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

Main areas
- rural infrastructure
- local capacity-building
- marketing
- rural financial services
- microenterprise development
- climate change adaptation

Country strategies

2001 ➔ 2010

Evaluation storyline

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.

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.

IFAD's support in community-driven development activities has been particularly successful.
Community development associations are registered and continue to function.
Main evaluation findings

Areas of strength

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.

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.

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.

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.

Areas for improvement

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.

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.

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).

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.