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QUICK FACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>96.5 million (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural population</td>
<td>78 million - 81% of total (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. GDP growth</td>
<td>10.7% (since 2004/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture share</td>
<td>45% of GDP (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty headcount decreased in the past 20 years

Sources: World Bank databank and Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

IFAD ENGAGEMENT

Largest portfolio in Africa

Since 1980:
- **17 projects**
- For a total amount of **$1.2 billion**
- Of which, attributed to IFAD... **$473 million**
- IFAD has also provided **28 million in debt relief**

Two IFAD country strategies (COSOPs)

1999

Support to the development of pastoral communities

Rural finance

2008

Strengthening of bottom-up approach to increase downward accountability and development support

Main areas of intervention
**MAIN EVALUATION FINDINGS**

**Strengths**
- The portfolio is generally expected to have a positive impact on reducing poverty through increased food security and its performance is rated as satisfactory.
- The relationship of trust established by IFAD with the Government of Ethiopia and the country office is highly regarded and respected in the country.
- Among the strongest features of the portfolio were the emphasis given to human and social capital, and project designs that were fully aligned with the Government’s decentralization thrust.

**Areas for improvement**
- The country programme was spread too thinly over five thematic areas, even though the 2007 CPE had recommended focusing on fewer areas (small-scale irrigation, rural finance and pastoral community development).
- A programmatic approach would have allowed IFAD to support consecutive project phases with a long-term vision.
- Projects did not put enough efforts in establishing M&E mechanisms to allow a periodic assessment of project outcomes and impact.
- IFAD has a good reputation and is in a position to carry out a more effective policy dialogue. There is still room for underpinning the dialogue with lessons learnt and more formal policy papers or analyses and to document IFAD’s contribution focusing on small scale irrigation, rural finance and community development.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**ONE**
Focus on fewer thematic areas
IFAD should use its limited resources to focus on those areas where it has developed a comparative advantage and established a leadership position. IFAD should refrain in engaging itself directly in agriculture marketing efforts, as this would divert focus of projects and disperse IFAD’s limited resources. IFAD should rather collaborate with specialized initiatives/projects with a proven track record.

**TWO**
Enhance the quality of programmes and non-lending services
Mobility should be ensured for pastoralists who can and want to continue such livelihood. Climate change and sustainable land and water management should be mainstreamed. Enhancing non-lending services is an issue of adequacy of resources, a narrower focus on fewer areas should help the next country strategy define mechanisms or resources needed to carry out the knowledge management and dialogue with Government and development partners.

**THREE**
Use longer-term programmatic approach to lending
The new projects should be conceived as a part of long-term programme in a particular theme. Given its strong partnership with the country IFAD has a real opportunity to move towards programmatic lending in Ethiopia and be a catalyst to enhance development effectiveness.