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IFAD in Mozambique, an overview

• 12 projects funded thus far, total cost: US$370 million
  ❖ IFAD highly conc. loans: US$ 212 million (57%)
  ❖ Gov counterpart: US$ 40m (11%)
  ❖ International cofinancing: US$ 110m (30%)
  ❖ Beneficiaries’ contribution: US$ 8m (2%)

• Country office since 2003; resident Country Director since mid-2015
CSPE scope

• Second CSPE in the county (previous completed in 2009). Lending portfolio (2010-2019), 4 loan-projects

• Five grants, both in support of loans and self-standing

• Other Non-lending activities: policy dialogue, knowledge management, partnership building

• Performance of IFAD and the Government

• 2011 COSOP performance
Main evaluation findings

Lending portfolio - strengths

• Technology transfer contribution: poultry, read meat, cassava, fishing gear and fish post-capture conservation (post-harvest handling, processing and marketing)

• Promotion of accumulative savings and credit associations (ASCAs), for a large number of poor rural women and men

• Contribution to capacity of public organizations (e.g., demand-responsive extension services; national organizations supporting artisanal fisheries and aquaculture)

• Attention to integrating women among beneficiaries and as leaders of grassroots groups and associations
Main evaluation findings

Lending portfolio – challenges and issues

- Low efficiency, significant delays in projects’ implementation
- Focus on small farmers with marketable surplus (less attention to potentially food insecure farmers)
- Overall, limited financial services for beneficiaries, partly due to IFAD’s withdrawal from the sector. A barrier to engagement in value chains
- Low level of attention to environmental sustainability
- Limited gender analysis during project planning, implementation and M&E (e.g., sex-disaggregated data)
Main evaluation findings

Non-lending activities

• **Knowledge management**: mostly focused on communication products. Limited analytical work and little capturing of experience in other countries.

• **Partnerships**: IFAD highly-valued partner for the Government; solid with Rome-based Agencies, other UN organizations and bilateral partners, reflected in resources leveraged.

• **Policy engagement**: advocacy and support for mainstreaming nutrition in the National Agricultural Extension System. Constraints: high turnover of CPMs and limited country office staffing and resources.
Main evaluation findings

Non-lending activities (cont.)

• **Grants.** High synergy between grants and loans. Filled in some design gaps (e.g., nutrition, HIV/AIDS and natural resource management)

• **Regional grants** have contributed key technical assistance on phyto-sanitary control, fully integrated in the National Agricultural Extension System.
Key conclusions

• Programme relevant to the needs of the country and aligned with national policies and strategies

• Two main operational shortcomings: (i) focus on surplus farmers, less so on food-insecure households; (ii) limited progress in providing financial services adapted to the poor’s needs (except ASCAs);

• Mixed experience in engaging service providers

• Non-lending activities had adequate treatment in the COSOP but there were limited resources available
Six Strategic Recommendations

1. **Focus on rural poor and on more vulnerable groups, including women, youth and people living with HIV.** Project strategies must tackle the obstacles they face in participating in value chains.

2. **Full attention to sustainable natural resources management and to strengthening climate-change resilience.**

3. **IFAD’s support to the rural finance sector to be conceptualized within a long-term commitment horizon and based on lessons learned.**
Six Strategic Recommendations (cont.)

4. **Enhance efficiency of financial execution.** While maintaining harmonization with the Government’s systems and procedures, pursue fast-tracking mechanisms for contract approval.

5. **Develop guidance for engaging external service providers in project implementation.**

6. **Dedicate further attention and resources to knowledge management and policy dialogue.**