



## Progress Report on the Corporate Level Evaluation on IFAD's Engagement in Fragile and Conflict Affected States and Situations

Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD  
7-8 October 2014

# Definition



“Fragile states are characterized by weak policies, weak institutions and weak governance, resulting in meagre economic growth, widespread inequality and poor human development. Fragile states are more exposed to the risk of outbreaks of violence than are non-fragile states. Fragile states may be well endowed with natural resources or be resource poor”.

*Source: IFAD 2006 Policy on Crisis Prevention and Recovery.*

# Evaluation objectives and timelines



- Evaluation approach paper discussed by Evaluation Committee:  
<https://webapps.ifad.org/members/ec/82/docs/EC-2014-82-W-P-6.pdf>
- Main objectives: (i) assess the performance of IFAD's engagement in fragile and conflict affected states and situations (FCS); (ii) identify explanatory factors of performance; and (iii) generate findings, lessons and recommendations.
- Evaluation covers IFAD's strategies and operations from 2004-2013 (10 years). Country visits currently underway.
- Final evaluation report and management response presented to the Executive Board in April 2015.

# Background



- IFAD classifies member states as fragile states based on AsDB, AfDB, OECD and World Bank combined list.
- In 2014, 48 IFAD member states were classified as fragile states. Nearly half are also classified as MICs.
- About 1.25b people live in countries affected by fragility, conflict and violence.
- Fragile States have higher poverty rates, lower growth rates, and weaker human development indicators than other low-income countries.
- Fragile States are also diverse: conflict, post-conflict, chronically violent, rapidly growing, slow-growing, resource-rich, resource-poor, very large and very small.

# IFAD policy and operations



- Since 2004, three dedicated policies guide IFAD's work in FCS: (i) 2006 Policy on crisis prevention and recovery; (ii) 2008 Role in fragile states; and (iii) 2011 Guidelines for disaster early recovery.
- Fragile states account for around 45% of PBAS allocation in 2013-15 (around USD1.2 billion). Around 60% of the funds will be lent on HC terms.
- Around 40% of IFAD member states with ongoing operations are classified as fragile states.
- 40% of ongoing projects in the current portfolio are in fragile states.

# Key questions and limitations



## Key questions:

- How has IFAD's engagement in fragile states and conflict affected situations changed over time?
- How does conflict affect project implementation and supervision
- What evidence is there of impacts that take core issues in fragile states and conflict situations

## Limitations

- i. Countries are not permanently classified as fragile states
- ii. There is no recognized list of countries with fragile situations
- iii. Previous evaluations did not emphasize fragility

# Project performance



- Project performance is less satisfactory in FS as compared to other countries (*source: ARRI*).

Distribution of ratings for overall project achievement by category of country, 2002-2011 (% of projects evaluated)		
Evaluation rating	Fragile states	Other countries
Highly satisfactory	-	-
Satisfactory	9	21
Moderately satisfactory	43	56
Moderately unsatisfactory	39	19
Unsatisfactory	9	4
Highly unsatisfactory	-	-
TOTAL	100%	100%

# Country programme performance: Average rating



(source: CPEs 2008-2013).

Evaluation rating	Fragile states	Non-fragile states
Non-lending activities	3.7	3.9
COSOP performance	4.0	4.3
Overall IFAD-Government partnership	4.2	4.4

- However, in fragile states with ICOs *IFAD's own performance* is 4.1 as compared to 3.8 in non-fragile states without ICOs and 4.3 in non-fragile states with ICOs.



# Some evaluation issues & questions (1)



## IFAD's policy framework

- The 2011-2015 strategic framework pays attention to IFAD's role in fragile states. The 2002-2005 and 2007-2010 frameworks made no reference.
- Guidance appears comprehensive on natural disasters and crises. How is institutional fragility treated in conflict-prone and conflict-affected states.
- How do the policy documents (including COSOPs) respond to fragile situations in non-fragile states?

# Some evaluation issues & questions (2)



## COSOPs

- Fragility classification is unwelcome to member states and complicates dialogue.
- How do COSOPs treat fragility and the associated risks?
- The integration of knowledge from secondary fragility analysis and evaluation lessons in COSOPs is essential.
- Are adequate efforts and resources allocated to analytic work for COSOP preparation, to ensure differentiated approach?

# Some evaluation issues & questions (3)



## Projects

- The need to fit assistance to context, and having a thorough understanding of context, is important.
- Projects in fragile states need simple objectives and design. How can IFAD support institutions in FCS improve their capacity?
- Higher risk of failure: should different metrics be used to assess performance of projects in fragile states/situations?
- Clear articulation and monitoring of risks to ensure necessary adjustments if risks materialize.