Republic of Turkey

Country programme evaluation 2003-2015

IFAD
Investing in rural people

Independent Office of Evaluation

Population: 75.9 million (2014)

Rural population: 20.5 million; 27% of total population (2014)

GDP growth: 2.87% (2014) in real terms

Poverty headcount ratio (at national poverty line): 16.3% of population (2014)

Life expectancy at birth: 75 years (2014)

Human dev index: 0.761 (2014)

Sources: IFAD Project and Programme Management System; United Nations Development Programme International Human Development Indicators; World Bank, World Development Indicators; Ministry of Development of Turkey.

IFAD operations

(since 1982)

10 projects

US$ **661** million total project portfolio

US$ **189** million funds lent by IFAD

Main areas

- rural infrastructure
- natural resource management
- agriculture
- rural financial services

Country strategies

2000 ▶ 2006

An addendum to the 2006 country strategy was prepared in 2010 for the period 2011-2012

Evaluation storyline

Turkey is both a borrower and donor country, opening further opportunities for partnering, in particular in South-South and Triangular Cooperation

Beyond IFAD's financing role, there has been demand for IFAD to be a more active player in sharing knowledge and experience as a way to provide additional value to the partnership.

IFAD is a collaborating partner in implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in Turkey

IFAD is appreciated for:

- addressing marked regional disparities;
- its rural poverty focus, its technical expertise, country experience, and its potential to bring international knowledge and experience to Turkey.

The country strategy reported country-wide analysis of poverty and disparity, but did not define or guide targeting at the household level

Since 2006, the targeting approach has become diffused rather than focused on the rural poor.
At the same time, the country strategy documents reflect a diminishing focus on gender and women's empowerment since 2006 and largely ignored youth.

Main evaluation findings

Areas of strength

The country strategy (COSOP) recognized aspects of the country context and priorities of the Government

The strategy maintained a geographic focus in eastern and south-eastern Anatolia and a number of counties/districts in central Anatolia and the Black Sea region.

Projects interventions were relevant and effective...

While rural infrastructure tended to generate broad-based benefits, the projects made important advances in increasing incomes and assets, in agricultural productivity and in supporting commercialization.

Geographical targeting was appropriate...

The current focus of targeting on an area basis is appropriate and needs to continue until poverty reduction is fully achieved.

Projects created a development momentum through integration and partnerships

The most successful aspects of the portfolio have occurred where the interventions were combined within the same village or in a specific value/supply chain. These have potential to create more development momentum rather than scattered interventions.

Areas for improvement

Non-lending activities were given a low priority

Policy engagement was limited and conducted mainly through the COSOP and the projects and within a narrow circle. IFAD's partnerships with other international development partners have been weak and there has been limited level of cooperation with the two other Rome-based UN agencies. Knowledge management activities have also been limited.

...with mixed results

Projects were not able to attract the private sector. Sustainability remains a concern in view of inadequate private sector involvement in supply chain management, inadequate preparation of local institutions for taking over infrastructure, insufficient collaboration with the rural financial sector, and a focus on high-cost agricultural technology packages.

...but should have been more focused on inclusiveness

Access to project benefits remains a challenge for poorer farmers, women and youth. There is evidence of income disparity even within project areas and within targeted villages.

A more integrated and decentralized approach with implementing partners would have improved projects

A stronger relationship with the Regional Development Administrations may have facilitated this approach given their multi-stakeholder Advisory Board structure including NGOs and the private sector.

Recommendations

1 Prepare a new IFAD Country strategy (COSOP) for Turkey

The new COSOP should be prepared with a proper analysis of IFAD's strengths and limitations in Turkey and the opportunities and threats it faces in building more effective partnerships.
It is imperative to engage relevant national and international resource people from within and outside the public sector and the donor community.

2 Improve targeting in terms of scope and accessibility to project benefits

Targeting should be improved particularly for poorer farmers and specific target groups, including women and youth. Future programming should be more precise in identifying target groups, use participatory processes, relevant interventions and new partners.

3 Strengthen IFAD's non-lending activities and ensure synergies with the portfolio

There is a need to strengthen and diversify partnerships, further enhance investment in knowledge management, and support South-South and Triangular Cooperation to facilitate transfer of knowledge and technical expertise to IFAD operations in other countries.

4 Emphasize innovation and scaling up as key strategic priorities

Innovation is required to reduce dependency on public programmes and build sustainable institutional support.
For scaling up, there is a need to shift from a project-centric approach to influencing other partners through leveraging policies, knowledge and resources.

5 Strengthen the strategic focus on women and youth

A consistent, strategic focus on gender equality and women's empowerment is required, including Gender Action Plans and gender equality in access to project resources and benefits at the project design stage.
A strengthened focus on youth in the new COSOP and project designs is recommended.

IFAD
Investing in rural people

IFAD - International Fund for Agricultural Development
Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE)
Via Paolo di Dono 44 - 00142 Rome, Italy
Telephone +39 0654591 - Facsimile +39 065043463
E-mail evaluation@ifad.org
Web site www.ifad.org/evaluation