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IFAD is one of the few multilateral development organizations that produce a report such as the ARRI. First ARRI issued in 2003.

The ARRI has two objectives: (i) report on results and impacts; and (ii) identify lessons and systemic issues.

The 2016 ARRI draws on a robust sample of 270 project evaluations and 36 country programme evaluations.
Project Performance

- Positive evolution of performance IFAD6 – IFAD9

Key evaluation criteria

Percentage of projects rated MS+ by replenishment periods
Project Performance (cont.)

- External benchmarking with agricultural portfolio of other IFIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of projects with performance rated MS +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time period</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Areas for further improvement
  - Efficiency (69% MS+) and Sustainability (70% MS+)
  - Further increase performance from moderately satisfactory to satisfactory and higher
  - 2016 ARRI: 4 areas of attention to further raise performance
Areas of attention:
1. Targeting

- Factors that constrain IFAD’s targeting strategies and outreach to poorest strata include:
  
  - Poverty analysis at design not sufficiently sensitive and tailored to the differences among groups of rural poor.
  
  - Targeting strategies often not sufficiently flexible to adapt to changing contexts.
2. Nutrition mainstreaming

- Impact on food security and agricultural productivity is positive: 86% of projects MS+

- However:
  - Mainly driven by increased agricultural productivity
  - Limited evidence of impact on food security and nutrition
3. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)

- Weak M&E limits the **assessment and attribution of impact**;

- Project M&E receives **limited resources and attention**;

- Limited use of M&E data for **knowledge management**.
4. Financial management and fiduciary responsibility

- **Government performance as partner:** 82% MS+

- M&E
- Management of fiduciary aspects
- Capacity of Governments and commitment
- Timeliness and quality of PCR

- Financial management and fiduciary responsibility is an area for improvement
Performance at the country level

Performance of non-lending activities is moderately satisfactory

Performance of non-lending activities 2006-2015
Percentage rated moderately satisfactory or better by criteria
How to improve the performance at the country level

- Establish realistic objectives for non-lending activities
- Clear linkages between lending and non-lending activities;
- Allocate time, resources, incentives to systematize KM
- Introduce processes and instruments to measure the achievements of non-lending activities at the country level
Recommendations

- **Targeting**: Adapt to complexity of contexts and target groups; better diagnosis of beneficiaries’ characteristics at design.

- **Food security and nutrition**: All new projects, when relevant, should be nutrition-sensitive (2016-18 Action Plan to Mainstream Nutrition-Sensitive Agriculture).

- **Partnerships at country level for learning and scaling-up results**: COSOPs to articulate partnerships with RBAs, technical ministries and private sector; monitor and report in the RIDE.

- **Knowledge management**: More resources, time and efforts in systematizing KM.

- **2017 ARRI Learning Theme**: Financial management and fiduciary responsibilities.