The ARRI presents a synthesis of IFAD’s PERFORMANCE, LESSONS and CHALLENGES. It highlights CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES and LESSONS LEARNED to enhance IFAD’s development effectiveness.

Total number of project-level evaluations (projects completed between 2007 and 2019)

CSPEs: 58 (2007-2020)

298

In addition to analysing performance ratings of project-level evaluations, the 2021 ARRI also features LEARNING-ORIENTED DISCUSSIONS ON FACTORS affecting project efficiency and performance in countries with fragile situations.

Overview of key performance criteria using IOE ratings

Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better, 2007-2018 *

On overall project achievement, 76% of projects completed between 2017-2019 were rated moderately satisfactory or above.


FLUCTUATING, RECENT IMPROVEMENT

government, performance; efficiency; sustainability; innovation; scaling up

NO CHANGE OR SLIGHT DECLINE

IFAD performance; relevance, effectiveness, gender and women’s empowerment, rural poverty impact

POSITIVE, STEADY

environment and natural resources management; adaptation to climate change
Operations in countries with fragile situations

Average project performance ratings over the long term were lower than other countries, but performance improved in recent periods.

IFAD has valuable operational experience in contexts of fragility, e.g. providing support to inclusive natural resource governance.

Some projects did well in social inclusion of e.g. young ex-combatants, pastoralists; however, in others, even if specific groups (e.g. ex-combatants, war-disabled) were part of the target group in design, there was no evidence of their effective targeting or monitoring.

CONCLUSIONS

IFAD and governments must act both at design and during implementation to improve project efficiency.

Capitalizing on its experience, IFAD needs solid strategies informed by dedicated conflict and fragility analyses, to address both the drivers and consequences of fragility.

Improving performance of non-lending activities at country programme level – knowledge management, partnership-building and in-country policy engagement – remains a challenge and requires strategic actions and resources.

IOE-IFAD Management engagement is required, to develop shared understanding on the basis for assessing certain evaluation criteria with widening disconnects between IOE ratings and project self-ratings.