7	22.8	24.3
Moderately satisfactory	41.18	33.30	28.60	28.90	33.30	34.90	44.20	42.60	38.30	31.90	37.70	41.50	40.50	32.90
Moderately unsatisfactory	29.41	14.29	17.14	26.67	28.89	34.88	23.26	27.78	33.33	36.11	30.43	26.83	29.11	35.71
Unsatisfactory	0.00	4.76	8.57	6.67	6.67	6.98	9.30	11.11	13.33	12.50	10.14	7.32	5.06	5.71
Highly unsatisfactory	11.76	9.52	5.71	2.22	4.44	4.65	4.65	1.85	0.00	1.39	2.90	2.44	1.27	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Efficiency (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.59	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.60	3.65	3.61	3.55	3.53	3.59	3.74	3.82	3.80
Standard deviation	1.24	1.41	1.36	1.19	1.20	1.10	1.08	0.95	0.90	0.97	1.00	0.99	0.92	0.92
1 st Quartile	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3 rd Quartile	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.75

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	14.3	8.9	0.0	0.0	1.4
Satisfactory	23.8	17.8	16.7	18.8	24.3
Moderately satisfactory	33.30	33.30	42.60	37.70	32.90
Moderately unsatisfactory	14.29	28.89	27.78	30.43	35.71
Unsatisfactory	4.76	6.67	11.11	10.14	5.71
Highly unsatisfactory	9.52	4.44	1.85	2.90	0.0
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.00	3.80	3.61	3.59	3.80
Standard deviation	1.41	1.20	0.95	1.00	0.92
1 st Quartile	3	3	3	3	3
3 rd Quartile	5	5	4	4	4.75

Project performance

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	20.0	14.3	14.8	13.3	18.3	19.6
Moderately satisfactory	56.0	52.4	52.5	55.0	56.3	57.1
Moderately unsatisfactory	20.0	28.6	26.2	21.7	19.7	19.6
Unsatisfactory	4.0	4.8	6.6	10.0	5.6	3.6
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100	100	100	100	100	100

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	3.95	3.83	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.19
Standard deviation	0.72	0.73	0.78	0.82	0.77	0.69
1 st Quartile	4.00	3.18	3.0	3.2	3.9	4.0
3 rd Quartile	4.00	4.00	4.0	4.3	4.6	4.7

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	4.8	5.7	4.4	4.4	2.3	2.3	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	29.4	38.1	40.0	40.0	35.6	32.6	27.9	24.1	0.78	15.3	17.4	19.3	25.0	23.9
Moderately satisfactory	52.9	42.9	40.0	40.0	40.0	44.2	51.2	50.0	3.8	52.8	53.6	55.4	52.5	54.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	11.8	9.5	14.3	15.6	20.0	14.0	11.6	20.4	4.2	26.4	20.3	20.5	20.0	19.7
Unsatisfactory	5.9	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	5.6	4.0	5.6	8.7	4.8	2.5	1.4
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.78	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Project performance (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.08	4.29	4.37	4.33	4.26	4.13	4.13	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.2	4.2
Standard deviation	0.80	0.88	0.80	0.79	0.82	0.88	0.84	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.82	0.76	0.7	0.69
1 st Quartile	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.8	3.8	3.0	3.7	3.0	4.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.8	4.7

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	4.8	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	38.1	35.6	24.1	17.4	23.9
Moderately satisfactory	42.9	40.0	50.0	53.6	54.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	9.5	20.0	20.4	20.3	19.7
Unsatisfactory	4.8	0.0	5.6	8.7	1.4
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.29	4.23	4.0	3.9	4.2
Standard deviation	0.88	0.83	0.78	0.82	0.69
1 st Quartile	4.00	4.00	3.8	3.7	4.0
3 rd Quartile	5.00	5.00	4.2	4.3	4.7

Rural poverty impact

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	24.0	30.8	31.0	35.7	31.9	36.5
Moderately satisfactory	56.0	53.8	50.0	50.0	55.1	55.8
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.0	10.3	12.1	8.9	8.7	5.8
Unsatisfactory	4.0	5.1	6.9	5.4	4.3	1.9
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	4	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.3
Standard deviation	0.75	0.78	0.84	0.80	0.75	0.65
1 st Quartile	4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4	4
3 rd Quartile	4	5.0	5.0	5.0	5	5

All evaluation data by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	7.1	5.9	6.5	2.4	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	28.6	35.3	29.0	26.8	20.9	22.0	26.2	30.2	35.1	33.3	40.0	32.9	36.5	32.3
Moderately satisfactory	35.7	29.4	38.7	36.6	41.9	41.5	50.0	45.3	47.4	47.8	47.7	54.4	55.4	55.4
Moderately unsatisfactory	21.4	23.5	22.6	29.3	27.9	31.7	21.4	22.6	14.0	13.0	7.7	8.9	6.8	10.8
Unsatisfactory	7.1	5.9	3.2	4.9	7.0	4.9	2.4	1.9	3.5	5.8	4.6	3.8	1.4	1.5
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Rural poverty impact (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8	4	4	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2
Standard deviation	1	1	0.94	0.92	0.91	0.84	0.76	0.78	0.78	0.83	0.78	0.74	0.64	0.68
1 st Quartile	5	3	3.5	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	3	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

All evaluation data – by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	5.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	35.3	20.9	30.2	40.0	32.3
Moderately satisfactory	29.4	41.9	45.3	47.7	55.4
Moderately unsatisfactory	23.5	27.9	22.6	7.7	10.8
Unsatisfactory	5.9	7.0	1.9	4.6	1.5
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.1	3.8	4	4.2	4.2
Standard deviation	1	0.91	0.78	0.78	0.68
1 st Quartile	3	3	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	5	4	5	5	5

Impact domains

Household income and assets

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	30.4	34.2	31.5	36.5	44.6	54.9
Moderately satisfactory	52.2	50.0	50.0	46.2	41.5	37.3
Moderately unsatisfactory	4.3	10.5	7.4	9.6	7.7	7.8
Unsatisfactory	13.0	5.3	11.1	7.7	6.2	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.5
Standard deviation	0.93	0.80	0.91	0.87	0.84	0.64
1 st Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	13.33	20.00	15.63	9.76	4.76	0.00	4.76	4.00	3.64	0.00	1.64	1.35	1.37	0.00
Satisfactory	33.33	35.00	40.63	31.71	26.19	31.71	38.10	40.00	36.36	32.81	37.70	41.89	52.05	49.23
Moderately satisfactory	40.00	25.00	25.00	31.71	42.86	43.90	40.48	38.00	43.64	48.44	45.90	43.24	35.62	36.92
Moderately unsatisfactory	6.67	15.00	12.50	19.51	19.05	19.51	14.29	12.00	12.73	9.38	8.20	8.11	10.96	13.85
Unsatisfactory	6.67	5.00	6.25	7.32	7.14	4.88	2.38	6.00	3.64	9.38	6.56	5.41	0.00	0.00
Highly unsatisfactory	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Household income and assets (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.40	4.50	4.47	4.17	4.02	4.02	4.29	4.24	4.24	4.05	4.20	4.26	4.44	4.35
Standard deviation	1.02	1.12	1.09	1.08	0.96	0.84	0.85	0.93	0.85	0.89	0.86	0.84	0.70	0.71
1 st Quartile	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	20.00	4.76	4.00	1.64	0.00
Satisfactory	35.00	26.19	40.00	37.70	49.23
Moderately satisfactory	25.00	42.86	38.00	45.90	36.92
Moderately unsatisfactory	15.00	19.05	12.00	8.20	13.85
Unsatisfactory	5.00	7.14	6.00	6.56	0.00
Highly unsatisfactory	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.50	4.02	4.24	4.20	4.35
Standard deviation	1.12	0.96	0.93	0.86	0.71
1 st Quartile	4.00	3.25	4.00	4.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

Impact domains (cont.)

Human and social capital empowerment

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	2.5	1.7	3.5	2.8	7.3
Satisfactory	52.0	47.5	45.8	45.6	44.4	47.3
Moderately satisfactory	36.0	37.5	35.6	33.3	37.5	36.4
Moderately unsatisfactory	12.0	10.0	11.9	12.3	12.5	9.1
Unsatisfactory	0.0	2.5	5.1	5.3	2.8	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5
Standard deviation	0.69	0.80	0.88	0.92	0.83	0.76
1 st Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.00	0.00	5.88	4.55	6.67	4.76	11.90	7.55	8.62	4.55	6.35	2.44	5.19	4.41
Satisfactory	40.00	25.00	26.47	22.73	22.22	26.19	30.95	43.40	44.83	46.97	46.03	42.68	38.96	35.29
Moderately satisfactory	46.67	45.00	41.18	38.64	35.56	26.19	23.81	28.30	32.76	31.82	33.33	40.24	45.45	45.59
Moderately unsatisfactory	6.67	15.00	14.71	25.00	28.89	40.48	30.95	20.75	12.07	12.12	9.52	12.20	10.39	14.71
Unsatisfactory	6.67	10.00	5.88	4.55	4.44	2.38	2.38	0.00	1.72	4.55	4.76	2.44	0.00	0.00
Highly unsatisfactory	0.00	5.00	5.88	4.55	2.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Human and social capital empowerment (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.20	3.75	3.94	3.84	3.91	3.90	4.19	4.38	4.47	4.35	4.40	4.30	4.39	4.29
Standard deviation	0.83	1.09	1.19	1.11	1.07	0.97	1.07	0.89	0.88	0.91	0.92	0.81	0.74	0.77
1 st Quartile	4.00	3.00	3.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5.00	4.25	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5 th)	2004-2006 (6 th)	2007-2009 (7 th)	2010-2012 (8 th)	2013-2015 (9 th)
Highly satisfactory	0.00	6.67	7.55	6.35	4.41
Satisfactory	25.00	22.22	43.40	46.03	35.29
Moderately satisfactory	45.00	35.56	28.30	33.33	45.59
Moderately unsatisfactory	15.00	28.89	20.75	9.52	14.71
Unsatisfactory	10.00	4.44	0.00	4.76	0.00
Highly unsatisfactory	5.00	2.22	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5 th)	2004-2006 (6 th)	2007-2009 (7 th)	2010-2012 (8 th)	2013-2015 (9 th)
Average rating	3.75	3.91	4.38	4.40	4.29
Standard deviation	1.09	1.07	0.89	0.92	0.77
1 st Quartile	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	4.25	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

Impact domains (cont.)

Food security and agricultural productivity

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	19.0	26.5	30.8	36.5	33.8	38.0
Moderately satisfactory	57.1	55.9	48.1	46.2	47.7	48.0
Moderately unsatisfactory	9.5	8.8	11.5	11.5	13.8	12.0
Unsatisfactory	14.3	8.8	9.6	5.8	4.6	2.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2
Standard deviation	0.91	0.84	0.90	0.83	0.81	0.73
1 st Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	4.0	4.8	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.00	5.00	8.82	9.30	6.98	2.50	2.50	2.04	1.92	3.28	3.45	2.70	1.45	0.00
Satisfactory	60.00	60.00	38.24	25.58	18.60	25.00	37.50	30.61	32.69	37.70	43.10	33.78	43.48	45.00
Moderately satisfactory	20.00	15.00	32.35	37.21	39.53	32.50	30.00	36.73	40.38	40.98	34.48	47.30	43.48	43.33
Moderately unsatisfactory	6.67	10.00	11.76	18.60	23.26	27.50	20.00	18.37	13.46	11.48	12.07	12.16	10.14	10.00
Unsatisfactory	0.00	0.00	5.88	9.30	9.30	10.00	5.00	10.20	9.62	6.56	6.90	4.05	1.45	1.67
Highly unsatisfactory	13.33	10.00	2.94	0.00	2.33	2.50	5.00	2.04	1.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Food security and agricultural productivity (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.13	4.30	4.24	4.07	3.84	3.75	3.98	3.90	3.98	4.20	4.24	4.19	4.33	4.32
Standard deviation	1.36	1.31	1.14	1.09	1.12	1.09	1.15	1.07	1.05	0.92	0.95	0.83	0.74	0.72
1 st Quartile	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	5.00	6.98	2.04	3.45	0.00
Satisfactory	60.00	18.60	30.61	43.10	45.00
Moderately satisfactory	15.00	39.53	36.73	34.48	43.33
Moderately unsatisfactory	10.00	23.26	18.37	12.07	10.00
Unsatisfactory	0.00	9.30	10.20	6.90	1.67
Highly unsatisfactory	10.00	2.33	2.04	0.00	0.00
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.30	3.84	3.90	4.24	4.32
Standard deviation	1.31	1.12	1.07	0.95	0.72
1 st Quartile	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00

Impact domains (cont.)

Natural resources, environment and climate change

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.9	2.6
Satisfactory	15.0	16.1	12.5	11.1	11.1	15.8
Moderately satisfactory	60.0	64.5	56.3	53.3	59.3	65.8
Moderately unsatisfactory	20.0	16.1	25.0	28.9	22.2	13.2
Unsatisfactory	5.0	3.2	6.3	4.4	5.6	2.6
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.81	4.03
Standard deviation	0.73	0.67	0.75	0.79	0.77	0.71
1 st Quartile	3.8	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.00	4.00

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.00	5.56	3.33	2.70	0.00	0.00	3.03	2.38	2.33	1.92	1.92	1.61	1.79	0.00
Satisfactory	33.33	33.33	23.33	21.62	17.65	25.00	21.21	21.43	18.60	15.38	17.31	12.90	17.86	12.00
Moderately satisfactory	25.00	33.33	30.00	29.73	20.59	15.63	24.24	40.48	55.81	51.92	51.92	59.68	60.71	70.00
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.67	16.67	23.33	21.62	35.29	40.63	42.42	28.57	20.93	25.00	25.00	19.35	16.07	16.00
Unsatisfactory	16.67	5.56	13.33	16.22	14.71	12.50	6.06	7.14	2.33	5.77	3.85	6.45	3.57	2.00
Highly unsatisfactory	8.33	5.56	6.67	8.11	11.76	6.25	3.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Natural resources, environment and climate change (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.58	4.00	3.60	3.49	3.18	3.41	3.65	3.84	3.98	3.83	3.88	3.84	3.98	3.92
Standard deviation	1.32	1.20	1.25	1.29	1.22	1.17	1.08	0.93	0.77	0.83	0.80	0.79	0.74	0.59
1 st Quartile	2.75	3.25	3.00	3.00	2.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.25	4.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	5.56	0.00	2.38	1.92	0.00
Satisfactory	33.33	17.65	21.43	17.31	12.00
Moderately satisfactory	33.33	20.59	40.48	51.92	70.00
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.67	35.29	28.57	25.00	16.00
Unsatisfactory	5.56	14.71	7.14	3.85	2.00
Highly unsatisfactory	5.56	11.76	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.00	3.18	3.84	3.88	3.92
Standard deviation	1.20	1.22	0.93	0.80	0.59
1 st Quartile	3.25	2.25	3.00	3.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

Impact domains (cont.)

Institutions and policies

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	4.5	5.7	5.5	5.5	4.3	3.9
Satisfactory	27.3	22.9	25.5	21.8	27.5	25.5
Moderately satisfactory	45.5	40.0	38.2	41.8	47.8	54.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	18.2	22.9	21.8	23.6	14.5	11.8
Unsatisfactory	4.5	8.6	9.1	7.3	5.8	3.9
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.1
Standard deviation	0.90	1.01	1.03	0.98	0.90	0.82
1 st Quartile	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00	4.88	7.50	4.88	6.12	5.77	4.62	4.69	3.80	2.78	1.59
Satisfactory	26.67	20.00	37.50	30.00	29.27	17.50	19.51	20.41	21.15	27.69	25.00	29.11	26.39	31.75
Moderately satisfactory	33.33	15.00	9.38	7.50	17.07	32.50	51.22	51.02	48.08	38.46	42.19	46.84	52.78	46.03
Moderately unsatisfactory	20.00	40.00	31.25	35.00	21.95	22.50	12.20	18.37	19.23	21.54	21.88	15.19	15.28	14.29
Unsatisfactory	6.67	10.00	12.50	17.50	21.95	17.50	9.76	4.08	5.77	7.69	7.69	5.06	2.78	6.35
Highly unsatisfactory	13.33	15.00	9.38	5.00	4.88	2.50	2.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Institutions and policies (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.53	3.15	3.53	3.55	3.59	3.68	3.90	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.08
Standard deviation	1.31	1.28	1.35	1.34	1.36	1.23	1.05	0.89	0.93	0.99	0.95	0.89	0.79	0.88
1 st Quartile	3.00	2.75	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.75	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	0.00	4.88	6.12	4.69	1.59
Satisfactory	20.00	29.27	20.41	25.00	31.75
Moderately satisfactory	15.00	17.07	51.02	42.19	46.03
Moderately unsatisfactory	40.00	21.95	18.37	21.88	14.29
Unsatisfactory	10.00	21.95	4.08	7.69	6.35
Highly unsatisfactory	15.00	4.88	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	3.15	3.59	4.06	4.00	4.08
Standard deviation	1.28	1.36	0.89	0.95	0.88
1 st Quartile	2.75	2.00	4.00	3.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00

Other performance criteria

Sustainability

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	20.0	17.1	13.3	11.9	11.0	10.7
Moderately satisfactory	40.0	46.3	43.3	47.5	52.1	58.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	28.0	29.3	36.7	33.9	32.9	26.8
Unsatisfactory	12.0	4.9	5.0	5.1	4.1	3.6
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	2.4	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.8
Standard deviation	0.93	0.89	0.84	0.82	0.72	0.68
1 st Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
3 rd Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Satisfactory	29.40	23.80	20.00	13.30	13.30	16.30	20.90	18.50	16.90	14.10	16.20	13.30	12.70	8.70
Moderately satisfactory	11.80	19.00	28.60	40.00	37.80	39.50	34.90	40.70	44.10	45.10	45.60	50.60	54.40	62.30
Moderately unsatisfactory	35.29	38.10	31.43	26.67	26.67	25.58	32.56	31.48	33.90	35.21	32.35	32.53	27.85	24.64
Unsatisfactory	17.65	14.29	17.14	17.78	20.00	18.60	11.63	9.26	3.39	4.23	4.41	3.61	5.06	4.35
Highly unsatisfactory	5.88	4.76	2.86	2.22	2.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.69	1.41	1.47	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Sustainability (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.41	3.43	3.46	3.44	3.40	3.53	3.65	3.69	3.71	3.66	3.71	3.73	3.75	3.75
Standard deviation	1.24	1.14	1.08	1.00	1.02	0.97	0.94	0.88	0.84	0.82	0.84	0.73	0.74	0.67
1 st Quartile	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3 rd Quartile	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Satisfactory	23.80	13.30	18.50	16.20	8.70
Moderately satisfactory	19.00	37.80	40.70	45.60	62.30
Moderately unsatisfactory	38.10	26.67	31.48	32.35	24.64
Unsatisfactory	14.29	20.00	9.26	4.41	4.35
Highly unsatisfactory	4.76	2.22	0.00	1.47	0.00
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	3.43	3.40	3.69	3.71	3.75
Standard deviation	1.14	1.02	0.88	0.84	0.67
1 st Quartile	3	3	3	3	3
3 rd Quartile	4	4	4	4	4

Other performance criteria (cont.)

Innovation and scaling-up

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	4.0	4.8	3.3	3.3	2.7	3.6
Satisfactory	28.0	28.6	29.5	35.0	39.7	41.1
Moderately satisfactory	40.0	38.1	39.3	35.0	39.7	42.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	24.0	19.0	19.7	18.3	15.1	10.7
Unsatisfactory	4.0	7.1	6.6	6.7	1.4	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	2.4	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.8
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.3
Standard deviation	0.92	1.08	1.02	1.04	0.88	0.85
1 st Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.85	3.30	2.80	2.90	2.40	2.50	2.80
Satisfactory	46.15	36.84	37.50	31.71	27.50	26.19	34.88	31.48	28.30	27.80	33.30	36.10	36.30	35.20
Moderately satisfactory	30.77	31.58	28.13	29.27	32.50	40.48	44.19	44.40	43.30	43.10	37.70	41.00	43.80	42.30
Moderately unsatisfactory	7.70	15.79	21.88	29.27	30.95	28.57	18.60	18.52	18.33	19.44	18.84	18.07	15.00	18.31
Unsatisfactory	15.38	15.79	12.50	9.76	7.14	4.76	2.33	3.70	5.00	5.56	4.35	2.41	2.50	1.41
Highly unsatisfactory	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.67	1.39	2.90	0.00	0.00	0.00
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Innovation and scaling-up (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.08	3.89	3.91	3.83	3.81	3.88	4.12	4.09	4.02	3.99	4.03	4.18	4.21	4.20
Standard deviation	1.07	1.07	1.04	0.99	0.91	0.85	0.78	0.84	0.97	0.96	1.04	0.84	0.82	0.82
1 st Quartile	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.75	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5	5	5	5	4.75	4.75	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	0.00	0.00	1.85	2.90	2.80
Satisfactory	36.84	27.50	31.48	33.30	35.20
Moderately satisfactory	31.58	32.50	44.40	37.70	42.30
Moderately unsatisfactory	15.79	30.95	18.52	18.84	18.31
Unsatisfactory	15.79	7.14	3.70	4.35	1.41
Highly unsatisfactory	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.90	0.00
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	3.89	3.81	4.09	4.03	4.20
Standard deviation	1.07	0.91	0.84	1.04	0.82
1 st Quartile	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00
3 rd Quartile	5	4.75	5	5	5

Other performance criteria (cont.)

Gender equality and women's empowerment

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	8.3	4.9	3.3	1.7	2.8	3.8
Satisfactory	25.0	26.8	29.5	38.3	46.5	49.1
Moderately satisfactory	54.2	46.3	45.9	40.0	38.0	37.7
Moderately unsatisfactory	8.3	17.1	18.0	18.3	9.9	5.7
Unsatisfactory	4.2	4.9	3.3	1.7	2.8	3.8
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.37	4.43
Standard deviation	0.88	0.91	0.85	0.81	0.81	0.81
1 st Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	7.4	4.8	3.2	1.5	2.5	2.6	1.5
Satisfactory	29.6	28.6	31.7	40.0	44.4	41.6	39.7
Moderately satisfactory	51.9	45.2	44.4	38.5	39.5	45.5	47.1
Moderately unsatisfactory	7.41	16.67	17.46	16.92	12.35	9.09	10.29
Unsatisfactory	3.70	4.76	3.17	3.08	1.23	1.30	1.47
Highly unsatisfactory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Gender equality and women's empowerment (cont.)

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.30	4.12	4.14	4.20	4.35	4.35	4.29
Standard deviation	0.85	0.91	0.85	0.84	0.77	0.73	0.73
1 st Quartile	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

All evaluation data - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	7.4	1.5	1.5
Satisfactory	29.6	40.0	39.7
Moderately satisfactory	51.9	38.5	47.1
Moderately unsatisfactory	7.41	16.92	10.29
Unsatisfactory	3.70	3.08	1.47
Highly unsatisfactory	0	0	0
	100	100	100

	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.30	4.20	4.29
Standard deviation	0.85	0.84	0.73
1 st Quartile	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	5	5	5

Overall project achievement

PCRVP/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	20.0	21.4	23.0	28.3	30.1	33.9
Moderately satisfactory	60.0	57.1	54.1	50.0	52.1	51.8
Moderately unsatisfactory	12.0	11.9	13.1	11.7	13.7	12.5
Unsatisfactory	8.0	9.5	9.8	10.0	4.1	1.8
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.2
1 st Quartile	4	4	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	4	4	4	5	5	5
Standard deviation	0.8	0.84	0.86	0.89	0.77	0.71

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	5.9	4.8	5.7	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	29.4	28.6	25.7	22.2	20.0	20.9	23.3	22.2	23.3	23.6	31.9	30.1	33.8	31.4
Moderately satisfactory	35.3	42.9	48.6	48.9	46.7	48.8	58.1	55.6	55.0	52.8	47.8	50.6	50.0	51.4
Moderately unsatisfactory	23.5	19.0	17.1	24.4	28.9	27.9	16.3	18.5	15.0	15.3	11.6	15.7	15.0	17.1
Unsatisfactory	5.9	4.8	2.9	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	3.7	6.7	8.3	8.7	3.6	1.3	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Overall project achievement (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.07	4.1	4.1
Standard deviation	1.0	0.9	0.87	0.80	0.81	0.75	0.70	0.74	0.81	0.85	0.88	0.77	0.71	0.68
1 st Quartile	5	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5

All evaluation data – by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	4.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	28.6	20.0	22.2	31.9	31.4
Moderately satisfactory	42.9	46.7	55.6	47.8	51.4
Moderately unsatisfactory	19.0	28.9	18.5	11.6	17.1
Unsatisfactory	4.8	2.2	3.7	8.7	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.1
Standard deviation	0.9	0.81	0.74	0.88	0.68
1 st Quartile	4	3	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	5	4	4	5	5

IFAD performance PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	4.0	2.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	24.0	26.2	31.1	31.7	41.1	42.9
Moderately satisfactory	60.0	52.4	49.2	51.7	45.2	44.6
Moderately unsatisfactory	12.0	19.0	16.4	15.0	12.3	12.5
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.7	1.4	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.3
1 st Quartile	4	4	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	5	5	5	5	5	5
Standard deviation	0.69	0.73	0.76	0.72	0.72	0.68

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	3.3	2.4	4.5	4.8	4.8	3.8	1.7	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	0.0	20.0	33.3	29.3	25.0	9.5	16.7	17.0	25.0	30.6	34.8	43.4	43.8	45.7
Moderately satisfactory	27.3	33.3	20.0	22.0	18.2	38.1	45.2	56.6	53.3	51.4	47.8	43.4	43.8	40.0
Moderately unsatisfactory	72.7	46.7	40.0	43.9	50.0	45.2	31.0	18.9	18.3	13.9	15.9	12.0	12.5	14.3
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	3.3	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.4	3.8	1.7	2.8	1.4	1.2	0.0	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
Standard deviation	0.4	0.8	1	0.95	0.99	0.86	0.87	0.81	0.77	0.77	0.73	0.72	0.68	0.71
1 st Quartile	3.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	3	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5

IFAD performance (cont.)

All evaluation data – by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	0.0	4.5	3.8	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	20.0	25.0	17.0	34.8	45.7
Moderately satisfactory	33.3	18.2	56.6	47.8	40.0
Moderately unsatisfactory	46.7	50.0	18.9	15.9	14.3
Unsatisfactory	0.0	2.3	3.8	1.4	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100	100	100	100	100

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	3.7	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.3
Standard deviation	0.8	0.99	0.81	0.73	0.71
1 st Quartile	3	3	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	4	5	4	5	5

Government performance

PCR/PPA data series – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Highly satisfactory	4.0	2.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	20.0	16.7	19.7	20.0	20.5	17.9
Moderately satisfactory	48.0	42.9	39.3	43.3	57.5	64.3
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.0	26.2	27.9	25.0	13.7	10.7
Unsatisfactory	12.0	11.9	11.5	11.7	8.2	7.1
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014
Average rating	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.9
Standard deviation	3	3	3	3	4	4
1 st Quartile	4	4	4	4	4	4
3 rd Quartile	0.99	0.96	0.96	0.91	0.81	0.75

All evaluation data – by year of completion

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	16.7	11.1	9.4	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.7	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	16.7	16.7	25.0	16.7	27.3	23.8	26.2	22.6	20.0	20.8	24.6	22.9	25.0	24.3
Moderately satisfactory	33.3	55.6	43.8	33.3	29.5	33.3	45.2	45.3	43.3	41.7	42.0	56.6	56.3	58.6
Moderately unsatisfactory	33.3	16.7	15.6	50.0	34.1	35.7	23.8	20.8	25.0	25.0	23.2	13.3	13.8	14.3
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	4.5	7.1	4.8	9.4	10.0	11.1	10.1	7.2	5.0	2.9
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Government performance (cont.)

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4	4.2	3	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0
Standard deviation	1.1	0.9	0	0.75	1.03	0.90	0.83	0.93	0.95	0.95	0.92	0.81	0.77	0.71
1 st Quartile	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.0	4.0	4.0	4
3 rd Quartile	5	4.8	3	4	5	4	4.75	4	4	4	4.0	4.0	4.3	4

All evaluation data – by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	11.1	2.3	1.9	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	16.7	27.3	22.6	24.6	24.3
Moderately satisfactory	55.6	29.5	45.3	42.0	58.6
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.7	34.1	20.8	23.2	14.3
Unsatisfactory	0.0	4.5	9.4	10.1	2.9
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.2	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.0
Standard deviation	0.9	1.03	0.93	0.92	0.71
1 st Quartile	4.0	3	3	3.0	4.0
3 rd Quartile	4.8	5	4	4.0	4.0

Number of projects per each rating in the PCRV/PPA series

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<=6	<=5	<=4	<=3	<=2	<=1
Relevance	4	51	61	11	1	0
Effectiveness	0	40	60	19	9	0
Efficiency	1	24	50	37	13	2
Project performance	0	22	70	28	7	0
Rural poverty impact	0	38	66	12	5	0
Sustainability	0	17	64	39	6	1
Innovation and scaling up	4	46	51	21	4	2
Gender equality and women's empowerment	4	49	52	15	4	0
IFAD performance	1	47	60	19	1	0
Government performance	1	25	65	25	12	0
Overall project achievement	0	37	66	16	8	0
Household income and assets	0	48	51	9	8	0
Human and social capital and empowerment	5	58	44	15	3	0
Food security and agricultural productivity	0	38	53	12	7	0
Environment	1	13	57	20	4	0
Institutions and policy	5	30	53	21	7	0

Per cent of projects per each rating in PCRV/PPA series

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<=6	<=5	<=4	<=3	<=2	<=1
Relevance	3.1	39.8	47.7	8.6	0.8	0.0
Effectiveness	0.0	31.3	46.9	14.8	7.0	0.0
Efficiency	0.8	18.9	39.4	29.1	10.2	1.6
Project performance	0.0	17.3	55.1	22.0	5.5	0.0
Rural poverty impact	0.0	31.4	54.5	9.9	4.1	0.0
Sustainability	0.0	13.4	50.4	30.7	4.7	0.8
Innovation and scaling up	3.1	35.9	39.8	16.4	3.1	1.6
Gender equality and women's empowerment	3.2	39.5	41.9	12.1	3.2	0.0
IFAD performance	0.8	36.7	46.9	14.8	0.8	0.0
Government performance	0.8	19.5	50.8	19.5	9.4	0.0
Overall project achievement	0.0	29.1	52.0	12.6	6.3	0.0
Household income and assets	0.0	41.4	44.0	7.8	6.9	0.0
Human and social capital and empowerment	4.0	46.4	35.2	12.0	2.4	0.0
Food security and agricultural productivity	0.0	34.5	48.2	10.9	6.4	0.0
Environment	1.1	13.7	60.0	21.1	4.2	0.0
Institutions and policy	4.3	25.9	45.7	18.1	6.0	0.0

IOE-PMD peer-to-peer comparison

Country	Project name	Relevance		Effectiveness		Efficiency		Project Performance		Rural poverty impact		Sustainability		Innovation and scaling up		Gender		IFAD		Government		Overall achievement	
		IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD
Albania	Programme for Sustainable Development in Rural Mountain Areas	3	4	3	4	4	4	3.33	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	5	3	4	3	4	4	4
Armenia	Farmer Market Access Programme	4	5	5	5	5	5	4.6		4	4	4	4	4		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Bangladesh	Market Infrastructure Development Project in Charland Regions	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5
Burkina Faso	Sustainable Rural Development Programme	5	5	5	5	4	4	4.7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	5
Burundi	Transitional Programme of Post-Conflict Reconstruction	5	5	5	5	3	4	4.33	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	n.a.	5	5	5	4	4	4	5
Cape Verde	Rural Poverty Alleviation Programme	4	5	5	5		4	4.5	5		5	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	6	4	4	4	5
Eritrea	Post-crisis Rural Recovery and Development Programme	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	4	5

Country	Project name	Relevance		Effective-ness		Efficiency		Project Perform-ance		Rural poverty impact		Sustainabi- lity		Innovation and scaling up		Gender		IFAD		Government		Overall achieve- ment	
		IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD
Ethiopia	Agricultural Marketing Improvement Programme	4	6	3	4	3	3	3.33	4	n.r.	4	3	4	3	4	2	n.r.	4	5	2	3	3	4
Guinea Bissau	Rural Rehabilitation and Community Development Project	5	6	3	4	2	3	3.3	4	3	4	3	4	4	5	4	5	3	3	3	3	3	4
Kenya	Southern Nyanza Community Development Project	5	5	5	5	3	4	4.3	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	n.r.	5	5	5	5	5	4	5
Laos	Northern Regions Sustainable Livelihoods through Livestock Development Programme	5	5	4	4	3	4	4		4	5	3	5	4		5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5
Madagascar	Rural Income Promotion Programme	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4
Malawi	Rural Livelihoods Support Programme	5	6	4	5	4	4	4.3	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	5
Mauritius	Marine and Agricultural Resources Support Programme	4	4	3	2	2	3	3		n.a.	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3
Mozambique	Rural Finance Support Programme	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	3	3	4	4	5	4	3	3	3	3	3	3

Country	Project name	Relevance		Effective-ness		Efficiency		Project Perform-ance		Rural poverty impact		Sustainabi- lity		Innovation and scaling up		Gender		IFAD		Government		Overall achieve- ment	
		IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD
Nicaragua	Technical Assistance Fund Programme for the Departments of Leon, Chinandega and Managua	5	5	5	5	4	5	4.6	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	5	6	5	6	4	4	5	5
Niger	Rehabilitation Initiative for Agricultural Development and Rural-Institutional Capacity-Building	5	5	4	4	5	5	4.6	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5
Niger	Project for the Promotion of Local Initiative for Development in Aguié	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	6	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5
Nigeria	Community-based Agricultural and Rural Development Programme	5	4	5	4	4	4	4.66	4	2	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	4
Pakistan	Programme for Increasing Sustainable Microfinance	5	5	5	5	6	6	5.3	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	4	5	5	6	5	4	5	5
Paraguay	Empowerment of Rural Poor Organizations and Harmonization of Investments Project	5	5	5	5	4	4	4.7	5	4	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	6	4	5	5	5

Country	Project name	Relevance		Effective-ness		Efficiency		Project Perform-ance		Rural poverty impact		Sustainabi- lity		Innovation and scaling up		Gender		IFAD		Government		Overall achieve- ment	
		IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD
Rwanda	Support Project for the Strategic Plan for the Transformation of Agriculture	6	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Rwanda	Rural Small and Microenterprise Promotion Project	5	5	4	4	4	4	4.33	4	4	5	3	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4
Sri Lanka	Dry Zone Livelihood Support and Partnership Programme	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	6	5	4	n.r.	4	5	5	5
Sri Lanka	Post-Tsunami Coastal Rehabilitation and Resource Management Programme	3	5	4	5	3	5	3	5	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	6	5	5	4	4	3	5
Swaziland	Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project	4	5	3	4	2	4	3	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	4
Turkey	Sivas – Erzincan Development Project	4	4	4	4	5	5	4.33	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4
Uganda	Community Agricultural Infrastructure Improvement Project	4	4	4	4	5	5	4		4	4	4	4	4		5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4

Country	Project name	Relevance		Effective-ness		Efficiency		Project Perform-ance		Rural poverty impact		Sustainabi- lity		Innovation and scaling up		Gender		IFAD		Govern- ment		Overall achieve- ment	
		IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD	IOE	PMD
Uganda	Rural Financial Services Programme	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	4
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Sustainable Rural Development Project For The Semi-Arid Region Phase II	4	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5		5
Yemen	Zones Of Falcon and Lara States	5	5	4	4	3	3	4.3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	6	4	4	4	4
Zambia	Rural Finance Programme	4	5	4	4	3	4	3.7	4	4	4.0	4	5	4	4	5	5.0	4	5	4	4	4	4
Average		4.50	5.00	4.22	4.41	3.81	4.19	4.19	4.56	4.14	4.50	3.78	4.34	4.38	4.75	4.40	4.74	4.34	4.81	3.94	4.09	4.13	4.47
Average Disconnect		-0.50		-0.19		-0.38		-0.36		-0.36		-0.56		-0.38		-0.34		-0.46		-0.16		-0.34	

Comparison of IOE's PPA ratings and PMD's PCR ratings for all evaluation criteria in projects completing in 2007-2015 (N=39)

Criteria	Mean ratings		Disconnect of mean rating	Mode ratings	
	IOE	PMD		IOE	PMD
17. Relevance	4.28	4.82	-0.54	4	5
18. Effectiveness	4.31	4.51	-0.20	5	5
19. Efficiency	4.08	4.28	-0.20	4	4
20. Project performance	4.00	4.56	-0.56	4	5
21. Rural poverty impact	4.00	4.41	-0.41	4	5
22. Sustainability	3.89	4.10	-0.21	4	4
23. Innovation and scaling-up	4.28	4.69	-0.41	4	5
24. Gender equality and women's empowerment	4.49	4.51	-0.02	5	5
25. IFAD performance	4.33	4.42	-0.09	4	5
26. Government performance	4.13	4.31	-0.18	4	5
27. Overall project achievement	4.31	4.49	-0.18	4	5
28. Household income and assets	4.33	4.50	-0.17	5	5
29. Human and social capital and empowerment	4.54	4.63	-0.09	5	5
30. Food security and agricultural productivity	4.29	4.66	-0.37	5	5
31. Environment	3.84	4.09	-0.25	4	4
32. Institutions and policy	4.31	4.63	-0.32	4	5