

Document: EB 2013/110/R.5/Rev.1
Agenda: 5
Date: 31 December 2013
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

IFAD Country Presence Strategy (2014-2015)

Note to Executive Board representatives

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Kevin Cleaver

Associate Vice-President
Programme Management Department
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2419
e-mail: k.cleaver@ifad.org

Shyam Khadka

Senior Portfolio Manager
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2388
e-mail: s.khadka@ifad.org

Paula Kim

Senior Operations Adviser
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2731
e-mail: p.kim@ifad.org

Dispatch of documentation:

Deirdre McGrenra

Head, Governing Bodies Office
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2374
e-mail: gb_office@ifad.org

For: Approval

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	ii
Recommendation for approval	1
I. Background	1
II. Progress to date	1
III. Country presence costs and impact: Evidence from recent evaluations	2
IV. Updated country presence strategy	4
A. Objectives	4
B. Criteria for opening of country offices	4
C. Country office models	4
D. Exit strategy	6
V. Proposed expansion of country offices and cost implications	7
VI. Relationship between ICOs and headquarters	9
VII. Investment in ICOs	11
A. ICO connectivity initiative	11
B. Decentralized Enterprise Resource Planning	11
VIII. Monitoring framework for country offices	12
IX. Recommendations and next steps	12
Annexes	
I. IFAD country offices by region and year of approval	13
II. Outposted CPMs by regional division	14
III. Host country agreements status as at 1 October 2013	15
IV. Host agency service-level agreements: Status as at 1 October 2013	16
V. Excerpts from country programme evaluations	17
VI. ICO Performance 2013 Project Status Reports	20
VII. Authority and responsibilities of headquarters office for country offices	21
VIII. Monitoring indicators for IFAD country offices	24
IX. Ranking of country programmes for establishing country offices	21

Abbreviations and acronyms

AWP/B	annual workplan and budget
CPE	country programme evaluation
CPM	country programme manager
CPO	country programme officer
FSU	Field Support Unit
ICO	IFAD country office
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
HCA	host country agreement
PMD	Programme Management Department

Recommendation for approval

Remaining within the framework of IFAD's country presence policy approved by the Board in 2011, the Executive Board is invited to approve an updated country presence strategy for 2014-2015, including:

- (a) Continued use of: (i) existing criteria for opening of country offices, as indicated in paragraphs 17-18; (ii) existing criteria for selecting various models of country offices (paragraphs 19-25); and (iii) the existing exit strategy for country offices (paragraphs 26-29);
- (b) Establishment of up to 10 additional country offices arrived at in accordance with the selection criteria approved by the Executive Board (paragraphs 30-33); and
- (c) Agreement to the countries in which nine of the new IFAD country offices will be established (listed in paragraph 33, table 1), with the tenth to be decided at a later date, in agreement with the Executive Board.

IFAD Country Presence Strategy (2014-2015)

I. Background

1. IFAD's first country presence initiative, the Field Presence Pilot Programme was approved by the IFAD Executive Board in December 2003 and 15 IFAD country offices (ICOs) were established by 2006. An independent evaluation undertaken in 2007 found that IFAD's achievements were markedly better in countries with country offices than in comparator countries. In this light, IFAD's country presence programme was expanded to 30 ICOs by 2009. Following a self-assessment of country presence by IFAD Management in 2010, a country presence policy and strategy were submitted and approved by the Executive Board at its 102nd session in May 2011, followed by an update of the policy in September 2011. This policy allowed Management to increase the number of ICOs to 40 by 2013.
2. In the light of Management's commitment to provide regular updates to the Board, this paper presents progress to date in establishing ICOs and describes the systems and procedures guiding their management. The document proposes several updates and modifications to the country presence strategy for the period 2014-2015, including a progressive strengthening and continued but limited expansion of the number of ICOs.

II. Progress to date

3. Of the 40 ICOs approved by the Executive Board, 39 have been established and one, Benin, is in the process of being established (annex I). About half of these offices were expected to be led by a country programme manager (CPM), which will be achieved in due course. So far, 17 CPMs have been outposted to their respective country offices and four are scheduled to be outposted by the first quarter of 2014 (annex II). There has been a progressive increase in seniority, with 11 of the 17 CPMs outposted at P-5 level. This is facilitating more responsive operational and organizational solutions. The business processes have been reviewed and consistently adapted to deliver key benefits without increasing costs and within a limited time frame, which is strategically important. Of the 40 host country agreements (HCAs) required, 23 have been signed and 17 are in various stages of negotiation (annex III).
4. In line with its Board-approved country presence policy and strategy, IFAD has established its ICOs under hosting arrangements with United Nations agencies and,

in one case, with a publicly funded research institution (the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research – CGIAR). Thirty-five host agency service-level agreements have been signed. Of these, 21 are with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), seven with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), five with the World Food Programme (WFP), and one each with the United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) and the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI, a CGIAR centre) (annex IV). The in-country process for HCAs and host agency service-level agreements varies significantly across countries and agencies.¹

III. Country presence costs and impact: Evidence from recent evaluations

5. IFAD relies heavily on its country offices to enhance its development effectiveness and achieve institutional efficiency. Relative to the role that ICOs play, the level of resources committed so far is low. For example, the total country presence budget of US\$12.51 million in 2013 constitutes only 8.7 per cent of IFAD's total budget. While the country office staff budget accounts for only 9.6 per cent of the total budget allocated for IFAD staff, these offices account for 16 per cent of the total number of staff, introducing significant efficiency gains in the business model. This is explained largely by having a more balanced staffing structure between international professionals with global knowledge and nationals with significant local experience – reducing the unit costs associated with headquarters staff.
6. The cost of the 39 country offices established by the end of 2012 was budgeted at US\$12.34 million. This amount has increased only marginally to US\$12.51 million for 2013. (Of the latter, US\$8.65 million covers staff costs and US\$3.86 million non-staff costs.) In other words, the budget for country presence is not only relatively low, but also stabilized.
7. Although IFAD's country presence initiative began in 2004, strengthening in terms of staffing and budgetary resources have only recently taken place. Additionally, most nationally recruited staff did not become IFAD staff until 2011. Therefore it is rather early to assess the impact of ICOs on programme performance. Nevertheless, there are strong early signals that demonstrate the positive impact ICOs have had on the performance of IFAD's programmes and the likely impact they have had on the intended beneficiaries. This is attested to by the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE), which has stated that the absence of country offices constrained the impact of IFAD loans in several countries, most recently in Argentina and Jordan (annex V).
8. Country programme evaluations (CPEs) have also consistently found improved performance in terms of: (i) policy dialogue (Ghana 2012, Ecuador 2013); (ii) partnership building (Viet Nam 2012); (iii) knowledge management (Mali 2013); (iv) contribution towards scaling up (Ghana 2012, Argentina 2010); and (v) implementation support everywhere. In addition, ICOs have contributed to an enhanced profile and visibility of IFAD in Madagascar, Mozambique, Uganda and Viet Nam. In corollary, problems arising from a lack of country offices in the field are also highlighted in some CPEs: limited progress in policy dialogue (Jordan 2012) or the challenge of quickly responding to a changing political and social context (Argentina 2010).
9. Independent evaluations also state that ICOs have made crucial contributions in terms of project supervision and implementation support. Improved management of projects is delivered through: better identification of problems, timely

¹ An HCA is with a government; a host agency service-level agreement is the agreement with the United Nations agency hosting IFAD's staff.

information flows, communication with partners, dialogue with governments, improved monitoring and evaluation (M&E), closer follow-up on fiduciary aspects and overall enhanced efficiency (Yemen 2011, Kenya 2011). Overall, improvements in efficiency have also been attributed to direct supervision and country presence (Rwanda 2011). It has been further noted that an outposted CPM contributes even more effectively to policy dialogue and timely implementation support (Ghana, Kenya, Viet Nam, and the outposted associate country programme manager in Madagascar). With respect to the Nairobi regional office in Kenya, IOE noted that a regional office can contribute significantly to improved results, not only through better administrative processing of withdrawal applications, but also through prompt technical advice in three priority thematic fields – land management, climate change and gender – and in loan and grant administration (Kenya 2011).

10. IOE has also found that insufficient resources have constrained the performance of country offices, especially in terms of policy dialogue and partnerships in Nepal and Uganda. In some CPEs, evaluations have suggested strengthening country offices (along with outposting of CPMs, suggested in Ecuador, India and Uganda) and increasing ICO staff, for example in Uganda. At a more aggregate level, IOE has attributed some of IFAD's performance improvement to the increasing presence of IFAD in the field (2012 ARRI).
11. Management's own most recent annual portfolio review exercise (2013) suggests that projects in countries with ICOs perform better in terms of project management, which includes areas such as quality of project management, targeting, and gender and poverty focus. There is as yet no noticeable difference in terms of the fiduciary aspects of projects, which are heavily dependent on governmental systems.
12. The table below also helps show the impact of ICOs. Each supervision mission uses a rating system from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 6 (highly satisfactory) to judge project performance. The table shows that in every category, except fiduciary, ongoing projects in countries with ICOs perform better.

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Non-ICO</i>	<i>ICO</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Difference ICO to non-ICO</i>
Average fiduciary	4.09	4.02	4.06	-2%
Average management	4.02	4.20	4.12	4%
Average sustainability	4.04	4.19	4.12	4%
Physical/financial assets	3.96	4.16	4.07	5%
Food security	3.97	4.20	4.09	6%
Overall implementation progress	3.95	4.10	4.03	4%
Likelihood of achieving the development objectives	4.03	4.15	4.09	3%
Average impact	3.98	4.15	4.07	4%
Average of EB to first disbursement (months)	19.47	18.95	19.19	-3%
Average of entry into force to first disbursement (months)	6.92	6.82	6.87	-1%

13. Similarly, projects with ICO support perform better in terms of a number of sustainability-related criteria such as innovation and learning, beneficiary empowerment, scaling up and replication (annex VI). The ICO-supported projects also perform better in two overarching indicators – overall implementation progress and likelihood of achieving the development objective. These projects also report small, albeit important, improvements in early implementation delay, an area IFAD has accorded high priority for improvement.
14. Members of the Evaluation Committee, following their visit to Viet Nam and Ghana, have highlighted the positive contributions made by these country offices.

IV. Updated country presence strategy

15. In view of the more recent evidence of the effectiveness of IFAD's presence in the field, observations about excessive constraints on the number of offices, and after a review of the country presence policy and strategy approved by the Board in 2011, IFAD Management proposes several revisions of the strategy to be implemented over 2014-2015, while keeping the overall policy framework approved by the Board unchanged. The changes proposed are limited, are mostly operational in nature, and have only limited financial and human resource implications.

A. Objectives

16. In line with the approved policy objective, IFAD will continue to strengthen existing offices and establish new country offices in recipient countries where they can contribute to improving the development effectiveness and cost efficiency of IFAD's operations. It will close offices in countries where they are judged as not contributing to these objectives.

B. Criteria for opening of country offices

17. In order to ensure that new offices contribute positively to achieve the twin objectives of enhancing development effectiveness and increasing cost efficiency, IFAD Management will continue applying the set of six empirically verifiable criteria approved by the Executive Board for opening new offices and considering office closures. These criteria are: (i) size of IFAD's country programme; (ii) country's dependence on agriculture; (iii) size of rural population; (iv) prevalence of poverty; (v) existence of an enabling policy environment; and (vi) "state fragility" – representing weak performance in achieving development outcomes (annex VII).
18. The criterion of "state fragility" was specifically chosen in order to fully align the country office selection process with IFAD's mandate – operationally defined in its Results Measurement Framework as moving people out of poverty. The higher the fragility, the higher the priority placed on establishing a country office. The International Development Association's (IDA) Resource Allocation Index serves as a proxy measure for this variable. The IDA Resource Allocation Index is derived from IDA's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment, which assesses the quality of a country's present policy and institutional framework and rates countries against a set of 16 criteria grouped in four clusters: (i) economic management; (ii) structural policies; (iii) policies for social inclusion and equity; and (iv) public sector management and institutions. These criteria essentially assess how conducive a country's framework is to fostering poverty reduction, sustainable growth and the effective use of development assistance.

C. Country office models

19. **Evolution of country office models.** In the course of experimentation with various approaches, four country office models of organizational arrangement have emerged as effective – with the decision on the appropriate model for a country depending on the country context. These will be maintained and adapted where necessary in order to respond to local specificities.
- (a) Under the first model, a country national has been employed as the country programme officer (CPO), under the overall supervision and guidance of a Rome-based CPM, and makes maximum use of local knowledge. The level of delegation to the country office is minimal in this case, and the office largely performs day-to-day functions, liaises with government, contributes to project implementation support and undertakes project supervision. It remains a suitable option for countries with smaller portfolios.
- (b) Under the second model, the CPM is outposted to the country office and takes full management responsibility for the office and the country programme. The CPM is supported in this role by a national and/or international programme

officer, a locally recruited CPO, short-term technical expertise and local General Service (GS) staff, as well as by GS staff at headquarters. This is the most effective model, according to IOE and to Management's self-assessment.

- (c) A third operational model is a variant of (a) and (b), which is either a CPM- or a CPO-led office that also provides services to a neighbouring country whose programme is too small to justify a self-standing office. In these cases, an international programme officer or a national officer working with the neighbouring country is based in the office, or is based in the neighbouring country, but managed out of the IFAD office within the hosting agency (within the 40-country ceiling).
 - (d) Under a fourth model, currently adopted only for Kenya, the country office in Nairobi also serves as a regional service centre to support intraregional initiatives; it also has responsibility for the Indian Ocean island states. This East Africa regional hub is fundamental to decentralized operational support of cross-cutting disciplines, facilitating donor consultation and dialogue. The regional office has been restructured and strengthened with adequate decentralized administrative and operational capacity, and at the same time is avoiding becoming an additional layer between country offices and IFAD headquarters. Grants in support of thematic policy areas are being managed from Nairobi, contributing to agricultural/rural development partnerships and scaling up agenda and policy dialogue with East and Southern African regional economic communities. Initiatives introduced include the administration of loans and grants for all countries in the region, and some staff covering thematic issues such as gender, knowledge management and land. Regional and corporate technical and operational support roles are linked and have clearer accountability.
20. **Lessons learned to date.** In terms of the relative effectiveness of CPM-led or national-officer-led country offices, IFAD continues to accumulate valuable experience. The evidence gathered shows that the CPM-led model performs better in terms of undertaking policy dialogue and in expediting implementation immediately following project approval, especially in countries with larger programmes. Regarding partnership, there are examples of CPM-led country offices that also have some wider corporate responsibilities beyond country programme management, building closer relationships with the government and donor partners.
21. Although the overall approach and strategies for subregional service centres are still evolving, the experience gained suggests that regional or subregional offices providing financial management services from the Controller's and Financial Services Division may reduce the cost of travel and consultants, facilitate more effective delivery of services and enhance knowledge and communication, although this model requires an experienced team familiar with IFAD procedures and practices reporting directly to the headquarters-based team leader to assure quality standards. Subregional hubs could also be a cost-effective approach to providing supervision, implementation and design support and to ensuring improved oversight/compliance with fiduciary requirements. It must be underscored that the subregional hubs basically operate as service centres for the country programmes and in no way act as an administrative layer between headquarters and the country offices.
22. **Selection criteria for outposting a CPM.** In choosing a particular model for a country, IFAD Management will always be guided by the consideration that the main task of country offices is to contribute directly to the country programme. In this light, and on the basis of lessons learned, IFAD Management will apply the following guiding criteria in opting for a CPM outposting model:

- (a) Relatively large country programmes;
 - (b) Greater need and opportunity for policy dialogue on issues related to rural poverty reduction and smallholder agricultural development;
 - (c) Countries with weak institutions and development performance or those involved in or emerging from conflict;
 - (d) Greater potential for building partnership – leveraging resources for rural poverty reduction and smallholder agricultural development;
 - (e) Countries increasingly requiring other non-lending instruments such as knowledge management and support for a broader range of stakeholders, including farmers’ and other civil society organizations; and
 - (f) Country offices that serve multiple countries.
23. In selecting a particular model of country office, in addition to the above criteria, IFAD Management will also consider demand on the part of the respective host government.
 24. While it helps to look at country offices in terms of a particular model, IFAD Management will adopt a flexible approach in setting up and running these offices.
 25. The policy of limiting the regional/subregional offices to a maximum of two, as approved by the Board in 2011, will be maintained until 2015 when IFAD Management will undertake and present a detailed management review of this aspect of the policy to the Executive Board.

D. Exit strategy

26. In approving the country presence policy and strategy, the Executive Board adopted the operating principle that IFAD will close offices that are no longer relevant to the country programme. This operating principle is closely linked with the basic approach that the main task of a country office is to contribute directly to the country programme. Thus, once the country programme’s need for a country office is eliminated or drastically reduced, the country office will lose its relevance and will be closed. In operational terms, this will mean major changes in a number of indicators that were used initially in selecting a country for establishment of a country office. These indicators, such as dependence on agriculture or size of the rural population, or even prevalence of poverty, change over time. Variables such as an enabling rural policy environment can also change over a relatively short period. Similarly, some countries in which IFAD has established a country office may be nearer to the threshold in terms of eliminating rural poverty, which may be reached in a relatively short period of time, and at that point an IFAD office may no longer be needed.
27. ICOs may also be closed temporarily for security reasons. In deciding the temporary closure or reopening of an office for this reason, IFAD will follow the advice and guidance of the United Nations Security Management System. In line with IFAD’s commitment to serve fragile or weakly performing countries, the Fund will identify the most appropriate functioning modality to ensure that the programme is supported effectively, while guaranteeing the security of IFAD staff.
28. IFAD Management proposes that it will remain within the proposed cap of 50 country offices through 2015. In choosing new countries, it will apply the process and criteria detailed in paragraphs 17-18 above.
29. Management will report the closure or opening of new country offices to the Executive Board as part of the annual workplan and budget (AWP/B).

V. Proposed expansion of country offices and cost implications

30. **Proposed expansion of country offices.** In undertaking the review of the country presence strategy, Management found that the expansion of IFAD's ongoing portfolio has increased the need for country offices. The increased portfolio of ongoing projects was the result of expanded lending in 2010-2013, and an expansion of IFAD's country presence is needed to cover the greater number of countries with relatively large programmes. Given IFAD's emphasis on assisting countries in post-conflict situations or those with weak policy and institutional frameworks, expanded country presence would prioritize countries demonstrating these characteristics.
31. In order to select the countries for establishment of ICOs, IFAD Management calculated the scores for each of the eligible Member States using the latest available figures. The composite score for each country was obtained by applying the following weights to the operational criteria stated in paragraphs 17-18 above.

Portfolio size	50%
Agriculture value added	15%
Inversely to per capita gross national income	15%
Size of rural population	10%
IDA Resource Allocation Index	10%
<hr/> Total	<hr/> 100%

32. The composite index was appropriately complemented by factoring in the fragility status of each country using the IFAD list of fragile states. This list was compiled by combining the lists of countries identified by multilateral development banks and by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
33. The scores thus obtained are presented in annex VII. Based on these results, IFAD Management proposes that a maximum of 10 ICOs be added during 2014-2015. Of these, nine are identified in this document, and one will be identified at a later date. The new ICOs, alongside the total number of ICOs per region, are presented in table 1, with justification provided as applicable for each ICO.

Table 1: List of additional ICOs proposed for 2014-2015

<i>Region/Country</i>	<i>Current number of ICOs</i>	<i>New ICOs proposed for 2014-15</i>	<i>Total ICOs by 2015</i>	<i>Justification for country selection</i>
Asia and the Pacific	10	2	12	
1 Afghanistan				With low per capita national income, low institutional capability, and relatively large IFAD investment, Afghanistan ranks highest in composite score among the countries not yet served by ICOs. In addition, it is a fragile state.
2 Myanmar				Myanmar has a large rural population, low per capita national income, and a relatively large PBAS allocation. An institutional capability score is not available but such capability can be assumed to be low. IFAD is reengaging with Myanmar after a long period of absence and a steep learning curve is foreseen. An ICO would therefore be necessary.
East and Southern Africa	10	-	10	
Near East, North Africa and Europe	3	3	6	
3 Kyrgyzstan/Tajikistan				The combined portfolio has a composite rank of 2 among the countries not covered by ICOs. In addition, Kyrgyzstan is identified as a fragile state by IFAD (as defined by OECD).
4 Morocco				Morocco ranks very high among countries yet to be covered by ICOs and ranks thirty-first in the entire portfolio, mainly because of the size of the portfolio and relatively high agricultural value added.
5 Turkey				Turkey has a relatively high composite score and therefore meets the criteria adopted by the Board. Furthermore, IFAD's projects in Turkey operate in the relatively underdeveloped eastern part of the country inhabited by an ethnic minority.
Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)	6	1	7	
6 Colombia				Colombia ranks highest among countries not yet covered by the ICOs in LAC. Although, technically not a fragile state, the country has a large rural population, shows signs of past conflicts in some areas, and has a relatively large IFAD allocation.
West and Central Africa (WCA)	11	3	14	
7 Liberia				All three countries proposed for WCA have a medium-sized portfolio and clearly meet the criteria adopted by Board. Liberia's GNI is very low and it also has high agricultural dependency. All three countries are classified as fragile by IFAD and all other multilateral development banks.
8 Côte d'Ivoire				
9 Chad				
10 Undecided				To be submitted later for the approval of the Board.
Grand total	40	10	50	

34. **Country office model.** Of the nine new country offices proposed, all will be led by locally recruited national officers, at least in the early years. It is probable that the ICO yet to be identified will also be headed by a locally recruited national officer. However, in 2014 and 2015, additional country programme managers may need to be outposted in the 21 established ICOs currently led by locally recruited staff, in view of increasing programme size; the need to undertake activities such as policy dialogue, knowledge management and partnership building; or the need to lead ICOs overseeing multiple countries or programmes in countries that are emerging from conflict. IFAD Management will limit the number of CPMs outposted to a maximum of half of the total ICOs in order to permit a balanced rotation of CPMs between headquarters and the field.
35. In the proposed country offices, national officers will be supported by part-time support staff, who will be time-shared with the hosting agency. The incremental number of staff in these new offices will not exceed 20 for the foreseeable future.
36. **Cost implications.** In the recent past, the Programme Management Department (PMD) has been able to improve the Professional to General Service staff ratio by limiting and reducing GS staff at headquarters, despite an increase in the number of Professional staff to undertake direct supervision of projects. A significant part of the costs associated with the incremental staff will be offset by the savings realized by recruiting fewer consultants, in particular, for undertaking project supervision and implementation support. Since the budget related to ICOs is fully integrated into the administrative budget, staff assigned to the country offices fall within the

total approved PMD annual budget. There will be some additional one-time costs associated with the establishment of the new offices, which have been included in the action plan for enhancing institutional efficiency and would be absorbed by the budget in 2014-2015.

37. **Long-term prospects for the expansion of country offices.** With the establishment of the additional 10 offices, the total number of ICOs will reach 50. These offices will serve a group of countries that contain 89 per cent of the world's rural population, 70 per cent of the total number of IFAD-funded projects, 83 per cent of total IFAD financing and 79 per cent of the indicative PBAS allocation for 2013-2015. In essence, with 50 country offices, IFAD will be able to serve a large majority of poor rural people and its own projects, which means that it would not propose additional ICOs for the foreseeable future. This does not mean that there will not be a need to serve additional countries. On the contrary, there will be such a need, mainly owing to the evolving nature of the Fund's programme and the changing circumstances of borrowing member countries.

VI. Relationship between ICOs and headquarters

38. While ICOs have representational functions, as described in paragraphs 19-25, their main responsibility is to provide programmatic support to IFAD operations in the country(ies) assigned to them. IFAD's country office model differs from other international financial institutions with respect to the overall structure of ICOs, which are deliberately kept small, with only a limited number of staff. Guidance and support of these units in relation to country programmes will continue to be provided by the respective regional division, and in relation to thematic and technical issues, by the Policy and Technical Advisory Division.

A. Delegation of authority

39. The relationship between ICOs and headquarters has evolved over time. A significant number of the tasks performed by country offices were carried out under authority delegated by CPMs to the CPOs heading the offices. Where the ICOs were led by outposted CPMs, the delegation of authority was much clearer from the beginning – and more standardized – because outposted CPMs continued to exercise the same level of authority as at headquarters. The levels of authority have been codified and the current level of authority vested at various levels is presented in annex VIII.
40. The broad level of authority already delegated will be complemented by specific delegations to carry out activities approved under the AWP/B. Such annual plans will identify activities to be implemented by ICOs, and the financial authority for making such expenditures will be delegated to the country offices.

B. Field Support Unit

41. In response to the expanded IFAD footprint in the field and the need to further decentralize, the Corporate Services Department (CSD) has strengthened the existing support mechanism for ICOs by creating the Field Support Unit (FSU) within the Department. The FSU is a more structured approach to better support IFAD's activities in the field by providing a "one-stop shop" responsible for managing security and administrative matters related to all IFAD field activities. This includes the functions of field security, field security training, security compliance of IFAD travel, general administration, human resources, information technology, service-level agreements with host agencies, host country agreements, accreditation and privileges. The FSU works closely and coordinates support actions with the responsible technical divisions, while ensuring that substantive responsibility lies with the respective regional divisions.

C. IFAD representatives

42. As representatives of the President in their country of accreditation, IFAD representatives² develop and maintain relations with the government and other institutions in the country. Under the framework of the regional programme and budget envelope, they guide all staff regarding country assistance priorities and policy, security and general administrative issues. Representatives report directly to the regional division director.
43. The role of the IFAD representative is expanding and includes increasing responsibility for project supervision and design, interaction with the United Nations Country Team, participation in the Security Management Team and increased levels of management. In this context, the delegation of authority granted to IFAD representatives is being reviewed in the context of a larger organizational review.
44. The selection process for IFAD representatives is currently being redesigned by the FSU and PMD. A roster of potential representatives will be created through periodic internal and external vacancy announcements, followed by a rigorous selection process that assesses technical, interpersonal and managerial suitability. Successful candidates will be included in a roster, which will be managed by the Human Resources Division in close collaboration with the FSU. When a position of IFAD representative becomes vacant, a candidate from the roster will be identified through interviews with senior managers. Appointment as an IFAD representative will require approval by the President.

D. Communication between ICOs and headquarters

45. With an increasing level of decentralized functioning, there is now a need in IFAD to introduce a system of communication that ensures coherence in planning and implementing operations, while also ensuring that basic institutional policies and procedures are uniformly applied across various entities. Aware of the possible gaps in communication, knowledge attrition, and lack of common institutional response procedures that decentralized functioning may create, IFAD Management has instituted the following:
 - (a) Systematic entry-point orientation for all country office staff;
 - (b) Regular training of country staff in key activities such as project design and supervision;
 - (c) Annual regional planning and review workshops;
 - (d) Close involvement of country staff in project design, supervision and financial review missions;
 - (e) Participation of key country office staff in headquarters project processes, including selected Executive Board meetings;
 - (f) Video communication of all important staff interaction meetings in headquarters, such as town-hall meetings, portfolio review meetings, relevant seminars, etc.
46. The Fund recognizes the value of effective internal communication for an increasingly global organization and is working to improve its internal communication practices in order to make its operations more efficient and to build a global team, with a strong focus on inclusion of ICOs. IFAD also seeks to increase awareness of its work and familiarity with its mission within a wider audience. As the organization's face and voice in countries, ICOs play a vital role in bringing IFAD's corporate identity to life. They will be key players in an effort to strengthen

² ICOs may be headed by an IFAD representative or a CPM.

IFAD's identity and profile. The Fund is developing an intensified programme of communication training and knowledge-sharing, as well as new communication tools, to empower ICO and regional division staff to communicate more effectively and to support their partnership, resource mobilization, advocacy, knowledge management and policy dialogue objectives in the countries in which IFAD operates and at the regional level.

47. In addition, IFAD has committed itself to ensuring reliable access to the Internet and other communications vectors, and has started an ICO connectivity initiative (paragraph 49).

VII. Investment in ICOs

48. Under the country presence policy, IFAD is committed to applying, inter alia, the principles of: (i) setting up its offices under hosting arrangements with United Nations agencies or international financial institutions; and (ii) closing down ICOs that have become less relevant to the country programme. This implies, in principle, that IFAD would not make any significant investment in creating its own premises. There are, however, one-time costs incurred in setting up and administering ICOs, and it is proposed that these costs be met from the total allocation in the action plan for enhancing IFAD's efficiency.

A. ICO connectivity initiative

49. Largely owing to the fact that ICOs are hosted by other organizations, coupled with their quick transition from pilot initiatives to operational facilities, the set-up in ICOs of the infrastructure for information and communications technology (ICT) has not been adequately addressed. As a result, ICOs have been relying on ad hoc arrangements for Internet access, network connectivity, ICT equipment and technical support, with varying degrees of success and client satisfaction.
50. Connectivity between ICOs and IFAD headquarters is a particularly critical issue, in terms of both bandwidth availability and service reliability, which in many cases prevents ICO staff from accessing IFAD's applications and other ICT services effectively. Thus it is extremely important that a solution be implemented that will optimize the availability and performance of the connections from each ICO to headquarters and will minimize the risk of IT failures, which severely interrupt business operations.
51. The Country Presence Coordination Group has approved a project that will address this issue by extending its wide area network (WAN) to link ICOs worldwide. The WAN will introduce cost-effective connectivity and inexpensive solutions that will allow ICOs to be part of the IFAD network, which is centrally managed and supported by ICT and telecommunications partners. The pilot phase of this project, which will cover one country office in each of the regional divisions, is under way.

B. Decentralized Enterprise Resource Planning

52. IFAD continues to integrate its core platform – Oracle's PeopleSoft Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software. ERP is largely headquarters-centric and the ICOs are not configured to utilize it for their own administration (budget/procurement, etc.). Instead, they rely on the hosting agency to provide administrative functions through a service-level agreement. As IFAD gains more experience in the field, it is apparent that ERP needs to be further developed with decentralization in mind, in order that field staff may begin to better manage assigned ICO budgetary resources and rely less on the hosting agency for administrative support. A working group under the FSU began a project reviewing the workflow, and a capital budget request will be made in the 2014 budget for a pilot initiative so that the results can be studied before full implementation. ERP needs to provide an enabling environment to support the extension of decentralized country offices.

VIII. Monitoring framework for country offices

53. In view of the evolving nature of ICOs and the need for institutional learning and monitoring of outputs, outcomes and costs, IFAD will further strengthen the systems of review and monitoring of its country presence under the general guidance of regional directors. On an ongoing basis, country offices will be responsible for ensuring compliance with IFAD's administrative, programmatic and security procedures. Portfolio and administrative reports will follow the established corporate workflow (performance reviews, quarterly financial reports, etc.).
54. Key indicators for monitoring the performance of ICOs in managing programmes and the performance of IFAD headquarters in managing ICOs are presented in annex IX.

IX. Recommendations and next steps

55. Remaining within the framework of IFAD's country presence policy approved by the Board in 2011, the Executive Board is invited to approve an updated country presence strategy for 2014-2015, including:
 - (a) Continued use of: (i) existing criteria for opening of country offices, as indicated in paragraphs 17-18; (ii) existing criteria for selecting various models of country offices (paragraphs 19-25); and (iii) the existing exit strategy for country offices (paragraph 26-29);
 - (b) Establishment of up to 10 additional country offices arrived at in accordance with the selection criteria approved by the Executive Board (paragraphs 30-33); and
 - (c) Agreement to the countries in which nine of the new IFAD country offices will be established (listed in paragraph 33, table 1), with the tenth to be decided at a later date, in agreement with the Executive Board.
56. IFAD Management will report on progress made in establishing new country offices or closing existing ones as part of the annual programme of work and budget submitted to the Executive Board for approval.

IFAD country offices by region and year of approval

<i>Region</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Year of approval</i>
APR	Bangladesh	2011
	China	2003
	India	2003
	Indonesia	2011
	Lao People's Democratic Republic	2012
	Nepal	2008
	Pakistan	2008
	Philippines	2009
	Sri Lanka	2008
	Viet Nam	2004
APR Total		10
ESA	Burundi	2012
	Ethiopia	2004
	Kenya	2008
	Madagascar	2008
	Malawi	2011
	Mozambique	2008
	Rwanda	2008
	Uganda	2008
	United Republic of Tanzania	2003
	Zambia	2009
ESA Total		10
LAC	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	2008
	Brazil	2008
	Guatemala	2011
	Haiti	2004
	Panama	prior to 2003
	Peru	prior to 2004
LAC Total		6
NEN	Egypt	2004
	Sudan	2003
	Yemen	2003
NEN Total		3
WCA	Benin	2012
	Burkina Faso	2008
	Cameroon	2009
	Democratic Republic of the Congo	2003
	Ghana	2008
	Guinea	2008
	Mali	2011
	Niger	2014
	Nigeria	2004
	Senegal	2003
	Sierra Leone	2013
WCA Total		11
IFAD Total		40

Outposted CPMs by regional division

<i>Region</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Outposted CPM</i>	<i>Effective date</i>	<i>Outposting plan</i>	<i>Tentative date</i>
APR	Bangladesh				
	China				
	India			Nigel Brett	Q1 2014
	Indonesia			Ron Hartman	Q1 2014
	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Stefania Dina	01 Jun 2012 – Present		
	Nepal				
	Pakistan				
	Philippines				
	Sri Lanka				
	Viet Nam	Henning Pedersen Atsuko Toda	01 Jun 2012 - Present 08 Nov 2008 – 10 Feb 2012		
ESA	Burundi	Hamed Haidara	17 Dec 2012 – 31 Dec 2013		
	Ethiopia	Robson Mutandi	01 Jun 2010 – Present		
	Kenya (Regional Office)	Nadine Gbossa Samuel Eremie	15 Feb 2013 – Present 01 Jun 2013 – 01 July 2012		
	Madagascar				
	Malawi				
	Mozambique				
	Rwanda				
	Uganda				
United Republic of Tanzania	John Gicharu Samuel Eremie	01 July 2010 – 01 Sep 2012 01 Oct 2008 – 01 Jan 2010	Francisco Pichon	31 Jan 2014	
Zambia	Abla Benhammouche	01 Aug 2013 – Present			
LAC	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Jaana Keitaanranta	05 Mar 2012 – Present		
	Brazil				
	Guatemala	Joaquin Lozano Glayson Santos	15 May 2012 – Present 10 Feb 2013 – Present		
	Haiti	Esther Kasalu-Coffin	01 Mar 2013 – Present		
	Panama	Jaana Keitaanranta	01 Nov 2002 – 01 Feb 2012		
	Peru	SRC ^a /CPM Jesus Quintana		Vacant	Q1 2014
			01 Feb 2013 – Present		
NEN	Egypt				
	Sudan	Hani Elsadani Rasha Omar	02 Feb 2013 – Present 11 Nov 2009 – 31 Dec 2011		
	Yemen				
WCA	Benin				
	Burkina Faso				
	Cameroon	Bernard Hien Nadine Gbossa	01 July 2013 – Present 01 Jan 2011 – 14 Feb 2013		
	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Rasha Omar	01 Jan 2012 – Present		
	Ghana	Ulac Demirag Aissa Toure	01 Feb 2011 – Present 18 July 2011 – 31 Aug 2013		
	Guinea				
	Mali				
	Congo/Niger	Bernard Hien	16 Jan. 2011 – 30 Jun 2013		
	Nigeria	Atsuko Toda	01 May 2012 – Present		
	Senegal	Luyaku Nsimpasi	15 Mar 2013 – Present		
	Sierra Leone				

^a SRC: Subregional coordinator

^b The office will be closed.

Host country agreements status as at 1 October 2013

<i>Region</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2013</i>	<i>Completed</i>	<i>Draft</i>	<i>Note verbale sent</i>	<i>Total</i>
APR	Bangladesh								1		1
APR	China								1		1
APR	India								1		1
APR	Indonesia								1		1
APR	Lao People's Democratic Republic					1					1
APR	Nepal								1		1
APR	Pakistan								1		1
APR	Philippines								1		1
APR	Sri Lanka								1		1
APR	Viet Nam	1						2			2
APR Total		1				1		2	8		10
ESA	Burundi					1		1			1
ESA	Ethiopia			1				1			1
ESA	Kenya		1					1			1
ESA	Madagascar						1	1			1
ESA	Malawi				1			1			1
ESA	Mozambique				1			1			1
ESA	Rwanda			1				1			1
ESA	Uganda				1			1			1
ESA	United Republic of Tanzania	1						1			1
ESA	Zambia			1				1			1
ESA Total		1	1	3	3	1	1	10			10
LAC	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)								1		1
LAC	Brazil								1		1
LAC	Guatemala								1		1
LAC	Haiti									1	1
LAC	Panama		1					1			1
LAC	Peru					1		1			1
LAC Total			1			1		2	3	1	6
NEN	Egypt				1			1			1
NEN	Sudan								1		1
NEN	Yemen									1	1
NEN Total					1			1	1	1	3
WCA	Benin								1		1
WCA	Burkina Faso								1		1
WCA	Cameroon				1			1			1
WCA	Democratic Republic of the Congo				1			1			1
WCA	Niger								1		1
WCA	Ghana			1				1			1
WCA	Guinea				1			1			1
WCA	Mali					1		1			1
WCA	Nigeria					1		1			1
WCA	Senegal				1			1			1
WCA	Sierra Leone					1		1			1
WCA Total		0	0	1	5	3		9	3	0	12
Grand Total		2	2	4	9	6		23	15	2	40

Host agency service-level agreements: Status as at 1 October 2013

Region	Country	Hosting agency					Process yet to begin	Total
		FAO	ILRI	UNDP	UNON	WFP		
APR	Bangladesh					1		1
APR	China					1		1
APR	India					1		1
APR	Indonesia						1	1
APR	Lao People's Democratic Republic			1				1
APR	Nepal					1		1
APR	Pakistan	1						1
APR	Philippines			1				1
APR	Sri Lanka						1	1
APR	Viet Nam			1				1
APR Total		1		3		4	2	10
ESA	Burundi			1				1
ESA	Ethiopia		1					1
ESA	Kenya				1			1
ESA	Madagascar	1						1
ESA	Malawi			1				1
ESA	Mozambique	1						1
ESA	Rwanda	1						1
ESA	Uganda			1				1
ESA	United Republic of Tanzania	1						1
ESA	Zambia					1		1
ESA Total		4	1	3	1	1	0	10
LAC	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	1						1
LAC	Brazil			1				1
LAC	Guatemala			1				1
LAC	Haiti			1				1
LAC	Panama			1				1
LAC	Peru			1				1
LAC Total		1		5			0	6
NEN	Egypt			1				1
NEN	Sudan			1				1
NEN	Yemen	1						1
NEN Total		1		2			0	3
WCA	Benin						1	1
WCA	Burkina Faso			1				1
WCA	Cameroon			1				1
WCA	Democratic Republic of the Congo			1				1
WCA	Ghana			1				1
WCA	Guinea			1				1
WCA	Mali			1				1
WCA	Niger					1		1
WCA	Nigeria			1				1
WCA	Senegal			1				1
WCA	Sierra Leone	1						1
WCA Total		1		8		1	1	11
Grand Total		8	1	21	1	6	3	40

Excerpts from country programme evaluations

Mali (Evaluation Committee 77, June 2013)

- The country office was only established in 2012. The CPE suggests that this move will help the transition to a programme approach, and that improved sharing of knowledge with partners can be achieved through the ICO. "The opening of the IFAD country office in Bamako should encourage the sharing of knowledge, including on development initiatives other than those supported by IFAD." (EC 2013/77/W.P.6, paragraph 20 on non-lending activities)
- Enhanced implementation support through direct supervision and country offices will "make it easier to move from a project approach to a programme approach, in which the various activities financed by loans and grants will be linked and coordinated." (paragraph 22)

Uganda (April 2013)

- Enhancing IFAD's influence in policy dialogue. "From government's point of view and according to the assessment of MoFPED, IFAD's influence on policy issues could be enhanced by strengthening the country office with professionals with adequate backgrounds and by delegating more authority to the country office." (paragraph 203)
- Partnerships/partners: "IFAD started during 1997-1998 to move from being a follower of the World Bank to becoming a more directly engaged and active partner. As a pilot, IFAD gained experience with direct supervision of DDSP already from 1998 and today IFAD is directly supervising all ongoing loan projects except for ATAAS where IFAD, however, participates in the donor-government dialogue. IFAD's direct engagement was further enhanced with establishment of the country office in 2006 and the general transition to direct supervision as from 2007." (paragraph 180)
- Overall, enhanced profile in-country: "The establishment of the country office in 2006 increased IFAD's visibility and further strengthened IFAD's participation in dialogue and development partner fora." (paragraph 273)

Kenya (2011)

- Overall, enhanced effectiveness in terms of understanding country context and dialogue with partners, though some elements of the country office need to be defined. "The Kenya country office in Nairobi has enabled the Fund to gain a better understanding of country context and develop greater communication and dialogue with a range of partners. The Government of Kenya, project staff and others are highly appreciative of the permanent physical presence of the CPM in Nairobi."
- Strengthened direct supervision through the country office. "Direct supervision and implementation support – undertaken by the country office – also appears to be appreciated both by the projects and central government agencies. This new arrangement has made it possible to combine the verification of fiduciary aspects with technical and methodological implementation support, which was not obvious when UNOPS was in charge of both loan administration and project supervision. IFAD's country presence and direct supervision and implementation support can be considered as a synergy-building package conducive to closer interaction and transparency." (paragraph 161)
- The Kenya CPE also states that IFAD's shift to the United Nations compound in Nairobi will help enhance visibility and partnerships with other donors.
- On the benefits of the regional office. "All in all, the CPE believes the establishment of the ESA regional office, the first in any of the five geographic regions covered by IFAD operations, is a laudable initiative in the right direction." (paragraph 168)

Rwanda (2011)

- Improvements in efficiency were attributed to the shift to direct supervision and the establishment of the country office. "Improvements over the period under review reflect both the increasing capacity of Rwandan partners and IFAD's transition to direct supervision and implementation support, and establishment of a country office." (paragraph 7, Executive summary)
- The potential of the country office in contributing to policy dialogue. "For reasons that relate to corporate practices and culture, IFAD traditionally espoused the first and second notions of policy dialogue (project component fixing and technical assistance). This is understandable due to its past lack of country presence and exclusive focus on project-level activities (a fact already underlined in the 2005 CPE). But the situation is changing, because IFAD now has a country office providing further opportunities (yet to be harnessed)."
- Participation in One UN. "Through the country office, IFAD has become an active partner in the One UN Process which requires time and resources for participation in meetings and reporting." (paragraph 247)
- Increasing responsiveness (but providing support is still time-intensive). "Moving to the direct supervision modality and opening a country office in Kigali has clearly enhanced IFAD's responsiveness vis-à-vis project implementation issues." (paragraph 261)

Nepal (Evaluation Committee 74, Nov 2012)

- The country presence in Nepal is seen as crucial, but resources allocated so far are inadequate. Again, in EC 2012/74/W.P.5 paragraph 306 (under resource allocation), the CPE states that the Nepali country programme coordinator "provided much needed country presence since 2007, but is often constrained by lack of support facilities."

Jordan (Evaluation Committee 72, July 2012, ARRI 2012)

- While there is no country presence in Jordan, the CPE suggests that progress on policy dialogue has been limited and the issues were too ambitious, especially considering the absence of a country office. "Progress on the policy dialogue agenda proposed by the COSOPs has been overall limited. The list of issues has been too ambitious in relation to IFAD's capacity to engage in an on-going dialogue with the Government – in particular without a country presence." (EC 2012/72/W.P.5, paragraph 268)

Ghana (Evaluation Committee 71, April 2012)

- The Ghana CPE was positive in its initial assessment, but did not provide a detailed assessment of the country office (as indicated, because it had opened only recently at the time of the evaluation), but very positive contributions were noted by Evaluation Committee members. The absence of a country office until 2010 was seen as a constraint. "Weak traditional supervision arrangements and the absence of an IFAD country office (until 2010) ... made it difficult for IFAD to act upon implementation problems in a timely manner." (EC 2012/71/W.P.3, paragraph 7)
- Further, the CPE points to greater opportunities for policy dialogue through the recently opened country office (paragraph 13). "In the past, owing to the lack of an IFAD field presence, policy dialogue had to be conducted at a distance and filtered through project/programme components. However, with the establishment of the IFAD country office, greater opportunities exist." The country office should be used to further promote non-lending activities. "IFAD should use the opportunity of its country office in Ghana and outposted CPM to further support its country programme, including non-lending activities."
- In the case of Ghana, Evaluation Committee members noted the contributions made by the field office and stated that they "were pleased to note donor

appreciation for IFAD's leadership in development processes in the country, and recognized that this positive outcome would not have been possible without the establishment of an IFAD country office led by an outposted CPM." (paragraph 15, report of the Evaluation Committee chairperson on the field visit to Ghana). The Committee members also "commended the Ghana country office for the important contribution it was making by supporting enabling public policies and programmes for agricultural and rural development." (paragraph 26)

Viet Nam (Evaluation Committee 71, April 2012)

- Overall contributions to partnership-building and raising the profile of IFAD were noted. "IFAD's performance as a partner is well appreciated by the Government and other organizations. The country office and outposted country programme manager have helped raise the Fund's profile by participating in COSOP formulation, and by designing, implementing and effectively supporting programmes through the promotion of more knowledge-sharing." (EC 2011/71/W.P.4, paragraph 9, Executive summary). In addition, "The CPE believes that IFAD's country office in Viet Nam has made an important contribution to the overall success of its country programme. The establishment of a country office with sufficient capacity to support project preparation, implementation and supervision has been broadly successful." (paragraph 19, Executive summary)
- Policy dialogue. "The establishment of IFAD's country office including outposting from Rome to Hanoi of the IFAD CPM for Viet Nam has been a positive step to strengthen dialogue and performance." (paragraph 7). The Committee member's visit report highlighted the contribution of the ICO to policy dialogue: "The value of a strong IFAD country office including outposted country programme manager was clear. The country office has enabled a closer dialogue with key partners and more intensive supervision and follow-up during project implementation. The IFAD country team has very good knowledge of the ground realities and opportunities and challenges for IFAD to make a difference to the country's efforts in rural poverty reduction." (paragraph 34, Chairperson's report)

Yemen (Evaluation Committee 69, October 2011)

- Partnership and enhanced supervision. "The establishment of a country office in Sana'a in 2007, led by a national country programme officer (CPO), has contributed to IFAD's development effectiveness in Yemen both by providing adequate and timely support to supervision and by building up a strong relationship with the Government." (EC 2011/69/W.P.4/Rev.1, paragraph 12, Executive summary) "Moreover, IFAD's country presence has been consolidated with a national officer based in Sana'a reporting to the CPM based in Rome. IFAD has built a strong relationship with the Government at various levels." (paragraph 263) In addition, "The CPO has engaged in policy dialogue with the Government to support the EOF, the new institutional body which will manage the new IFAD programme in Yemen." (paragraph 264)

Argentina (Evaluation Committee 64, 2010)

- The CPE states that the absence of a country office was affecting the portfolio. "Lack of country presence in Argentina is a limitation for two reasons: the need to adjust quickly to changing political and economic conditions and the high cost of missions to the country (because of transportation costs to one of the IFAD-supported countries geographically most distant from Rome, and the necessary frequency of missions in the Argentine context)." (EC 2010/64/W.P.4, paragraph 100).

ICO Performance 2013 Project Status Reports

	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Non-ICO</i>	<i>ICO</i>	<i>Average</i>
Fiduciary	Quality of financial management	4.03	4.00	4.02
Fiduciary	Acceptable disbursement rate	3.83	3.64	3.73
Fiduciary	Counterpart funds	4.23	4.13	4.18
Fiduciary	Compliance with financing covenants	4.14	4.22	4.18
Fiduciary	Compliance with procurement	4.11	4.01	4.05
Fiduciary	Quality and timeliness of audits	4.23	4.15	4.19
	Average fiduciary	4.09	4.02	4.06
Management	Quality of project management	4.07	4.16	4.12
Management	Performance of M&E	3.64	3.96	3.81
Management	Coherence between AWP/B & implementation	3.67	3.83	3.76
Management	Gender focus	4.11	4.42	4.28
Management	Poverty focus	4.35	4.47	4.42
Management	Effectiveness of targeting approach	4.29	4.39	4.34
	Average management	4.02	4.20	4.12
Sustainability	Average of innovation and learning	4.15	4.17	4.16
Sustainability	Average of institution building (organizations, etc.)	3.93	4.13	4.04
Sustainability	Average of empowerment	4.02	4.21	4.12
Sustainability	Average of quality of beneficiary participation	4.15	4.35	4.26
Sustainability	Average of responsiveness of service providers	3.89	4.06	3.99
Sustainability	Average of responsiveness of service providers	3.89	4.06	3.99
Sustainability	Average of potential for scaling up and replication	4.26	4.37	4.32
	Average sustainability	4.04	4.19	4.12
Impact	Physical/financial assets	3.96	4.16	4.07
Impact	Food security	3.97	4.20	4.09
Impact	Overall implementation progress	3.95	4.10	4.03
Impact	Likelihood of achieving the development objectives (section B3 and B4)	4.03	4.15	4.09
	Average impact	3.98	4.15	4.07
	Average of EB to first disbursement	19.47	18.95	19.19
	Average of entry to first disbursement	6.92	6.82	6.87

Ranking of country programmes for establishing country offices

S.N.	Country	Fragile state?	No.project in current portfolio	No of Project Rank	Current projects directly supervised	Directly supervised rank	Total IFAD current financing (US\$ '000)	IFAD financing rank	Country allocation 2013 to 2015	Country allocation rank	Combined portfolio average	Portfolio rank	Agric value added % of GDP	Year	Agric value added % of GDP rank	GNI ranking	Rural population 2012 (Millions)	Rural population ranking	IRAI 2012	IRAI ranking	Composite score	Composite rank
Asia and the Pacific																						
1	Afghanistan	Yes	2	47	2	45	81896	24	48523810	15	33	33	21	2011	34	21	23	22	2.68 3	7	28	24
2	Myanmar		0	98	0	96	0	99	38349186	22	79	88	NA		NA	17	35	13		NA	NA	NA
Near East, North Africa and Europe																						
3	Kyrgyzstan/Tajikistan	Yes	5	7	4	9	87900	21	34404537	27	16	17	19	2011	41	35	9	46	3.38 /3.5 9	46	29	26
4	Morocco		4	12	4	9	64478	31	26580029	35	22	23	15	2011	49	67	14	31	0	NA	34	31
5	Turkey		3	26	3	22	71391	28	14420155	61	34	39	9	2011	79	123	20	23	0	NA	44	44
Latin America and the Caribbean																						
6	Colombia		1	68	1	67	30536	58	29484303	28	55	59	7	2011	88	108	12	36		NA	51	52
West and Central Africa																						
7	Liberia	Yes	2	47	2	45	24384	63	20660569	48	51	56	53	2011	3	5	2	81	2.51	19	39	38
8	Côte d'Ivoire	Yes	2	47	2	45	32506	57	20953935	47	49	54	24	2011	27	40	10	45	3.07	12	43	42
9	Chad	Yes	2	47	2	45	36897	51	19659288	49	48	53	14	2008	57	28	10	43	3.06	4	44	45

Authority and responsibilities of headquarters office for country offices

1. **Executive Board** is the authority competent to approve the establishment of a country office under the recommendation of the President.
2. **President** signs host country agreements and framework agreements with hosting agencies.
3. **Associate Vice-President (AVP), Programme Management Department (PMD)**, has overall responsibility for the establishment, management and operation of ICOs.
4. **Associate Vice-President (AVP), Corporate Services Department (CSD)**, has responsibility for ensuring timely and efficient support services and that appropriate guidance is provided to ICOs in the areas of human resources, administrative services, information and communications technology, and security.
5. **Associate Vice-President (AVP), Financial Operations Department (FOD)**, has responsibility for ensuring that services to ICOs in the areas of budget, financial services and treasury are provided promptly and efficiently.
6. Regional **divisional director** directly supervises the ICOs under his/her regional scope of responsibility through the respective country programme manager (CPM). S/he manages ICOs in the context of the regional division's human and financial resource management and security practices; and approves the ICO annual workplan and budget (AWP/B). S/he oversees the CPMs' responsibilities for management of their respective ICOs and, where appropriate, the performance evaluation of ICO staff.
7. **Country programme manager** is directly responsible for the management and operations of a particular ICO. S/he reports to the divisional director and has the following tasks:
 - (i) Signing the service-level agreement with the hosting agency;
 - (ii) Managing the ICO in line with the goals and objectives of the country programme;
 - (iii) Preparing the annual report assessing the activities of the ICO in terms of outcomes and results achieved, and how these support the achievement of the country programme objectives;
 - (iv) Defining the terms of reference for ICO staff and carrying out or contributing to their performance evaluations;
 - (v) Within regional budget parameters, establishing the country office AWP/B in conjunction with ICO staff;
 - (vi) Ensuring compliance by ICO staff with IFAD policies and procedures, the host country agreement and the hosting agency service-level agreement;
 - (vii) Ensuring compliance with audit requirements and recommendations;
 - (viii) Complying with the implementation of security measures in the ICO;
 - (ix) Representing IFAD on the United Nations Security Management Team (SMT); and
 - (x) Ensuring, with the support of the FSU, that ICO premises have the level of security established by the United Nations Minimum Operational Security Standards (MOSS), as approved by the United Nations Department of Safety and Security.

8. **Country representative** is the legal representative of IFAD in the host country. The country representative represents IFAD before all governmental authorities of the host country. Any country representative designated for an ICO must be approved by the President.
9. **Country programme officer (CPO)** is a national professional staff member. S/he reports to the CPM and, if the CPM is not outposted, is responsible for the management of daily operations at the country office. S/he is also responsible, under the guidance of the CPM, for preparing the annual report assessing the activities of the ICO in terms of outcomes and results achieved and how these support the achievement of the country programme objectives.

Monitoring indicators for IFAD country offices

<i>Category</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Purpose/target</i>
Outreach and scaling up	1.1 Number of countries covered by country offices	50 by 2015
	1.2 Number of projects and value of IFAD financing in countries with country offices	Percentage of total portfolio
	1.3 Number of IFAD-financed activities/projects scaled up by government or other donors	Tracked
Country programme development	2.1 Number of design missions in which country office staff participate	100 per cent
	2.2 Number of RB-COSOPs in which country office staff participate	100 per cent
Project implementation	3.1 Period between approval and entry into force	Reduction from 2012
	3.2 Months between approval and first disbursement	Reduction from 2012
	3.3 Number of supervision/implementation support missions in which country office staff participate	100 per cent
	3.4 Percentage of financing disbursed as a percentage of disburseable funds	Increase from 2012 average of 15 per cent
	3.5 Days between submission of withdrawal application and disbursement	Reduction from 2012 average
	3.6 Project status report ratings for selected fiduciary aspects	Improvement from 2012 average
Partnership-building	4.1 Cofinancing (domestic and external) as a percentage of total project costs	Tracked
	4.2 Enhanced harmonization of IFAD programmes with other donors	Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) reports, client survey
Policy dialogue	5.1 Number of national forums at which IFAD is represented: 5.1.1 Government 5.1.2 Donor	Tracked, progress reports
	5.2 Enhanced alignment of IFAD programmes with national mechanisms and objectives in relation to rural poverty reduction	MOPAN reports, client survey
	5.3 Policy changes, as a result of IFAD interventions, that address rural poverty issues and changes	Tracked
Knowledge management and innovation	6.1 Number of in-country Country Programme Management Teams [CPMTs]	At least one per year
	6.2 Number of annual reviews of country programmes	100 per cent
Country office management	7.1 Number of country offices approved 7.1.1 Functional	Executive Board approvals Staff contracted, host agency agreement signed
	7.2 Number of host country agreements signed 7.2.1 Period between note verbale sent and agreement signed	Per cent of country offices, 100 per cent initiated by 2014 Monitor
	7.3 Number of progress reports received on time	100 per cent by 2015
	7.4 Country office costs available – administrative and programmatic	Complete by end-2014
	7.5 Number of local staff with IFAD direct contracts	100 per cent of CPOs and country programme assistants in countries with host country agreements
	7.6 Number of international staff posted to country offices	Tracked
	7.7 Number of country office bank accounts 7.7.1 Opened 7.7.2 Reconciled monthly	Tracked Per cent of those requested 100 per cent of accounts opened