IFAD's engagement in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations

COUNTRY-LEVEL EVALUATION

Countries characterized by

- Weak policies, institutions and governance
- Meagre economic growth
- Widespread inequality
- Poor human development

Including situations of

- Strong diversity: Large/small countries, Rapidly growing or stagnant, Resource-rich or poor
- Conflict: Recent conflict, Violence

IFAD OPERATIONS IN FRAGILE STATES

- 45% $1.2bn allocation of IFAD’s performance-based allocation system in 2013-15 to fragile states
- 60% Percentage of funds lent on highly concessional terms (very low interest rates) to fragile states
- 40% Percentage of ongoing projects in the current IFAD portfolio in fragile states

IFAD POLICIES UNDERPINNING ACTIVITIES IN FRAGILE STATES

- Policy on crisis prevention and recovery: reinforced IFAD’s approach to the prevention of crisis, defined the resource allocation process with respect to the financing of post-crisis interventions, enhanced programme implementation procedures and processes to work more effectively in crisis-prone and crisis-affected countries
- Guidelines for disaster early recovery: developed to support staff in implementing timely and effective interventions in a post-disaster context. The guidelines emphasize the need for IFAD involvement in early recovery to support the rehabilitation of rural livelihoods and ensure a swift transition from relief to long-term sustainable development

2006
- Policy on crisis prevention and recovery

2008
- Paper on IFAD’s role in fragile states: assessed IFAD’s operations in fragile states and outlined a proposed approach to fragile states

2011
- Guidelines for disaster early recovery
EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

1. Assess the performance of IFAD’s engagement in fragile states and identify the factors behind current performance.

2. Generate findings, lessons and recommendations that will assist IFAD in deciding on future directions.

EVALUATION TIMELINE

IFAD strategies and operations

2004 - 2013

MAIN FINDINGS

The performance of IFAD operations across most evaluation criteria in fragile states is generally weaker than in other country contexts.

IFAD’s broader policy framework is fragmented and does not tackle many wider issues related to fragility and conflict.

County strategies (COSOPs) and project design generally contain good poverty analysis, but less analysis of fragility and conflict issues.

There have been improvements in the operating model, but further customization is needed to respond to the specific requirements of working in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations.

STRENGTHS

The assumption that IFAD’s performance in fragile states is worse than in the rest of the portfolio is not borne by evidence. It is consistently worse in a small group of countries with very limited capacity.

Country presence and direct supervision and implementation support have brought benefits.

There have been significant improvements in countries that have always been fragile in overall project achievement, project effectiveness, IFAD’s performance as a partner and rural poverty impact.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

IFAD’s current approach to classifying fragile states needs reconsideration, as it is based on the classification of countries by other organizations.

IFAD’s policy framework needs to provide better guidance on how IFAD should tailor its support to specific contexts.

Weak data collection and inadequate M&E pose serious challenges to results measurement and reporting and the identification of good practices and lessons learned.

MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy and strategy
- Adopt a simpler approach to classifying fragile states, specific to IFAD’s mandate and priorities.
- Draft a policy statement defining how IFAD plans to engage with fragile and conflict-affected states, including sub-national situations.
- Change the approach to analysis in the COSOP.

Project and programme design
- Design programmes to identify where IFAD can and cannot engage.
- Simplify objectives and overall design in countries with low government capacity.

Project and programme implementation
- Increase resources for supervision and implementation support based on country need.
- Prioritize new IFAD country offices and outposting of country programme managers in fragile states.
- Create and build strategic partnerships to maximize complementary skills.

Empowerment of staff
- Introduce specific incentives for staff working in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations and promote capacity-building and training.

Results measurement and learning
- Plan and resource project M&E more selectively.
- Revise IFAD’s results measurement framework to fill major gaps in indicators such as for women’s empowerment and institutional performance.
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