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Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE)

- Special unit of IFAD that reports to the Executive Board of IFAD
- IOE conducts evaluations of IFAD-financed policies, strategies and operations to promote accountability and learning
- Two main principles: accountability and learning
Country strategy and programme evaluations (CSPEs)

• Assess the **results and performance** of the IFAD-financed strategy and programmes in Georgia;

• Generate findings and **recommendations** for the future partnership between IFAD and Georgia for enhanced development effectiveness and rural poverty eradication; and

• Inform the preparation of the new COSOP in 2018.
Sources of evidence

- Field visits
- Web surveys, phone interviews
- Stakeholder meetings and interviews
- Thematic focus groups
- Project evaluations and impact assessments
- Official statistical data
  - Often inconsistent or not disaggregated
  - Egypt CSPE: good data quality and availability at governorate level
METHODOLOGY USED IN EGYPT CSPE
• Lending portfolio: 8 projects (4 closed, 4 ongoing)
• Portfolio value over CSPE period US$580.2 million
• Portfolio composition: rural credit (42%), irrigation (20%), rural infrastructure (14%); technology development (7%)
• Strategic threads:
  - Strengthening agricultural productivity in the old lands through improved farming systems and more efficient use of land and water resources
  - Improving settlements in the new lands, through provision of comprehensive infrastructure and sustainable land and water management practices
  - Supporting economic diversification and employment generation through rural finance and capacity-building
Top down and bottom up

Country level
Achievement of strategic objectives;
Development effectiveness

Portfolio level
Achievements of intended outcomes and impact on poverty

Top-down review

Bottom-up review
BOTTOM-UP REVIEW - PORTFOLIO
Impact pathways

(1) Increase agricultural productivity and more efficient use of land and water

- More productive cropping systems ↑
- Adoption of new farming systems ↑
- Adoption of modernized irrigation technology ↑
- Integrated farming systems research, extension, farmer field schools ↑

(2) Economic diversification and employment

- Access to markets ↓
- Vocational training ↓
- Loans for small and medium enterprises, to increase productive assets ↓

(3) Improved living conditions

- Social infrastructure ↑
- Irrigation, drainage, potable water ↑
- Community organisations ○
Poverty impact at project level

• For project beneficiaries
  - Household incomes increased as a result of new cropping systems and livestock
  - Impact on food security limited
  - Human and social capital: effectiveness of community organisations limited

• BUT: overall poverty situation has worsened
  - Poverty rates increased
  - Food poverty increased
Aggregate funding and support

Allocated project funding over evaluation period

- Beheira: 3 projects
- Beni Suef: 4 projects
- Fayoum: 1 project
- Ismailia: 1 project
- Minya: 4 projects
- Sohag: 3 projects
Combined project effectiveness

**Project funding per beneficiary (USD)**

- **Beheira**: Effectiveness 3.5
- **Beni Suef**: Effectiveness 4
- **Fayoum**: Effectiveness 5
- **Ismailia**: Effectiveness 4
- **Minya**: Effectiveness 4
- **Sohag**: Effectiveness 2.5

**Legend**
- Blue bar: funding per beneficiary
Aggregate outreach among the poor

Outreach of IFAD projects

- **Good outreach**
- **Thinly spread**
- **Concentrated delivery, good outreach**
- **Concentrated delivery, poor outreach**

**Ratio of design beneficiary as a proportion of poor (percentage)**

**Ratio of actual beneficiary as a proportion of poor (percentage)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beheira</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni Suef</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayoum</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismalia</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minya</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohaq</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TOP-DOWN REVIEW – POVERTY TRENDS
Public infrastructure

Percentage of villages without public sanitation

Sanitation Issues directly addressed by project
Cropping intensity

Change in cropped area (2000 - 2014)(%)

Big change, unlikely direct contribution because of low outreach

Moderate change, likely contribution

Beheira  Beni Suef  Fayoum  Ismailia  Minya  Sohaq  All Egypt

Beheira
Beni Suef
Fayoum
Ismailia
Minya
Sohaq
All Egypt
Poverty trends

Change in poverty rates (2008-2015)

No impact on poverty rates!

Some likely contribution

Unlikely contribution

Beheira
Beni Suef
Ismailia
All Egypt
Fayoum
Sohag
Minya
### Top-down findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Improvement of living conditions</th>
<th>Contribution to public sanitation</th>
<th>Agricultural productivity increased</th>
<th>Contribution to cropping intensity</th>
<th>Increase in poverty rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beheira</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Not directly</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni Suef</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayoum</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Around average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismailia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minya</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohaq</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Above average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- CSPE require conclusive findings on strategic and country-level results
- Scope and nature of interventions often makes the results look insignificant
- Bottom-up review constrained by lack of impact-level data
- Project-level indicators limit possibility of aggregation
- Top-down review constrained by lack of credible and disaggregated statistics
- Food security and nutrition on consistently measured
CONCLUSIONS