

Nigeria

Country programme evaluation 2009-2015



Population: 173.6 million (2014)

Rural population: 93.3 million; 47% of total population (2014)

GDP growth: 6.3% (2014) in real terms

Poverty headcount ratio: 46% of population (2009)
(at national poverty line)

Life expectancy at birth: 52.5 years (2013)

Human development index: 0.504; ranking: 152 out of 187 countries (2013)

Sources: United Nations Development Programme International Human Development Indicators; World Bank, World Development Indicators.

IFAD operations

(since 1985)

10

total
projects

4

ongoing
projects

US\$
795.3
million

total project
portfolio

US\$
317.6
million

funds lent
by IFAD

Country strategies

2001



2010

Main areas



rural
infrastructure



marketing



microenterprise
development



local capacity-
building



rural financial
services



climate change
adaptation

Evaluation storyline



**The Government-IFAD partnership
has grown stronger over the
current COSOP period**

The country programme evolved over
the years, adapting to changing
priorities, realities and needs

**The portfolio targets poverty
reasonably well, especially with the
programmes in the North and
Middle Belt**

Successful targeting requires strong
support from programme teams who
must convince local government to
select the remotest or most vulnerable
communities



**IFAD's support in community-driven
development activities has been
particularly successful**

Community development associations
are registered and continue to function



Main evaluation findings



Poverty targeting led to a greater focus of IFAD support on the poorest regions of the North

The 2010 country strategy aimed to reach poorest communities and avoid states or regions that are better off.



Lack of credible poverty data at sub-state level remained a challenge

The programmes used participatory methods to select the poorest locations and households, but the actual process remains somewhat opaque.

Results were achieved in incomes, social capital, food security and agricultural productivity

Impact studies have reported significant increases in food production and productivity in programme areas.



Delivery of results was hampered by slow funding and implementation delays

Implementation delays due to loan agreement and effectiveness issues had an impact on the release of funds particularly in the early years of programme life.

There has been a marked increase in knowledge management activities

The programme benefited from a strategic and efficient use of available resources in knowledge management.



Effective knowledge management was hampered by poor monitoring and evaluation

Baselines and impact studies produced by some programmes were disappointing and have not effectively gone beyond figures of IFAD's Results and Impact Management System (RIMS).

Strengthening the country office brought greater engagement in partnership

With the out-posting of the country programme manager and the strengthening of the country office, partnerships with a wide array of stakeholders were initiated.



In the absence of a clear partnership strategy, engagement has been sometimes opportunistic and ad hoc

The establishment of partnerships was mostly built around the needs of individual programmes rather than at a more strategic level.

Recommendations

1

Address issues of state commitment

To be achieved through increased geographic focus, transformed state-level partnerships and realistic levels of counterpart funding.

2

Increase leverage and presence in operations

IFAD could accelerate effectiveness and efficiency by changing the way it delivers implementation support, for example through continuity in supervision and timely engagement with government leaders.

3

Dedicate resources to cross-cutting issues

These issues are youth, gender, natural resource management, pastoralism, and conflict and fragility.

4

Expand existing and develop new partnerships

IFAD should build more strategic opportunities with civil society organizations and facilitate the private sector in agriculture much more effectively.

5

Continue to build on IFAD's knowledge management strategy

By improving evaluability during design, putting greater effort in evaluation. IFAD should ensure rigorous survey design and analysis for major baseline or impact studies.



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