



The Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD

Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation for the Arab Republic of Egypt

99th Session of the Evaluation Committee - Thursday, 26 October 2017

Independent Office
of Evaluation



Investing in rural people

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)

Recommendations (CPE 2005)	Follow up
Work through partnerships and engage in policy dialogue	Partly addressed
Shift the geographical focus of IFAD interventions	Insufficiently addressed
Revise the approach to rural finance	Partly addressed
Strengthen Emphasis on gender	Insufficiently addressed

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.