

Investing in rural people

INDEPENDENT OFFICE OF EVALUATION

IFAD's engagement in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations

CORPORATE-LEVEL EVALUATION



Countries characterized by



Weak policies, institutions and governance



Meagre economic growth



Widespread inequality



Poor human development

Including situations of



Strong diversity: Large/small countries Rapidly growing or stagnant Resource-rich or poor



Conflict Recent conflict Violence

IFAD OPERATIONS IN FRAGILE STATES

45% \$1.2bn

allocation of IFAD's performance-based allocation system in 2013-15 to fragile states



Percentage of funds lent on highly concessional terms (very low interest rates) to fragile states

60%



Percentage of ongoing projects in the current IFAD portfolio in fragile states

IFAD POLICIES UNDERPINNING ACTIVITIES IN FRAGILE STATES



Policy on crisis prevention and recovery

- reinforced IFAD's approach to the prevention of crisis
- defined the resource allocation process with respect to the financing of post-crisis interventions
- enhanced programme implementation procedures and processes to work more effectively in crisis-prone and crisis-affected countries



Paper on IFAD's role in fragile states

assessed IFAD's operations in fragile states and outlined a proposed approach to fragile states

Guidelines for disaster early recovery

developed to support staff in implementing timely and effective interventions in a postdisaster context.

disaster context.

The guidelines emphasize the need for IFAD involvement in early recovery to support the rehabilitation of rural livelihoods and ensure a swift transition from relief to long-term sustainable development



EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

EVALUATION TIMELINE



Assess the performance of IFAD's engagement in fragile states and identify the factors behind current performance



Generate findings, lessons and recommendations that will assist IFAD in deciding on the future directions



IFAD strategies and operations

2004 - 2013

MAIN FINDINGS

The performance of IFAD operations across most evaluation criteria in fragile states is generally weaker than in other country contexts





IFAD's broader policy framework is fragmented and does not tackle many wider issues related to fragility and conflict County strategies (COSOPs) and project design generally contain good poverty analysis, but less analysis of fragility and conflict issues





There have been improvements in the operating model, but further customization is needed to respond to the specific requirements of working in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations



The assumption that IFAD's performance in fragile states is worse than in the rest of the portfolio is not borne by evidence. It is consistently worse in a small group of countries with very limited capacity



屋

IFAD's current approach to classifying fragile states needs reconsideration, as it is based on the classification of countries by other organizations

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMEN



Country presence and direct supervision and implementation support have brought benefits

There have been significant improvements in countries that have always been fragile in overall project achievement, project effectiveness, IFAD's performance as a partner and rural poverty impact





IFAD's policy framework needs to provide better guidance on how IFAD should tailor its support to specific contexts



Weak data collection and inadequate M&E pose serious challenges to results measurement and reporting and the identification of good practices and lessons learned

MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy and strategy

- Adopt a simpler approach to classifiying fragile states, specific to IFAD's mandate and priorities
- Draft a policy statement defining how IFAD plans to engage with fragile and conflictaffected states, including subnational situations
 - Change the approach to analysis in the COSOP

Project and programme design

Design programmes to identify where IFAD can and cannot engage

 Simplify objectives and overall design in countries with low government capacity Project and programme implementation

- Increase resources for supervision and implementation support based on country need
- Prioritize new IFAD country offices and outposting of country programme managers in fragile states
 - Create and build strategic partnerships to maximize complementary skills

Empowerment of staff

 Introduce specific incentives for staff working in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations and promote capacitybuilding and training Results measurement and learning

- Plan and resource project M&E more selectively
- Revise IFAD's results measurement framework to fill major gaps in indicators such as for women's empowerment and institutional performance

