Republic of the Sudan
Country Strategy and Programme Evaluation

COUNTRY CONTEXT

Area: 1.882 million km²
Population: 40.5 million (2017)
Rural population: 65.6% (2017)

36.1% global poverty line
25.2% extreme poverty line

Chronic malnutrition: 38.2%
16.3% acute malnutrition (2014)

Life expectancy at birth: 64.5 years (2016)

2011 - secession of South Sudan
2019 - beginning of democratic transition

IFAD OPERATIONS (1979-2018)

Total cost: US $815 million
IFAD investment financing approved: US $335 million
Number of IFAD loans approved: 21

EVALUATION COVERAGE

Years: 10 (2009-2018)
Projects evaluated: 9
Total cost: US $375 million
IFAD financing: US $198 million
COSOPs: 2009, 2013
Beneficiaries: over 220,000 households

AREAS COVERED BY PROJECTS

Crop & livestock production*
Natural resource management & governance
Access to finance
Community development
Rural infrastructure
Policy development

* Focus on rain-fed agriculture | Pastoralism and agropastoralism

Sources: World Bank, African Development Bank
**Areas of Strength**

- Impactful interventions, with a focus on rain-fed agriculture – e.g. crop & livestock productivity, natural resource management (NRM) and climate change
- Significant contributions towards strengthening NRM governance and reducing NRM conflicts between settled farmers and pastoralists: e.g. 6 conflict resolution centres established
- Remarkable results achieved for human and social capital and empowerment, e.g. 900 community-level institutions strengthened; women socially and economically empowered
- Investments in infrastructure (e.g. water supplies, rural access roads) were relevant to rural population’s basic and social needs

**Areas for Improvement**

- Modest performance in knowledge management and monitoring & evaluation impeded optimal policy engagement
- Further partnership-building with development partners & non-state actors required, to consolidate project gains
- Greater focus on institutional development and government engagement needed, to foster scaling-up and sustainability of results
- Insufficient attention to articulating pathways to reduce food insecurity and malnutrition
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**Recommendations**

- Identify opportunities for partnerships and cofinancing, to scale up achievements in key areas and have greater impact
- Articulate better the theory of change in country and project strategies that underline expected poverty impact
- Ensure an inclusive and differentiated targeting strategy
- Strengthen the knowledge management platform to foster information-sharing and effective monitoring of IFAD portfolio
- Support institutional capacity development of key Government counterpart agencies at local and state level, while strengthening links with IFAD-financed projects to enhance sustainability
- Enhance IFAD’s capacity to be better engaged in project supervision and reviews, knowledge management, coordination across strategic partnerships and policy dialogue