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Objectives for this session

• Show how evaluation can contribute to learning
• Share lessons from evaluations of community-driven development (CDD) in IFAD
Evaluation as knowledge product

What has worked in the past?

Under what conditions?

What were the challenges?

What may work in the future?
Findings from Corporate-level evaluations on innovations

INNOVATIONS THAT WORKED
Features of CDD innovations

• Most innovations are not genuinely novel
  - already proven practices elsewhere transferred in a new context and adjusted as needed => aligned with the definition of an innovation.

• CDD innovations were mostly effective

• CDD influential on sub-components of the agri-food system
  - primarily social capital and also human capital.
  - Enabling process, enhancing agricultural production and value chain development, management of natural resources.

• Examples of enabling CDD-related innovations
  - community facilitator for community mobilization in Burkina.
  - water users’ association in Malawi and Rwanda.
  - territorial development approach in Peru.
  - bay wide management committee in the Philippines.
Effective innovations

Local management and supervision committee (LMSC) in Rwanda

• Mobilised local / community stakeholders in watershed management.

• Each watershed has a LMSC, to define and oversee all watershed activities using the Watershed Natural Resource Development and Management Plan.

• It includes all rural stakeholders living within the watershed.

• Key community collective decision-making body that takes into account the interests of all stakeholders in the management of a common resource.
Effective innovations

Community network in Sudan

• Each network is managed by an executive committee composed of representatives from member communities and supervised by elders sub committees.

• Or consultancy council for tribal management and with capacity to solve any issues or problems rising among the member communities.

• Some networks added sub committees for women and youth to be taken on board in the planning and management process of the development issues.
Institutionalising innovations

• **Farmers’ organisations**: The creation and promotion of grassroots organisations (e.g. in Tunisia) allowed strengthening the position of the population vis-à-vis development agents and policy makers. The strengthening of their administrative and financial management capabilities allowed them to negotiate a better programme with the various administrations.

• In Rwanda, the **Innovation Community Centre** is a technical infrastructure, became an institutional body that serves as an information, coordination and service delivery platform for farmers which aims to ensure ownership, continuation and sustainability of project achievements.
Findings from evaluation synthesis report on CDD

PERFORMANCE THAT WORKED
CDD in the IFAD portfolio

Source: Analysis based on ESR CDD Database including All approved projects (full sample 1,089 projects)
Rolling out CDD in partner countries

Countries with 15 projects (India), 6%
Countries with 10 projects (Pakistan), 4%
Countries with 8 projects (Bangladesh, Vietnam, Yemen), 10%
Countries with 6 projects (Guinea, Indonesia, Nigeria), 7%
Countries with 5 projects, 10%
Countries with 4 projects, 15%
Countries with 3 projects, 19%
Countries with 2 projects, 16%
Countries with 1 project, 12%

% on no. of projects (on full CDD sample of 243 based on approved amount between 1982 and 2017)
Project effectiveness

IOE effectiveness
CDD-related projects over time

Source: ARRI database
• CDD projects were successful in addressing the priorities of the poor, indigenous peoples, women.

• Participatory poverty analysis, effective.

• Inclusive decision-making empowers the poor to raise their voices.

• Elite capture occurs but is underreported.

► Self-targeting not sufficient
► CDD requires critical mass of investments to ensure broad-based benefits
► Funds specifically allocated to ultra-poor, indigenous peoples, women enable effective targeting
► Community contributions may aggravate inequalities
Gender equality and women’s empowerment

• CDD increases female participation in village committees. Quality and results of this participation are not measured.

• CDD often improves women’s access to credit, training, and jobs. Changes in earnings, consumption, productivity, education, and health are not normally measured.

• CDD can increase women’s voice and decision making in project activities. Political empowerment at higher levels is not normally measured.

• Elite dominance and elite capture also occur among women.
• CDD mobilizes local knowledge for sustainable development.

• The multi-sectoral nature of investments in demand-driven CDD projects contributes to improved food security and nutrition.

• CDD empowers poor farmers to take control of their production systems and to decide what to grow best given the local conditions and their consumption.

• Community-based adaptation to climate change captures the wealth of knowledge and experience that communities have on dealing with climate variability and change.
LESSONS LEARNED
Lessons

• CDD is more effective than other approaches in remote and marginalized areas

• CDD is an effective way to provide infrastructure, improve social cohesion, and reduce conflict in fragile situations.

• CDD enhances the effectiveness and impact of interventions in the agri-food system

• CDD improves the sustainability of development interventions.

• CDD contributed to effective, accountable and transparent institutions (SDG 16)
Resources on CDD evaluation

IFAD CDD evaluation synthesis:
EvalForward blog post on CDD evaluation:
https://www.evalforward.org/index.php/blog/CDD