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Portfolio overview

• Total portfolio over CSPE period US$580.2 million, IFAD (loans and grants) US$239.2 million
• Portfolio: rural credit (42%), irrigation (20%), rural infrastructure (14%) and technology development and transfer (7%)
• Lending terms moved from “highly concessional” to “intermediate” (2002) to “ordinary” (2011)
• 2 COSOPs (2006 and 2012)
Main strategic threads

• Strengthening agricultural productivity in the old lands through improved farming systems and more efficient use of land and water resources

• Improving settlements in the new lands, through provision of comprehensive infrastructure and sustainable land and water management practices

• Supporting economic diversification and employment generation through rural finance and capacity-building
## Follow up from last CPE (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations (CPE 2005)</th>
<th>Follow up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work through partnerships and engage in policy dialogue</td>
<td>Partly addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift the geographical focus of IFAD interventions</td>
<td>Insufficiently addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the approach to rural finance</td>
<td>Partly addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Emphasis on gender</td>
<td>Insufficiently addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall country programme & strategy

• Strategy addressed Government’s needs and funding gaps, in particular in the new lands.
• Alignment with Government policies was partial and selective; regional diversity, food security and gender equality not specifically addressed.
• Strategy did not envisage re-focus on the new lands as undertaken during the 2015 MTR.
• Contribution to pro-poor sustainable use of resources, sustainable employment, participatory governance and gender equality was limited.
Rural poverty impact

• Positive impact on agricultural productivity through improved farming systems (old lands) and water and land management (new lands)
• Micro-lending has enabled smallholders to procure inputs and assets, in particular livestock
• Settlement development helped strengthening social and human capital in the new lands
• Limited contribution to non-agricultural diversification and job creation
Non-lending activities

• IFAD managed **knowledge** at regional level; less attention to Government’s role and ownership

• Lessons not systematically learned from operations; good practices were lost

• **Partnerships** have been good with key implementing partners

• **Policy engagement** around lending operations; mainly through supervision and implementation support
Conclusions

• High degree of continuity and focus in country programme.
• Concentrated and focused approaches effective in addressing poverty issues on a smaller scale.
• Rural finance plays pivotal role in the portfolio; performance and growth depends on expanded partnerships.
• Resources for capacity building were insufficient.
• Knowledge and experiences not adequately captured; not used to enable progressive learning.
• Partnerships were limited and coordination was weak.
Recommendations

1. Sharpen **poverty and geographic focus** and refine **poverty targeting**; improve poverty analysis, monitor disaggregated benefits.

2. Sharpen **thematic focus**; disengage from thematic areas where IFAD has no implementation experience or strategic partners.

3. Establish structure for **effective coordination and technical support** within a progressing **programmatic approach**.

4. Manage **knowledge from loans & grants**; establish clear roles and responsibilities in the country.

5. Prepare strategy for effective **capacity-building** of community-level institutions with a perspective on scaling up.