

Independent Office  
of Evaluation



**15<sup>TH</sup>**  
EDITION

# **ARRI 2017**

**2017 Annual Report on Results and Impact of  
IFAD Operations**

**Addendum**

**September 2017**

## **Table of contents**

**Section 1: 2017 ARRI methodology and analyses**

**Section 2: Two sample t-test on PCRV/PPE data**

**Section 3: Test for correlation between evaluation criteria**

**Section 4: Project performance ratings 2000-2015**

**Section 5: IOE-PMD peer-to-peer comparison**

**Section 6: Objectives of projects and programmes**

# Section 1 - 2017 ARRI methodology and analyses

1. **Methodology.** The project evaluations informing the 2017 ARRI were performed in 2016 and thus follow the provisions of the second edition of the Evaluation Manual published in December 2015. This is the first year that this new methodology is reflected in the ARRI. However, the evaluation criteria and definitions included in the revised harmonization agreement<sup>1</sup> between Management and IOE, applied in evaluations conducted in 2017, will be fully reflected in the 2018 ARRI.
2. With the introduction of the 2015 evaluation manual, each project is assessed and rated across nine evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of benefits, rural poverty impact<sup>2</sup>, gender equality and women’s empowerment, innovation and scaling up, environment and natural resource management as well as adaptation to climate change; the latter two criteria were introduced in the second edition as two new stand-alone criteria.
3. IOE also has two composite evaluation criteria: project performance and overall project achievement. Project performance is an average of the ratings of four individual evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability - newly included), whereas overall project achievement is based on (but not an average of) all nine criteria now applied by IOE. Finally, each project is also evaluated for IFAD and government performance as partners, in line with the practice of other international financial institutions. The definitions for each evaluation criteria are found in Annex II.
4. **Ratings scale and data series.** In line with the Good Practice Standard of the Evaluation Cooperation Group of the Multilateral Development Banks for Public Sector Evaluations, IOE uses a six-point rating scale to assess performance in each evaluation criterion. The rating scale is summarized in table 1.

Table 1  
IOE rating system

Score	Assessment	Category
6	Highly satisfactory	
5	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
4	Moderately satisfactory	
3	Moderately unsatisfactory	
2	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
1	Highly unsatisfactory	

Source: IFAD Evaluation Manual, 2015.

5. The ratings, which are the foundation of performance reporting in IOE evaluations, are thereafter used in the analysis of the ARRI for reporting on IFAD’s aggregate operational performance. Therefore, in each independent evaluation, IOE pays maximum attention to ensuring that the ratings assigned are based on evidence and follow a standard methodology and process. Moreover, comprehensive internal and external peer reviews are organized in finalizing the assessments and ratings of each evaluation, also as a means to enhance objectivity and minimize inter-evaluator variability.
6. As in the last couple of ARRIs, the analysis is based on two data series: (i) all evaluation data and (ii) PCR/V/PPE data only. The 2017 ARRI primarily presents analysis based on “PCR/V/PPE data” series<sup>3</sup> which contains only ratings from PCR/Vs, PPEs and impact evaluations of completed projects. As IOE conducts PCR/Vs for all completed projects

<sup>1</sup> Agreement on the Harmonization of IFAD’s Independent Evaluation and Self-Evaluations Methods and Systems Part I: Evaluation Criteria: <https://webapps.ifad.org/members/eb/120/docs/EB-2017-120-INF-2.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> As per the new methodology, Environment and natural resources management as well as adaptation to climate change are no longer included among the impact domains contributing to Rural Poverty Impact. the four remaining impact domains (Household income and net assets; Human and social capital and empowerment; Food security and agricultural productivity; Institutions and policies) are no longer rated.

<sup>3</sup> Introduced in the 2013 ARRI.

since 2011, covering the entire portfolio at exit, there are no selection biases in the projects chosen for evaluation. The PCRV/PPE data series currently includes ratings from 157 evaluations out of the total 295 evaluations<sup>4</sup> analysed in the 2017 ARRI. As the PCRVs, PPEs and IE evaluations conducted in 2016 include projects that completed between 2011 and 2015, both data series stop in 2015 in the last cohort<sup>5</sup>.

7. The "all evaluation data" series consists of ratings from all evaluations conducted by IOE since 2002. In addition to PCRV/PPE data it also includes CSPEs, and therefore contains evaluated projects that were not selected randomly and followed other criteria.<sup>6</sup> In the 2017 ARRI, the "all evaluation data" series is used to triangulate findings and for the analysis benchmarking IFAD performance with other IFIs, as the sample sizes provided by "PCRV/PPE data" series are currently too small for this exercise. Finally, the ratings discussed in the CSPE section (portfolio performance, non-lending activities and COSOPs) come from a separate database of CSPEs undertaken by IOE between 2006 and 2016.<sup>7</sup> The analysis on all three data series has been carried out based on the year of project completion<sup>8</sup>, in line with most other IFIs and previous editions of the ARRI.
8. Tables and Charts showing the moving averages of performance based on the "all evaluation data" series are available in Annex III and IV respectively, as they overall support the trends of the "PCRV/PPE data" series and therefore do not need to be mentioned in comparison with the "PCRV/PPE data" series. As in the past, the 2017 ARRI analysed independent evaluation ratings grouped by IFAD replenishment periods, starting with the IFAD5 replenishment period (2001-2003). The results of the analysis by replenishment periods are used in this chapter in the section dedicated to analyse performance by replenishment period and included in Annex III.
9. The qualitative analysis is based on the 35 project evaluations done in 2016 (PCRVs, PPEs, impact evaluations and CSPE projects) as well as Evaluation Syntheses and a Corporate-level evaluation. For the complete overview of consulted evaluations of 2016, please see Annex V.
10. **Analysis of ratings.** As per past practice, the ARRI uses three-year moving averages to smoothen short-term fluctuations and highlight long-term trends.<sup>9</sup> While the moving averages is particularly applicable to the "all data" series as it includes projects that were not randomly selected, it also enlarges the sample of ratings for the PCRV/PPE data set.
11. The main trends in performance are explained through an analysis of the percentages of projects that are rated as moderately satisfactory or better. However, as requested by the Evaluation Committee, the proportion of ratings for each evaluation criteria falling within the full range of the six-point rating scale (i.e. from highly unsatisfactory to highly satisfactory) used by IOE are shown in Annex IV.
12. Before proceeding with the detailed analysis on the performance of IFAD's operations, the ARRI provides an overview of the results from 2007 to 2015. This includes the results of the distribution analysis of available ratings in the PCRV/PPE data series in the period. Further comparison is done between the IFAD8 and IFAD9 periods by conducting a t-tests<sup>10</sup> to test the significance of the difference between their evaluation criteria means.

---

<sup>4</sup> Sample size of the all evaluation data series,

<sup>5</sup> The all evaluation data series also stops in 2015 due to comparability with the PCRV/PPE data series and due to the small sample size of CSPE projects completing in 2016.

<sup>6</sup> For example, in the past it was mandatory for IOE to undertake an interim (project) evaluation before Management could proceed with the design of a second phase of the same operation.

<sup>7</sup> CSPEs are included in this database based on year of evaluation.

<sup>8</sup> Reporting by year of project completion is preferred to year of approval as this includes all the inputs and changes to the project, not just project design and appraisal. It is also preferred over presentation by year of evaluation results where there is a wide range of project approval dates, and sometimes very old projects are included. Presentation by year of project completion provides a more homogenous cohort.

<sup>9</sup> Three-year moving averages were first used in the 2009 ARRI, before IOE started undertaking PCRVs/PPEs. A three-year moving average allows for the assessment of trends in performance over time, and also overcomes any biases that may result from the sample of projects evaluated, which are not chosen on a random basis. Three-year moving averages are calculated by adding evaluation results from three consecutive years and dividing the sum by three.

<sup>10</sup> In order to determine whether there is a significant difference in the means of the evaluation criteria ratings between 2010-2012 (IFAD8) and 2013-2015 (IFAD9) periods, a two sample t-test is used. These two period have been selected due to the

Finally, these analyses are complemented by a block analysis which provides a summary of the mean, and SDs by evaluation criteria and correlation analyses of PCRV/PPE ratings to test for interrelationships among evaluation criteria.

13. The block analysis conducted on the PCRV/PPE dataset in the period 2007-2015 presents in table 3 the nine evaluation criteria ranked by mean. In fact, the median values show that project performance is moderately satisfactory in all evaluation criteria. However, drawing conclusions using only the median values could be misleading as for some criteria the median rating is moderately satisfactory, but a large number of projects are actually moderately unsatisfactory or worse (as shown in Annex IV). This is the case for efficiency and sustainability.
14. Therefore, for a more nuanced understanding of performance, it is important to look at the mean together with the Standard Deviation (SD). Analysis of the means reveals that the best performing criteria in the period 2007-2015, besides relevance, are IFAD performance, gender equality, innovation and scaling up and rural poverty impact This is positive given the mandate of IFAD to reduce poverty for women and men in rural areas. The weakest performing areas based on the means from 2007-2015 are operational efficiency, sustainability of benefits and adaptation to climate change. However, the performance of adaptation to climate change is based on a very small sample and is therefore only indicative.

Table 2

**Ranking of averages and data dispersion per criteria – PCRV/PPE data, 2007-2015**

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>Median</i>	
Relevance	4.32	0.71	4	Best Performance
IFAD performance	4.22	0.72	4	
Gender equality and women's empowerment	4.21	0.84	4	
Innovation and scaling-up	4.18	0.90	4	
Rural poverty impact	4.09	0.77	4	
Overall project achievement	3.98	0.75	4	Weaker Performance
Effectiveness	3.97	0.87	4	
Project performance	3.95	0.76	4	
Environment and natural resources management	3.89	0.75	4	
Government performance	3.83	0.88	4	
Sustainability	3.67	0.78	4	
Efficiency	3.62	0.97	4	
Adaptation to climate change	3.59	0.93	4	

Source: IOE evaluation database, March 2017.

sample size in each period, the consistency of the dataset and the number of missing values assuring the representativeness of the periods under review to provide reliable results.

## Section 2 - Two Sample t-test on PCRV/PPEs data (independent data with unequal variances)

1. This section presents an overview of the statistical significance using a t-test procedure. Such procedure is useful for interpreting comparison results from two sets of data. The purpose of this study is to compare the means of the evaluation criteria between IFAD 9 and IFAD 8 data through the analysis of their statistical significance.
2. Results show that the average differences between IFAD 8 and IFAD 9 are positive and statistically significant for five evaluation indicators and suggest an improvement in the overall project performance<sup>11</sup> (Table 3).

### Interpreting the Non significance level results

3. Slight positive variances between IFAD 8 and IFAD 9 have been found, although they are not statistically significant.
4. The observed standard deviation comes in at 0.87 and 0.74 in IFAD 8 and IFAD 9 respectively. The mean score of the overall achievement in IFAD 9 (4.04) appears to be greater than the mean score of IFAD 8 (3.93). However, this difference<sup>12</sup> is not statistically significant.
5. It is worth noting that considering the nonsignificant difference, the sampling error may likely be too large as the sample size for these criteria remains small and therefore leading to a nonsignificant test.

Table 3

**Comparison of projects ratings of IFAD 9 vs IFAD 8 for significant criteria**

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Difference between IFAD9 and IFAD8 averages</i>	<i>P-value</i>
Relevance	+0.21	.05**
Innovation and scaling up	+0.30	.03**
Project performance	+0.21	.08***
Gender equality & women empowerment	+0.66	.001*
IFAD performance	+0.23	.04**

Source: IOE ratings database 2017, STATA

\*, \*\* and \*\*\* respectively indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level.

Table 4

**Comparison of projects ratings of IFAD 9 vs IFAD 8 for non-significant criteria**

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>	<i>Difference between IFAD9 and IFAD 8 averages</i>	<i>P-value</i>
Efficiency	+0.16	.30
Effectiveness	+0.21	.13
Sustainability	-0.02	.89
Gov. performance	+0.21	.14
Rural & poverty impact	-0.04	.76
Overall project achievement	+0.10	.41

Source: IOE ratings database 2017, STATA

\*, \*\* and \*\*\* respectively indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level.

<sup>11</sup> Relevance, Innovation and scaling up, Project performance, Gender equality and women empowerment and IFAD performance.

<sup>12</sup> Two means may have a little difference, that difference is clearly mathematically different from zero, but statistically it is equal to zero.

### Section 3 - Test for correlation between evaluation criteria

1. The most commonly followed approach to evaluating project performance is an analysis of the various evaluation criteria through their ratings scale. This approach involves an examination of ratings for individual criteria in order to understand performance of projects (either the project is performing well or not). However, this method may reveal only part of the picture. It may be then useful to take into account ratings of other criteria which could be closely associated and could therefore guide in understanding the underlying explanation on the performance of projects. For instance, close association between ratings for effectiveness and sustainability could help understand to what extent project objectives have been reached and how results from the project are likely to continue beyond the phase of IFAD's funding support.
2. In order to avoid multicollinearity issues among some evaluation criteria, project performance and the overall project achievement criteria have been removed from the analysis. In fact, these variables represent two composite evaluation criteria: while the former is based on the ratings of four individual criteria (namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability), the latter is based on all eight criteria<sup>13</sup> applied by IOE.
3. The correlation analysis is based on IOE ratings<sup>14</sup> data available for projects completed between 2007 and 2015. For a better understanding of the underlying associations between the various evaluation criteria, the Spearman's rank correlation test<sup>15</sup> is used to undertake correlations. The correlation results are also tested for statistical significance at the 5 per cent significance level. The results are presented in a matrix form and show the degree of association i.e. the correlation coefficient between the various criteria.
4. For the sake of simplicity, the different correlation coefficient values could be interpreted<sup>16</sup> in the following way:
  - \* for values between 0.9 and 1, the correlation is very strong.
  - \* for values between 0.7 and 0.89, correlation is strong.
  - \* for values between 0.5 and 0.69, correlation is moderate.
  - \* for values between 0.3 and 0.49, correlation is moderate to low.
  - \* for values between 0.16 and 0.29, correlation is weak to low.
  - \* for values below 0.16, correlation is too low to be meaningful.
5. The graph below shows the scatterplots of all the variables with one another. It is important to ensure that there are no perfectly correlated variables (which would need removing) before looking for significant correlations and possibly clusters of them.
6. The results are presented in the table below. Thus, for instance, results show that:
  - A moderate to strong correlation exists between most criteria (0.60 to 0.71). Importantly, for these criteria, the results are all significant at the 5 per cent significance level.
  - The strongest correlation was observed between Government performance and effectiveness (0.71).

---

<sup>13</sup> See ARRI 2017, p. for description of all evaluation criteria.

<sup>14</sup> See IOE Evaluation manual, chap.2, p18, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

<sup>15</sup> The Spearman correlation test provides reliable results for ordinal variables which usually present non-linear relationship among them.

<sup>16</sup> There is no set rule in the interpretation of the correlation coefficient.

- On the other hand, for indicators such as Rural Poverty Impact and Gender, the correlation with most variables was moderately low, although these results were significant at 5% level.

Table 5  
Spearman's correlation coefficients<sup>17</sup>

	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Effectivene.</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>Rural Pov. Imp</i>	<i>Innov. Scal</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Gov. perf</i>	<i>IFAD perf</i>
Relevance	1.00								
Effectiveness	0.61*	1.00							
Efficiency	0.36*	0.59*	1.00						
Sustainability	0.47*	0.67*	0.44*	1.00					
Rural Pov.Imp	0.40*	0.42*	0.35*	0.47*	1.00				
Innov. Scal.	0.54*	0.66*	0.51*	0.52*	0.32*	1.00			
Gender	0.28*	0.44*	0.28*	0.30*	0.02	0.32*	1.00		
Gov. perf	0.47*	0.71*	0.68*	0.53*	0.38*	0.58*	0.44*	1.00	
IFAD perf	0.49*	0.61*	0.45*	0.54*	0.32*	0.42*	0.39*	0.62*	1.00

Source: IOE evaluation database, STATA, March 2017.

<sup>17</sup> \* means the correlation coefficient is statistically significant at 5% level.





	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.5
Standard deviation	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Relevance

### All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period

#### Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	19.0	31.1	3.7	1.4	3.3
Satisfactory	42.9	35.6	37.0	38.0	48.9
Moderately satisfactory	28.6	26.7	55.6	46.5	38.0
Moderately unsatisfactory	9.5	6.7	3.7	12.7	9.8
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

  

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.7	4.9	4.4	4.3	4.5
Standard deviation	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	6.0	5.0	5.0	4.0

## Effectiveness

### PCR/V/PPE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	24.0	24.4	21.7	23.0	26.8	32.9	36.2
Moderately satisfactory	56.0	48.8	51.7	50.8	50.0	43.9	39.1
Moderately unsatisfactory	12.0	17.1	15.0	16.4	18.3	20.7	21.7
Unsatisfactory	8.0	9.8	11.7	9.8	4.9	2.4	2.9
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1
Standard deviation	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Effectiveness

### All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	4.8	2.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.9	1.7	0.0	2.8	2.2	3.0	3.3
Satisfactory	29.4	33.3	34.3	31.1	26.7	20.9	25.6	25.9	30.0	25.0	25.4	25.8	50.0	1.1
Moderately satisfactory	52.9	42.9	40.0	33.3	37.8	44.2	51.2	46.3	40.0	47.2	46.5	48.3	35.0	33.7
Moderately unsatisfactory	11.8	14.3	17.1	28.9	26.7	25.6	9.3	18.5	20.0	18.1	15.5	20.2	12.0	43.5
Unsatisfactory	5.9	4.8	5.7	4.4	8.9	9.3	11.6	7.4	8.3	9.7	9.9	3.4	0.0	19.6
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1
Standard deviation	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	5.0	4.3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Effectiveness

### All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	4.8	0.0	1.9	2.8	1.1
Satisfactory	33.3	26.7	25.9	25.4	33.7
Moderately satisfactory	42.9	37.8	46.3	46.5	43.5
Moderately unsatisfactory	14.3	26.7	18.5	15.5	19.6
Unsatisfactory	4.8	8.9	7.4	9.9	2.2
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.2	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.1
Standard deviation	0.9	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	3.0	3.3	3.5	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Efficiency

### PCR/PPE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	1.5
Satisfactory	16.0	14.6	18.3	14.8	17.3	17.3	20.6
Moderately satisfactory	48.0	34.1	30.0	37.7	43.2	43.2	35.3
Moderately unsatisfactory	24.0	36.6	36.7	32.8	25.9	27.2	30.9
Unsatisfactory	12.0	14.6	13.3	11.5	9.9	9.9	11.8
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	1.7	3.3	2.5	1.2	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.7
Standard deviation	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

## Efficiency

### All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	5.9	14.3	14.3	11.1	8.9	4.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.0	1.1
Satisfactory	11.8	23.8	25.7	24.4	17.8	14.0	16.3	16.7	15.0	18.1	18.3	20.5	19.2	20.9
Moderately satisfactory	41.2	33.3	28.6	28.9	33.3	34.9	44.2	42.6	38.3	31.9	36.6	39.8	38.4	33.0
Moderately unsatisfactory	29.4	14.3	17.1	26.7	28.9	34.9	23.3	27.8	33.3	36.1	32.4	27.3	32.3	36.3
Unsatisfactory	0.0	4.8	8.6	6.7	6.7	7.0	9.3	11.1	13.3	12.5	9.9	9.1	8.1	8.8
Highly unsatisfactory	11.8	9.5	5.7	2.2	4.4	4.7	4.7	1.9	0.0	1.4	2.8	2.3	1.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7
Standard deviation	0.8	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

## Efficiency

### All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	14.3	8.9	0.0	0.0	1.1
Satisfactory	23.8	17.8	16.7	18.3	20.9
Moderately satisfactory	33.3	33.3	42.6	36.6	33.0
Moderately unsatisfactory	14.3	28.9	27.8	32.4	36.3
Unsatisfactory	4.8	6.7	11.1	9.9	8.8
Highly unsatisfactory	9.5	4.4	1.9	2.8	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.7
Standard deviation	1.4	1.2	1.0	1.0	0.9
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0



	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
Standard deviation	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

## Sustainability

### All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	23.8	13.3	18.5	15.7	8.9
Moderately satisfactory	19.0	37.8	40.7	45.7	58.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	38.1	26.7	31.5	32.9	27.8
Unsatisfactory	14.3	20.0	9.3	4.3	4.4
Highly unsatisfactory	4.8	2.2	0.0	1.4	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.7
Standard deviation	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0





	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1
Standard deviation	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.0	3.7	3.5	3.7	3.7
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.6	4.7	4.7

## Project performance

### All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	4.8	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	38.1	35.6	24.1	15.5	17.4
Moderately satisfactory	42.9	40.0	50.0	56.3	53.3
Moderately unsatisfactory	9.5	20.0	20.4	19.7	25.0
Unsatisfactory	4.8	0.0	5.6	8.5	4.3
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.3	4.3	4.0	3.9	4.1
Standard deviation	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.7
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	4.2	4.3	4.7

## Rural poverty impact

### PCR/PPE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	24.0	31.6	31.6	35.1	28.2	32.1	28.8
Moderately satisfactory	56.0	52.6	49.1	50.9	57.7	56.4	56.1
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.0	10.5	12.3	8.8	10.3	9.0	10.6
Unsatisfactory	4.0	5.3	7.0	5.3	3.8	2.6	4.5
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1
Standard deviation	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Rural poverty impact

### All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	7.1	5.9	6.5	2.4	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	28.6	35.3	29.0	26.8	20.9	22.0	26.2	30.2	35.1	33.3	38.8	29.4	32.6	31.0
Moderately satisfactory	35.7	29.4	38.7	36.6	41.9	41.5	50.0	45.3	47.4	47.8	49.3	56.5	55.8	52.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	21.4	23.5	22.6	29.3	27.9	31.7	21.4	22.6	14.0	13.0	7.5	10.6	9.5	12.6
Unsatisfactory	7.1	5.9	3.2	4.9	7.0	4.9	2.4	1.9	3.5	5.8	4.5	3.5	2.1	3.4
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1
Standard deviation	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.3	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Rural poverty impact

All evaluation data by year of completion – by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	5.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	35.3	20.9	30.2	38.8	31.0
Moderately satisfactory	29.4	41.9	45.3	49.3	52.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	23.5	27.9	22.6	7.5	12.6
Unsatisfactory	5.9	7.0	1.9	4.5	3.4
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.1	3.8	4.0	4.2	4.1
Standard deviation	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

**Environment and natural resources management**  
**PCR/PP/PE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages**

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.6	3.2	1.9
Satisfactory	15.0	16.7	12.8	10.9	9.5	15.9	16.7
Moderately satisfactory	60.0	63.3	55.3	52.2	57.1	58.7	63.0
Moderately unsatisfactory	20.0	16.7	25.5	30.4	27.0	20.6	16.7
Unsatisfactory	5.0	3.3	6.4	4.3	4.8	1.6	1.9
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.8	4.0	4.0
Standard deviation	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.8	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

**Environment and natural resources management**  
**All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages**

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	5.6	3.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.4	2.3	0.0	1.9	1.5	2.6	1.4
Satisfactory	33.3	33.3	23.3	21.6	17.6	25.0	21.2	21.4	18.6	13.0	14.8	11.8	18.4	15.5
Moderately satisfactory	25.0	33.3	30.0	29.7	20.6	15.6	24.2	40.5	55.8	57.4	51.9	55.9	53.9	60.6
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.7	16.7	23.3	21.6	35.3	40.6	42.4	28.6	20.9	24.1	25.9	25.0	22.4	21.1
Unsatisfactory	16.7	5.6	13.3	16.2	14.7	12.5	6.1	7.1	2.3	5.6	5.6	5.9	2.6	1.4
Highly unsatisfactory	8.3	5.6	6.7	8.1	11.8	6.3	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.6	4.0	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9
Standard deviation	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	2.8	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.8	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

**Environment and natural resources management**  
**All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period**  
**Percentage of projects**

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	5.6	0.0	2.4	1.9	1.4
Satisfactory	33.3	17.6	21.4	14.8	15.5
Moderately satisfactory	33.3	20.6	40.5	51.9	60.6
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.7	35.3	28.6	25.9	21.1
Unsatisfactory	5.6	14.7	7.1	5.6	1.4
Highly unsatisfactory	5.6	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.0	3.2	3.8	3.8	3.9
Standard deviation	1.2	1.2	0.9	0.8	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.3	2.3	3.0	3.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

## Adaptation to climate change

### PCR/VPE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.7	1.6	0.0
Satisfactory	15.0	16.7	13.0	11.1	10.0	11.5	13.2
Moderately satisfactory	60.0	63.3	54.3	48.9	55.0	65.6	67.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	20.0	16.7	26.1	31.1	23.3	13.1	7.5
Unsatisfactory	5.0	3.3	6.5	6.7	10.0	8.2	11.3
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.9	3.8
Standard deviation	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.8	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

## Adaptation to climate change

### All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	5.6	3.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.4	2.4	0.0	1.9	1.5	1.4	0.0
Satisfactory	33.3	33.3	23.3	21.6	17.6	25.0	21.2	21.4	19.0	13.5	15.4	12.3	14.9	12.9
Moderately satisfactory	25.0	33.3	30.0	29.7	20.6	15.6	24.2	40.5	54.8	55.8	48.1	53.8	59.5	64.3
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.7	16.7	23.3	21.6	35.3	40.6	42.4	28.6	21.4	25.0	26.9	21.5	16.2	14.3
Unsatisfactory	16.7	5.6	13.3	16.2	14.7	12.5	6.1	7.1	2.4	5.8	7.7	10.8	8.1	8.6
Highly unsatisfactory	8.3	5.6	6.7	8.1	11.8	6.3	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.6	4.0	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.8
Standard deviation	4.2	4.9	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.7	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.1	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.6	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.2	5.0	4.5	4.4	4.1	4.4	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

## Adaptation to climate change

### All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period

#### Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	5.6	0.0	2.4	1.9	0.0
Satisfactory	33.3	17.6	21.4	15.4	12.9
Moderately satisfactory	33.3	20.6	40.5	48.1	64.3
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.7	35.3	28.6	26.9	14.3
Unsatisfactory	5.6	14.7	7.1	7.7	8.6
Highly unsatisfactory	5.6	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.0	3.2	3.8	3.8	3.8
Standard deviation	1.2	1.2	0.9	4.7	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.3	2.3	3.0	4.6	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.7	4.0



## Innovation and scaling-up

### PCR/PPE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	4.0	4.9	3.3	3.3	2.4	3.7	2.9
Satisfactory	28.0	29.3	30.0	34.4	37.8	37.8	37.7
Moderately satisfactory	40.0	39.0	40.0	37.7	43.9	48.8	50.7
Moderately unsatisfactory	24.0	17.1	18.3	16.4	13.4	8.5	8.7
Unsatisfactory	4.0	7.3	6.7	6.6	1.2	0.0	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	2.4	1.7	1.6	1.2	1.2	0.0
	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.3
Standard deviation	0.9	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Innovation and scaling-up

### All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.3	2.8	2.8	2.2	3.0	3.3
Satisfactory	46.2	36.8	37.5	31.7	26.2	26.2	34.9	31.5	30.0	29.2	33.8	36.0	34.0	33.7
Moderately satisfactory	30.8	31.6	28.1	29.3	35.7	40.5	44.2	44.4	43.3	43.1	39.4	43.8	49.0	46.7
Moderately unsatisfactory	7.7	15.8	21.9	29.3	31.0	28.6	18.6	18.5	16.7	18.1	16.9	15.7	12.0	15.2
Unsatisfactory	15.4	15.8	12.5	9.8	7.1	4.8	2.3	3.7	5.0	5.6	4.2	2.2	2.0	1.1
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.4	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2
Standard deviation	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Innovation and scaling-up

### All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	1.9	2.8	3.3
Satisfactory	36.8	26.2	31.5	33.8	33.7
Moderately satisfactory	31.6	35.7	44.4	39.4	46.7
Moderately unsatisfactory	15.8	31.0	18.5	16.9	15.2
Unsatisfactory	15.8	7.1	3.7	4.2	1.1
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	3.9	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.2
Standard deviation	1.1	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Gender equality and women's empowerment

### PCR/PPE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	8.3	5.0	3.3	1.6	3.8	5.1	4.6
Satisfactory	29.2	25.0	28.3	36.1	41.3	34.6	33.8
Moderately satisfactory	50.0	47.5	46.7	41.0	38.8	44.9	46.2
Moderately unsatisfactory	8.3	17.5	18.3	19.7	13.8	12.8	13.8
Unsatisfactory	4.2	5.0	3.3	1.6	2.5	2.6	1.5
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
Standard deviation	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Gender equality and women's empowerment

### All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	7.4	4.8	3.2	1.5	3.4	4.2	3.4
Satisfactory	29.6	28.6	31.7	38.8	40.2	32.3	33.0
Moderately satisfactory	51.9	45.2	44.4	38.8	40.2	47.9	48.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	7.4	16.7	17.5	17.9	14.9	14.6	13.6
Unsatisfactory	3.7	4.8	3.2	3.0	1.1	1.0	1.1
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2
Standard deviation	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Gender equality and women's empowerment

All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	7.4	1.5	3.4
Satisfactory	29.6	38.8	33.0
Moderately satisfactory	51.9	38.8	48.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	7.4	17.9	13.6
Unsatisfactory	3.7	3.0	1.1
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.3	4.2	4.2
Standard deviation	0.9	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0

## Overall project achievement

### PCR/PPE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	20.0	22.0	21.7	26.2	25.6	26.8	26.1
Moderately satisfactory	60.0	56.1	55.0	50.8	53.7	54.9	55.1
Moderately unsatisfactory	12.0	12.2	13.3	13.1	17.1	15.9	15.9
Unsatisfactory	8.0	9.8	10.0	9.8	3.7	2.4	2.9
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.0
Standard deviation	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0

## Overall project achievement

### All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	5.9	4.8	5.7	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	29.4	28.6	25.7	22.2	20.0	20.9	23.3	22.2	23.3	22.2	29.6	27.0	27.0	25.3
Moderately satisfactory	35.3	42.9	48.6	48.9	46.7	48.8	58.1	55.6	55.0	54.2	49.3	51.7	53.0	54.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	23.5	19.0	17.1	24.4	28.9	27.9	16.3	18.5	15.0	15.3	12.7	18.0	18.0	17.6
Unsatisfactory	5.9	4.8	2.9	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	3.7	6.7	8.3	8.5	3.4	2.0	2.2
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0
Standard deviation	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5

## Overall project achievement

### All evaluation data by year of completion – by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	4.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	28.6	20.0	22.2	29.6	25.3
Moderately satisfactory	42.9	46.7	55.6	49.3	54.9
Moderately unsatisfactory	19.0	28.9	18.5	12.7	17.6
Unsatisfactory	4.8	2.2	3.7	8.5	2.2
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0
Standard deviation	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.9	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5

## IFAD performance as a partner

### PCR/V/PPE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	4.0	2.4	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	24.0	24.4	28.3	29.5	37.8	41.5	46.4
Moderately satisfactory	60.0	53.7	51.7	52.5	46.3	45.1	42.0
Moderately unsatisfactory	12.0	19.5	16.7	16.4	14.6	13.4	11.6
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.6	1.2	0.0	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.3
Standard deviation	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## IFAD performance as a partner

### All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	0.0	0.0	3.3	2.4	4.5	4.8	4.8	3.8	1.7	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	0.0	20.0	33.3	29.3	25.0	9.5	16.7	17.0	25.0	29.2	33.8	40.4	43.0	46.2
Moderately satisfactory	27.3	33.3	20.0	22.0	18.2	38.1	45.2	56.6	53.3	52.8	47.9	43.8	43.0	40.7
Moderately unsatisfactory	72.7	46.7	40.0	43.9	50.0	45.2	31.0	18.9	18.3	13.9	16.9	14.6	14.0	13.2
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	3.3	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.4	3.8	1.7	2.8	1.4	1.1	0.0	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.3	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.3
Standard deviation	0.4	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

## IFAD performance as a partner

### All evaluation data by year of completion - by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	0.0	4.5	3.8	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	20.0	25.0	17.0	33.8	46.2
Moderately satisfactory	33.3	18.2	56.6	47.9	40.7
Moderately unsatisfactory	46.7	50.0	18.9	16.9	13.2
Unsatisfactory	0.0	2.3	3.8	1.4	0.0
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	3.7	3.8	4.0	4.1	4.3
Standard deviation	0.8	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.7
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0



## Government performance as a partner

### PCR/PPE data series by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	4.0	2.4	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	20.0	17.1	18.3	18.0	19.5	23.2	23.2
Moderately satisfactory	48.0	41.5	40.0	44.3	56.1	54.9	53.6
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.0	26.8	28.3	26.2	15.9	15.9	17.4
Unsatisfactory	12.0	12.2	11.7	11.5	8.5	6.1	5.8
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.9	4.0	3.9
Standard deviation	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

## Government performance as a partner

### All evaluation data by year of completion – 3-year moving averages

Percentage of projects

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Highly satisfactory	16.7	11.1	9.4	4.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.7	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	16.7	16.7	25.0	25.6	27.3	23.8	26.2	22.6	20.0	19.4	22.5	22.5	26.0	25.3
Moderately satisfactory	33.3	55.6	43.8	32.6	29.5	33.3	45.2	45.3	43.3	43.1	43.7	53.9	51.0	52.7
Moderately unsatisfactory	33.3	16.7	15.6	30.2	34.1	35.7	23.8	20.8	25.0	25.0	23.9	15.7	18.0	17.6
Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	3.1	4.7	4.5	7.1	4.8	9.4	10.0	11.1	9.9	7.9	5.0	4.4
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	3.1	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	2000-2002	2001-2003	2002-2004	2003-2005	2004-2006	2005-2007	2006-2008	2007-2009	2008-2010	2009-2011	2010-2012	2011-2013	2012-2014	2013-2015
Average rating	4.2	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0
Standard deviation	1.1	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5

## Government performance as a partner

All evaluation data by year of completion – by replenishment period

Percentage of projects

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Highly satisfactory	11.1	2.3	1.9	0.0	0.0
Satisfactory	16.7	27.3	22.6	22.5	25.3
Moderately satisfactory	55.6	29.5	45.3	43.7	52.7
Moderately unsatisfactory	16.7	34.1	20.8	23.9	17.6
Unsatisfactory	0.0	4.5	9.4	9.9	4.4
Highly unsatisfactory	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

	2001-2003 (5th)	2004-2006 (6th)	2007-2009 (7th)	2010-2012 (8th)	2013-2015 (9th)
Average rating	4.2	3.8	3.9	3.8	4.0
Standard deviation	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8
1 <sup>st</sup> Quartile	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> Quartile	4.8	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.5

## Section 5 - Comparison of IOE's PPE ratings and PMD's PCR ratings for all evaluation criteria in projects completing in 2007-2015 (N=48)

Criteria	<i>Disconnect</i>				
	Mean ratings		of mean rating	Mode ratings	
	IOE	PMD		IOE	PMD
1. Relevance	4.25	4.92	-0.67	4	5
2. Effectiveness	4.25	4.54	-0.29	4	5
3. Efficiency	3.96	4.27	-0.31	4	4
4. Sustainability	3.90	4.17	-0.27	4	4
5. Project performance	4.16	4.57	-0.41	4	5
6. Rural poverty impact	4.33	4.46	-0.13	4	5
7. Innovation and scaling-up	4.33	4.72	-0.39	4	5
8. Gender equality and women's empowerment	4.46	4.63	-0.17	4	5
9. Environment and natural resources	3.78	4.09	-0.31	4	4
10. Overall project achievement	4.25	4.54	-0.29	4	5
11. IFAD performance	4.29	4.54	-0.25	4	5
12. Government performance	4.10	4.33	-0.23	4	5

Source: IOE evaluation rating database and PMD project completion report rating database

## Section 6 - Objectives of country programmes and individual projects evaluated

The main objectives of the country strategies can be summarized below:

- (i) **DR Congo.** The 2003 COSOP, which was extended until 2011, had an overall objective to improve food security among poor rural communities by supporting the transition from emergency assistance to development and identified four specific objectives for IFAD operations in DR Congo:
  - a) Support the growth of agricultural production by providing inputs and promoting technologies designed to increase productivity ;
  - b) Improve marketing channels through investment in infrastructure, the provision of market information and improvement in commodity market organization;
  - c) Strengthen organizational capacities among small producer groups to help them achieve better market access and improve their living conditions; and
  - d) Increase the access of impoverished communities to health and nutrition services.

The 2012 COSOP focused on two objectives which continued to target agricultural production and marketing, and capacity-building for farmer organizations:

- e) Improve smallholder access to effective production services, appropriate technologies and local markets; and
  - f) Professionalization of Peasant Organizations so that they become economic partners and key interlocutors in rural areas.
- (ii) **Mozambique.** The 2011 COSOP identified three objectives for IFAD operations in Mozambique:
  - a) The access of smallholders and artisanal fishers to production factors, technologies and resources is increased,
  - b) The access and participation of smallholders and artisanal fishers to markets that can bring them equitable shares of profit are increased,
  - c) The availability of and access to appropriate and sustainable financial services in rural areas are increased.
- (iii) **Nicaragua.** The 2012 COSOP identified three objectives for IFAD operations in Nicaragua:
  - a) Access is facilitated to assets, markets and income-generating activities, and job opportunities are increased. These will be achieved through affirmative actions that contribute to implementing inclusive strategies for the poor rural population in local and national socioeconomic development processes.
  - b) Labour productivity is increased through incentives that facilitate access to information, technology and technical and financial services.
  - c) Environmental, fiscal and institutional sustainability are improved.
- (iv) **Philippines.** The 2009 COSOP identified three objectives for IFAD operations in Philippines:
  - a) Upland poor households in the 20 poorest provinces – particularly those of indigenous peoples and agrarian reform beneficiaries – have

improved access to land and water resources and gainfully use these sustainably,

- b) Entrepreneurial poor in selected rural areas, particularly in the Visayas, and northern and western, southern and eastern, and central Mindanao, have improved access to markets and rural financial services to improve the value chains of agribusiness systems benefiting poor farmers, livestock producers, fishers, marginalized groups, women and rural entrepreneurs,
- c) Selected marginalized and poor communities dependent on coastal resources in Bicol, eastern Visayas, northern Mindanao and the Autonomous Region for Muslim Mindanao have sustainable access to fisheries and other productive coastal resources, use sustainable management practices and diversify livelihood opportunities to meet their basic needs, in particular food.

## Objectives of projects and programmes

<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	<i>Objectives</i>
<b>Argentina</b> Patagonia Rural Development Project	The programme's development objective is reduction in the economic and environmental vulnerability of the rural poor in Patagonia by rural development asset-building with gender equity and sustainable use of natural resources, and pursuant to the Millennium Development Goals for Argentina
<b>Azerbaijan</b> Rural Development Project for the North West	The project's goal is to reduce income poverty, malnutrition and food insecurity in a sustainable manner by improving the livelihoods of the rural poor in the project area and preventing further impoverishment. The key development objectives are to: (i) rehabilitate the irrigation infrastructure and introduce participatory irrigation management to ensure a sustainable and effective irrigation management regime; (ii) ensure the delivery of advisory, technology transfer, financial and enterprise support services; and (iii) enhance the capability and self-reliance of communities to look after their own affairs and plan and implement their own development initiatives more effectively.
<b>Bangladesh</b> Finance for Enterprise Development and Employment Creation Project	The project goal is to stimulate pro-poor growth to increase employment opportunities and reduce poverty. The project objective is to expand existing microenterprises and establish new ones. The project will aim to build the capacity of both PKSf and its POs to efficiently manage a microenterprise development programme.
<b>Bangladesh</b> National Agricultural Technologies Programme	The project's overall objective is to support the Government's strategy to increase national agricultural productivity and farm income. Its specific objective is to improve the effectiveness of the national agricultural technology system in Bangladesh for the benefit of small and marginal farmers.
<b>Bangladesh</b> Sunamganj Community-Based Resource Management Project	The main objectives of the project are to: (i) increase the assets and income of 135 000 households by developing self-managing grass-roots organizations to improve beneficiary access to primary resources, employment, self-employment and credit; and (ii) support the development of a viable national institution to replicate the project approach in other areas of Bangladesh. The project's objectives will be met through the financing of five components designed to assist the poor: (i) labour-intensive infrastructure development; (ii) fisheries development; (iii) crop and livestock production; (iv) credit; and (v) institutional support.
<b>Benin</b> Rural Development Support Programme	The programme's development Goal is to help reduce rural poverty sustainably by increasing household incomes and improving community-level organizations. Specifically, the programme aims to: 1) Earnings obtained directly and indirectly through group IGAs and Micro- Businesses (MBs) increased sustainably 2) Network of FSAs sustainably consolidated and expanded to provide financial services that respond to needs of the poor and women 3) Capacity of village-level organizations and actors (VDCs and IGA groups) sustainably strengthened and fully representative 4) Strengthen policy dialogue on rural development and forge strategic partnerships
<b>Burkina Faso</b> Small-Scale Irrigation and Water Management Project	The project's development objective is to contribute to rural poverty reduction and food security through improved access to, and management of, water resources for agricultural and pastoral use. Specific objectives are to: (i) strengthen target group capacities and facilitate their participation in project activities, including through access to irrigated land; (ii) assist target groups with investments to increase their access to irrigation water using technologies adapted to their technical skills and resource levels; (iii) intensify and diversify sustainable agricultural production under irrigation and in inland valley bottoms; and (iv) support marketing activities and enhance incomes, particularly of the most asset-poor households.

<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	<i>Objectives</i>
<p><b>Burundi</b> Livestock Sector Rehabilitation Support Project</p>	<p>The project aims to improve the livelihoods of the rural poor and restore their food security. It will: (i) raise livestock productivity while developing the downstream sector through increasing access to livestock processing technology, infrastructure and markets; (ii) facilitate the access of the poor and vulnerable to veterinary services and reinforce the sector in terms of sanitary risk management, prevention and protection; and (iii) strengthen the capacity of elected community committees responsible for local community development and introduce farmers' field school methodology to upgrade farmers' skills and promote participatory competitive research activities.</p>
<p><b>Colombia</b> Rural Microenterprise Assets Programme: Capitalization, Technical Assistance and Investment Support</p>	<p>The programme's development objective is to increase the social, human, financial, physical and natural assets of small-scale entrepreneurs, especially women and young people, in rural poor areas of Colombia. The specific objective is to increase the rural poor's access – through their microenterprise initiatives – to financial resources, technical assistance, knowledge, information and governance structures (local, regional and national) essential to the development of their microenterprises and markets. This will open the way for the simultaneous engagement and participation in policy dialogue and formulation of public policies related to economic integration and its impact on the rural poor.</p>
<p><b>Comoros</b> National Programme for Sustainable Human Development</p>	<p>The overall goal of the programme is to reduce poverty by promoting better natural resource management in order to raise agricultural production. This will in turn increase household income and food security. The specific objectives are to support: (i) farmer organizations and local governance, including village development associations, producer groups and private sector intermediary organizations; (ii) land rehabilitation and sustainable local land management, including environmental conservation and crop production, livestock development, and promotion of artisanal fisheries; and (iii) local initiatives in close partnership with migrants' associations.</p>
<p><b>Congo</b> Rural Development Project in the Niari, Bouenza and Lékoumou Departments</p>	<p>The project's development goal is to attain a sustained improvement in the social and economic conditions of artisanal fishing communities in the project area. To achieve this, the project will (a) empower and create capacity in fishing communities to take increased responsibility for local development initiatives, including implementing social infrastructure and service activities, and sustainably managing marine resources; (b) improve the access of artisanal fishers to the fish resources of the Sofala Bank, and promote their sustainable and commercially viable use; (c) improve the linkages of artisanal fishing communities to input and output markets; (d) increase the availability of savings facilities and small loans to artisanal fishers, increase business opportunities for traders with linkages to fishing centres, and improve services to fishers through access to finance by small-scale enterprises in the project area; and (e) improve the enabling environment for promoting and supporting artisanal fisheries development.</p>
<p><b>Democratic Republic of Congo</b> Agricultural Rehabilitation Programme in Orientale Province</p>	<p>The programme's development goal will be to help improve food security, incomes, nutritional status and living standards of up to 55 000 households including the households of 25 000 farmers and 6 000 fishers in the Tshopo district and 24 000 households along the three axes. Its specific objectives will be to build up the capacity for self-development of rural communities and their organizations; facilitate access by local producers to markets and factors of production (inputs, technologies, knowledge); improve access by local populations to basic social services; and ensure that programme resources are effectively used.</p>

<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	<i>Objectives</i>
<p><b>Democratic Republic of Congo</b></p> <p>Agricultural Revival Programme in Equateur Province</p>	<p>The overall goal of the programme is to contribute to enhancing food security and improving the livelihoods of the rural poor. The programme's development objective is to restore and improve sustainable livelihoods for rural communities. Specifically, the programme aims to: (i) restore and improve agricultural productive assets, promote equitable and sustainable access by farmers to markets and raise agricultural income; (ii) restore and improve the productive assets of the fisheries sector, promote equitable and sustainable access of fishermen (and women) to markets, and raise their income; and (iii) restore and improve the access of rural communities to basic social services. A special focus will be placed on addressing the development constraints faced by the poorest rural categories, in particular widows, pygmies and other vulnerable groups.</p>
<p><b>Djibouti</b></p> <p>Programme for the Mobilization of Surface Water and Sustainable Land Management</p>	<p>The programme's overall goal is to improve the living conditions of pastoral communities by promoting integrated management of natural resources. The two specific objectives are: (i) to implement a programme for the mobilization of surface water to improve access to water for the pastoral communities and their livestock and to increase agricultural production; and (ii) to strengthen organization and management capacity at the institutional, technical and community levels.</p>
<p><b>Ecuador</b></p> <p>Development of the Central Corridor Project</p>	<p>The objectives of FECD are to contribute to reaching targets set out in Ecuadorian development plans and those of CIDA's technical and financial cooperation programme in Ecuador. The institution was established to finance the local costs of projects and of activities identified by the secretariat of FECD.</p>
<p><b>Egypt</b></p> <p>West Noubaria Rural Development Project</p>	<p>The overall project goal is to enhance the livelihoods of the target population through increased and sustainable economic activity and greater social self-reliance. The overall goal will be achieved through: (a) attainment of social cohesion and a sense of community in the villages; (b) reliable and equitable access to the support services essential to economic and social well-being; (c) diversified and profitable farming based on more efficient water use; (d) establishment of self-sustaining arrangements for the provision of accessible and effective credit services; and (e) a diversified and strengthened local economy contributing to nationwide economic advancement.</p>
<p><b>India</b></p> <p>Women's Empowerment and Livelihoods Programme in the Mid-Gangetic Plains</p>	<p>The programme has three objectives: (i) building and/or strengthening community level institutions for social and economic empowerment; (ii) enabling the target group to access productive resources and social services; and (iii) building a sustainable livelihood base that is integrated with the wider economy.</p>
<p><b>Kenya</b></p> <p>Smallholder Horticulture Marketing Programme</p>	<p>The development goals are to (i) increase incomes and reduce poverty among poor rural households and the unemployed and underemployed in areas with medium-to high farming potential and where horticulture is an important source of livelihood; and (ii) improve the health and welfare of Kenyans by increasing the quality and quantity of horticultural produce consumed within the country. These goals will be pursued by seeking to (a) increase the output of – and the net margins per unit of land earned by – resource-poor smallholders from horticultural production for the domestic market; (b) increase employment in the production, processing and marketing of horticultural produce; and (c) reduce the cost to consumers and increase the quality of horticultural products consumed domestically.</p>
<p><b>Malawi</b></p> <p>Rural Livelihoods Support Programme</p>	<p>The overall objective of the programme is to improve the livelihoods and quality of life of the target population by improving access to resources and ensuring more efficient resource use by village households. The programme will achieve this objective by: (i) keeping the target population better informed and encouraging self-motivation; (ii) empowering the target group to organize its access to resources and improve production; (iii) ensuring responsiveness of service providers; (iv) reducing the hunger gap; and (v) improving the dietary and nutritional status of the target group.</p>



<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	<i>Objectives</i>
<p><b>Mali</b> Northern Regions Investment and Rural Development Programme</p>	<p>The programme's goal is to reduce poverty and vulnerability among the rural people of North Mali by reconstructing the economic and social fabric that has been severely compromised by drought and conflict, and to contribute to policy dialogue on rural poverty reduction. The programme's specific objectives are to: (i) build the capacity of local government, particularly at the community level, to lead a participatory development process that will benefit the most vulnerable groups; (ii) strengthen grass-roots organizations' capacity to manage programme-financed investments in an efficient and sustainable manner; (iii) improve access to basic services; and (iv) contribute to the promotion of policies for rural poverty reduction.</p>
<p><b>Mali</b> Kidal Integrated Rural Development Programme</p>	<p>The programme's overall goal is to help reduce poverty and food insecurity in the Kidal Region. Its specific objectives are to (i) increase and diversify local residents' incomes by stabilizing returns from nomadic livestock husbandry and promoting agropastoral activities; and (ii) improve their living conditions, notably those of women, by facilitating access to basic socio-economic services and infrastructure.</p>
<p><b>Mexico</b> Sustainable Development Project for Rural and Indigenous Communities of the Semi-Arid North West</p>	<p>The project's overall objective is to raise the quality of life and thus reduce the levels of poverty and marginality affecting rural and indigenous communities in the project area. The project will support project-area communities and grass-roots organizations in developing capacity to participate in local, social and economic development processes, increase their production, employment opportunities and incomes, and ensure the sustainability of natural resources. Specific objectives include: (i) improving the productive capacity of land and natural resources while facilitating better community control over assets, including land, agro-biodiversity and natural landscapes; (ii) developing the human and social resources of poor rural communities and indigenous populations while strengthening the management and decision-making capacity of communities and their organizations, with care to ensure gender equity and respect for ethnic diversity; (iii) boosting employment and income levels of beneficiary families through the receipt of payment for environmental services and from rural and nature-based tourism microenterprises; and (iv) strengthening the inter- and intra-institutional coordination capacity of the executing agency and project-related institutions at the municipal, state and federal levels.</p>
<p><b>Mozambique</b> Sofala Bank Artisanal Fisheries Project</p>	<p>The project's development goal is to attain a sustained improvement in the social and economic conditions of artisanal fishing communities in the project area. To achieve this, the project will (a) empower and create capacity in fishing communities to take increased responsibility for local development initiatives, including implementing social infrastructure and service activities, and sustainably managing marine resources; (b) improve the access of artisanal fishers to the fish resources of the Sofala Bank, and promote their sustainable and commercially viable use; (c) improve the linkages of artisanal fishing communities to input and output markets; (d) increase the availability of savings facilities and small loans to artisanal fishers, increase business opportunities for traders with linkages to fishing centres, and improve services to fishers through access to finance by small-scale enterprises in the project area; and (e) improve the enabling environment for promoting and supporting artisanal fisheries development.</p>
<p><b>Nicaragua</b> Programme for the Economic Development of the Dry Region in Nicaragua</p>	<p>The programme's overall development objective is to contribute to the reduction of rural poverty by increasing the income of rural poor households. Its specific objective is to improve sustainably and equitably the access of poor rural households to assets that allow them to benefit from income-generating opportunities. It will assist in the participatory planning and implementation of business and employment plans. In addition, it will ensure improved access to income-generating activities by: (i) strengthening the target group's capacity to access markets, with special emphasis on creating the right conditions for women and youth; and (ii) increasing the supply of local financial and non-financial services.</p>

<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	Objectives
<p><b>Nepal</b> Leasehold Forestry and Livestock Programme</p>	<p>The overall goal of the eight-year LFLP is a sustained reduction in the poverty of the 44 300 poor households that are allocated leasehold forestry plots in 22 districts through increased production of forest products and livestock. The programme has four components: leasehold forestry and group formation; livestock development; rural financial services; and programme management and coordination. The objectives of the programme components are: (i) improved household forage and tree crop production from secure and sustainable management of leasehold plots; (ii) improved household production of small livestock (goats); (iii) viable microfinance institutions providing services to leaseholders; and (iv) the Government's capacity to implement leasehold forestry as a national poverty reduction programme in a gender-sensitive way.</p>
<p><b>Nicaragua</b> Inclusion of Small-Scale Producers in Value Chains and Market Access Project</p>	<p>The project's goal is to enable the targeted rural poor to take part in local and national social and economic processes in order to improve their income and employment opportunities. In particular, the project will: (i) promote the participation of small-scale producers in strategic value chains; (ii) contribute to income diversification; and (iii) help achieve IDR's objectives and results frameworks by aligning project activities with its institutional objectives.</p>
<p><b>Nicaragua</b> Technical Assistance Fund Programme for the Departments of León, Chinandega and Managua</p>	<p>The development objective of the TAF will be to increase the productive and marketing capacity of small and medium-scale farmers and small-scale entrepreneurs living in rural areas by contributing to family incomes and improving living conditions. The specific objective of the TAF will be to ensure access by small-scale farmers and rural entrepreneurs to technical assistance services in a sustainable manner based on the competitive supply of services and in accordance with beneficiary needs. TAF implementation will result in: (a) strengthened organizations of small-scale farmers and entrepreneurs that are able to formulate technical assistance needs and to demand, negotiate and cofinance these services and other agricultural-production support services; (b) sustainable and efficient providers of technical assistance that use methodologies and appropriate techniques responsive to the demands of farmers' organizations; and (c) different modalities of technical assistance provision operating and linking supply and demand on a selective basis.</p>
<p><b>Niger</b> Emergency Food Security and Rural Development Programme</p>	<p>The programme's development objective is to support the improvement of food security in the Niger generally, with a special focus on poor farmer and herder households that are highly exposed to recurrent food and livestock crises in the three targeted regions.</p>
<p><b>Philippines</b> Rural Microenterprise Promotion Programme</p>	<p>The programme's development goal is rural poverty reduction through increased economic development, job creation and rural incomes for 200 000 poor rural households. Central to achieving this goal, and as its programme objective, RuMEPP expects to see increasing numbers of new and existing rural microenterprises expanding and operating profitably and sustainably.</p>
<p><b>Sao Tome and Principe</b> Participatory Smallholder Agriculture and Artisanal Fisheries Development Programme</p>	<p>Overall, the main objective of the programme is to continue providing support to improvement in the living conditions and incomes of women and men in rural smallholder agriculture and artisanal fisheries. More specifically, the programme will: (a) continue providing support towards the restructuring of the rural sector, in terms of strengthening grass-roots organizations and of preparing the ground for future decentralized local development; (b) contribute to support for a pool of professional service providers capable of responding to the needs and demands of the target group; and (c) empower the target group to undertake economic activities and take advantage of the income-earning opportunities offered by the development of new products, the capture of niche markets and diversification of activities.</p>

<i>Country and project/programme names</i>	Objectives
<b>Solomon Islands</b> Solomon Islands Rural Development Programme	The development objective of the RDP is to raise the living standards of rural households by establishing improved mechanisms for the delivery of priority economic and social infrastructure and services by the public and private sector. This is being achieved through: (i) increased, cost-effective and sustained provision of local services and basic infrastructure determined through participatory planning and prioritized by the villagers themselves; (ii) increased capacity of agricultural institutions to provide demand-driven agriculture services at the local level; and (iii) support for rural business development.
<b>Syrian Arab Republic</b> Idleb Rural Development Project	The principal objectives of the proposed project are to improve the food security and income levels of the target group of farmers and rural women by expanding the area of arable land, improving access to water, and introducing more efficient farming and water management practices for the sustainable use of land and water resources.
<b>Syrian Arab Republic</b> North-eastern Region Rural Development Project	The overall project goal is to contribute to poverty reduction and improved livelihoods of the target population in the project area. This objective will be achieved through (i) rural community organizations with sustainable resource management and commercial operations; (ii) optimal management and rational use of water resources for irrigation; (iii) farmers' access to effective and relevant advisory services; and (iv) private-sector investments creating employment and boosting incomes.
<b>Tunisia</b> Integrated Agricultural Development Project in the Governorate of Siliana- Phase II	The overall objective of the project is to achieve sustainable improvement in incomes and living conditions for rural people living in the Governorate of Siliana. Specific objectives are as follows: (i) engage communities in a local development process likely to promote their initiatives and investments in agriculture and soil and water conservation; (ii) diversify and increase employment and investment opportunities in rural areas for both women and youth and contribute to the development of sustainable economic linkages; (iii) develop the institutional capacities of the Regional Commission for Agricultural Development (CRDA) based on an integrated, participatory, equitable and gender-sensitive approach to local development; and (iv) ensure that regional stakeholders and national decision makers adopt the principles of sustainable land management.
<b>Yemen</b> Rainfed Agriculture and Livestock Project	The overall project goal is to reduce rural poverty in the project area and improve natural resource management. The development objectives are to: (i) help producers upgrade and diversify agricultural and livestock production and processing and marketing systems, and protect their assets (soil, water, rangeland, seed and animals); and (ii) empower rural communities to organize, participate in and gain benefit from community-based development planning and execution and to improve their access to public and private services, input and output markets and rural finance.