



## Country context

**Population:** 84.78 million (2021)

**Population living in rural areas:** 23% (2020)

**GDP per capita:** US\$ 9,661.2 (2021)

**Population living below the national poverty line:** 15% (2019)

**Agricultural sector as proportion of GDP:** 5.5% (2020)

**Human Development Index:** 0.838 – 48th out of 191 countries (2021)

Sources: World Bank; UNDP.

## IFAD operations

Total portfolio cost  
US\$ **804.5** million

IFAD financing  
US\$ **260** million

IFAD-approved  
investment projects  
**11**  
since 1982

## Evaluation coverage 2015-2022

Total portfolio cost  
US\$ **232.2** million

IFAD financing  
US\$ **136.6** million

Projects  
evaluated **4**

## Country strategies

Country Strategic  
Opportunities  
Programmes  
(COSOPs)

**2000** **2006**  
**2016**

## Main areas covered by projects

Agricultural  
diversification



Agricultural value  
chain development  
and market access



Climate change  
resilience



Natural resource  
management



# Main evaluation findings

## Strengths

**1** The overarching theme of resilience of social and ecological livelihoods in the upland areas, of the country strategy and programme, was found to be pertinent, as well as the development approaches applied by the programme to address rural poverty in geographically remote and marginalized areas.

**2** Over the evaluated period, the strategic partnership between IFAD and the Government was solid, and was translated into an effective operational involvement of government agencies within targeted provinces.

**3** IFAD-supported programme contributed to economic diversification, increased agricultural productivity and production in both crop and animal production, as well as more resilient agricultural ecosystems.

**4** Over the evaluated period, efforts to target specific groups – women, youth and nomadic groups – have been continuous and improved over years.

**5** IFAD-supported projects took into account gender gaps in the country context, and supported actions that led to women's empowerment, including increased income and increased participation and leadership in decision-making bodies.

## Areas for improvement

**1** While there were efforts to learn from previous interventions in designing new ones, there were insufficient learning within the country programme, weak consolidation of achieved results and low contribution of grants to program effectiveness.

**2** Despite evidence showed strong positive partnerships between IFAD and the Government, partnerships with other actors were limited, if not absent.

**3** In terms of policy engagement, the evaluation found no evidence of concrete policy results or changes due to IFAD-supported operations over the evaluated period.

**4** Supports to value chain development activities for the processing and marketing of agricultural products, and for access of poor farmers to markets led to modest results.

**5** Despite IFAD strengthened its presence in Türkiye over the evaluation period, its visibility was weakened by its location in Istanbul, while key national and international partners are located in Ankara.

## Recommendations

**1**

*Further prioritize the resilience of rural livelihoods in mountain areas in an integrated manner, by deploying approaches that build on the existing country potentials in value-chain segments.*

**2**

*Leverage the strategic partnership between IFAD and the Government, beyond portfolio oversight, to foster engagement on policy matters and effective knowledge management for greater scaling up of results.*

**3**

*Improve the inclusiveness of the country programme towards poor and vulnerable rural women, as well as youth.*

**4**

*Strengthen the programmatic approach in the delivery of IFAD's support, and foster the learning culture, to address persistent implementation challenges.*