

Country context

Population: 13.2 million (2023)

Population living in rural areas: 72% (2023)

GDP per capita: US\$ 834 (2021)

Poverty headcount ratio at US\$ 2.15: 52% (2016)

Agricultural sector as proportion of GDP: 25% (2022)

Human Development Index: 0.534 – 165th out of 191 countries (2021)

Sources: World Bank; UNDP; ILO; National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda; MINAGRI.

IFAD operations

IFAD-approved investment projects **20** since 1981

Total portfolio cost US\$ **699.5** billion

IFAD financing US\$ **391.8** million

Evaluation coverage

Projects evaluated **9** Total portfolio cost US\$ **509.6** million

IFAD financing US\$ **280.1** million Government co-financing: US\$ **141.7** million

Other co-financing US\$ **87.8** million

Country strategies

Country Strategic Opportunities Programmes (COSOPs)

1999

2019

2002

2013

2007

Main areas covered by projects



Value chain development



Gender equality and women's empowerment



Rural finance

Natural resource management and climate change



Rural infrastructure



Main evaluation findings

Strengths

Areas for improvement

1

The strategic focus of the country programme on sustainably increasing agricultural productivity, improving post-harvest practices, strengthening market linkages and improving nutrition was consistent with Rwanda's development priorities.

2

IFAD's comparative advantage in supporting smallholders to boost productivity and access markets was well recognized by the Government and development partners.

3

The country programme demonstrated continuity, and built on the experiences of previous projects in dairy and small livestock value chain development. It also paid more attention to supporting downstream activities along agricultural value chains.

4

The country programme introduced various innovations and achieved significant results, especially in terms of increased agricultural and livestock production and productivity, increased income, improved food security and greater involvement of women.

5

IFAD's project designs were done in close collaboration with the government, which showed strong ownership of the country programme and commitment to achieve results, supported by a well-defined institutional structure and functional accountability system.

1

Several issues highlighted by the previous country programme were not adequately addressed, with continued limited emphasis on non-lending activities, support to districts and harmonizing approaches to rural finance and cooperative development.

2

The country programme needs to strengthen its poverty targeting strategies and improve its youth focus, tailoring interventions to the actual needs of different target groups and contexts.

3

In terms of market orientation, there is still room for greater engagement of the private sector, in both project design and implementation.

4

Limited access to finance, lack of collateral, poor financial literacy and limited tailored services continued to constrain the productive capacity and inclusion of smallholder farmers, small-scale entrepreneurs and vulnerable groups.

5

While the country programme had a strong focus on increasing agricultural production and productivity, insufficient efforts were made to effectively address malnutrition.

Recommendations

1.

Sharpen the thematic focus, with a greater reliance on markets and private initiative.

2.

The next COSOP should clearly state a focus on environment and natural resources management, climate change and addressing malnutrition.

3.

Refine the targeting strategies to sharpen the poverty focus and increase attention to youth inclusion.

4.

Articulate a coherent action plan for non-lending activities that allows to increase IFAD's scale of impact and influence.

5.

IFAD and the Government should come up with an action plan to address recurrent issues, to make sure the Single Project Implementation Unit is fit-for-purpose