

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION

Addressing challenges in inclusive and sustainable development

The International Fund for Agricultural Development's (IFAD) support to Turkey for the period covered by the evaluation (2003-2015) focused on the lagging regions and provinces, but its impact was limited due to lack of adequate targeting and inclusive approaches to rural transformation.

The Turkey Country Programme Evaluation assessed four IFAD-financed projects – two had ended by the time of the evaluation and the other two were ongoing. Using national socio-economic data, IFAD and the Government of Turkey selected the nine provinces to be covered by the projects from among the 38 provinces found to be relatively poor (under-developed) or the poorest (severely under-developed). Within these provinces, they assigned priority to the poorest counties, using the same data (and, in one project, carefully selected micro-catchments), and also developed criteria for selecting villages.

The projects channelled resources effectively to poorer villages and selected households in the villages. A large part of the resources were allocated to public goods such as access roads, irrigation and sewerage systems, and livestock watering facilities. These interventions offer broad-based benefits to rural communities aimed at ensuring sustainable long-term social and economic welfare. A substantial amount was also invested in household and individual activities, such as agricultural demonstrations, training, cattle barns and supply chain investments. Both types of interventions – public goods and household/individual assistance – can be designed to include a target group. However, these projects focused primarily on more capable and better-resourced farmers, to the exclusion of the poorer farmers, and without broad-based participation by women and youth.

Identifying interventions specific to the target groups

In order to ensure inclusiveness and sustainability, a project must have activities (interventions) and corresponding resources for specific target groups, such as poorer farmers, women and youth. Interventions should be selected based on what is needed and feasible in an area, and on what the intended beneficiaries consider important and feasible. Therefore, it is important to consult each target group to identify its priorities (within the sectors allocated to the project), discuss opportunities and constraints, propose options specific to the group, and let them decide what they can do best. This is useful during project design as well as implementation, when there may be a need to adjust the technical, financial and other aspects of what was envisaged during the design stage.

Agricultural technology, in particular, requires that careful attention be given to the differences between farmers with large holdings and farmers who are resource-poor. Extension agents prefer to demonstrate new technology to farmers with large holdings because they are considered to be progressive; that is, more amenable to accepting expert recommendations. It follows that the technical recommendations they demonstrate usually entail costs and risks that are too high for smallholder farmers. What is needed is a differentiated – or

inclusive – approach, one in which recommendations differentiate between the priorities and resources of the two types of farmers. One such approach, illustrated below, is based on the idea of recommendation domains.

	RECOMMENDATION DOMAIN (WITHIN THE SAME AGRO-ECOLOGICAL ZONE)	
	SMALL FARMERS	LARGE FARMERS
PRIORITIES AND CONSTRAINTS		
Household priority	Home consumption and cash income	Cash income
Preferred markets	Village and nearby towns	Nearby and distant towns
Access to capital	Limited	Adequate
Source of labour	Family members	Family and hired workers
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OFF-SEASON CROPS		
Crops	Vegetables and flowers	Strawberries
Size of demonstration area	300 square metres	1 800 square metres
Greenhouse design	Small, low cost	Large, costly
Irrigation	Traditional or low-cost alternative	Drip irrigation with tubewell

Including target households through informal platforms

It is often difficult for outsiders, project staff among them, to decide who within a rural community is poor and deserving of project assistance. Approaches for identifying the poor include participatory wealth ranking, the poverty score card (used in World Bank-assisted projects), analysis of government data, and asking the village leader or another official. Another approach, which can be used on its own or to validate other information, is to ask the community itself to identify households (or individuals, as the case may be) that fulfil the criteria for beneficiary selection. The criteria must include relevant poverty indicators but can otherwise vary across interventions – for example, between livestock and horticulture interventions, and between interventions for women and men.

Identifying beneficiaries with the community's help is a cost-effective approach and requires that community members be brought together on a common platform. The best platform is an informal assembly (or assemblies) made up of household representatives drawn from a geographical unit and consisting of men, women and youth. They can meet separately or together. In some settings, local customs may require men and women to meet separately, and distances may require that households assemble within their hamlets, rather than in the village centre, or it may be convenient for the hamlets to send one or two representatives to meet in the village centre. It is important to respect such considerations, and to take village elders and leaders into confidence before starting any group activity.

Informal platforms can also enhance the participation of the target group in planning, implementing, monitoring and sustaining project activities at the village level. Every grass-roots sub-project, whether it relates to infrastructure, agriculture, livestock, forestry or value chains, goes through a project cycle that typically starts with project identification, followed by project preparation and appraisal, and then implementation, after which it needs to be sustained, often through local involvement. A participatory approach is one in which project staff, including technical experts, make decisions in consultation with the beneficiaries throughout the project cycle.

Supporting sustainability and inclusion through appropriate institutions

The government and non-government institutions engaged in development include some that have a technical orientation and others that have a comparative advantage in engaging communities; some specialize in agriculture and natural resources management, and others in youth and women's affairs. Within agriculture and natural resource management, some experts specialize in the agricultural or environmental sciences and some in agricultural or resource economics. Generally, it is not possible for people in one area of expertise to substitute for another. In order to pursue inclusive and sustainable development effectively, it is important for a project that seeks to assist poorer farmers, women and youth to select appropriate partners from among the relevant institutions and individuals.

Further information:

Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD, Via Paolo di Dono, 44, 00142, Rome, Italy. The evaluation Profile, Insights and infographic are available online: www.ifad.org/evaluation; email: evaluation@ifad.org.