

Document: EB 2016/117/R.28  
Agenda: 6(a)  
Date: 12 April 2016  
Distribution: Public  
Original: English

E



Investing in rural people

## Minutes of the ninety-first session of the Evaluation Committee

### Note to Executive Board representatives

#### Focal points:

#### Technical questions:

Oscar A. García  
Director  
Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD  
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2274  
e-mail: o.garcia@ifad.org

#### Dispatch of documentation:

Alessandra Zusi Bergés  
Officer-in-Charge  
Governing Bodies Office  
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2092  
e-mail: gb\_office@ifad.org

Executive Board — 117<sup>th</sup> Session  
Rome, 13-14 April 2016

---

For: Information

## Minutes of the ninety-first session of the Evaluation Committee

1. These minutes cover the deliberations of the Evaluation Committee during its ninety-first session held on 29 March and on the morning of 30 March 2016.
2. Upon the approval of the Evaluation Committee, the minutes will be shared with the Executive Board.

### Agenda item 1: Opening of the session

3. The session was attended by Committee members from India (Chair), Egypt, France, Indonesia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway and Switzerland. Members of the Working Group on the Performance-based Allocation System (PBAS) – including Nigeria (as Chair), China, France and Ireland (through videoconference) – attended as observers to participate in the discussion of the corporate-level evaluation on the PBAS. The session was attended by the Director, Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE); Deputy Director, IOE; Associate Vice-President, Programme Management Department (PMD); Lead Programme Manager, PMD; Associate Vice-President, Strategy and Knowledge Department (SKD); Director, Strategic Planning, SKD; Director, Near East, North Africa and Europe Division (NEN); Country Programme Manager, NEN; Director, Latin America and the Caribbean Division (LAC); Country Programme Manager, LAC; Senior Legal Officer, Office of the General Counsel (LEG); Officer-in-Charge, Office of the Secretary (on the 29 March); Secretary of IFAD (on 30 March); and other IFAD staff.
4. The Committee was also joined by Ms Sinem Mingan, Counsellor and Deputy Head of Mission, and Mr Hilmi Ergin Dedeo lu, Agricultural Counsellor at the Embassy of Turkey for the discussions on the country programme evaluation (CPE) for Turkey; and Her Excellency, Maria Laura da Rocha, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Federative Republic of Brazil to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Agencies in Rome for the agenda item on the CPE for Brazil.

### Agenda item 2: Adoption of the agenda

5. The provisional agenda contained the following items: (i) opening of the session; (ii) adoption of the agenda; (iii) corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's performance-based allocation system (PBAS); (iv) draft approach paper on the corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's decentralization; (v) country programme evaluation for Brazil; (vi) country programme evaluation for Turkey; (vii) IFAD's approach to a strategy for engagement in countries in fragile situations, with IOE comments; (viii) IFAD9 Impact Assessment Initiative: A synthesis of lessons learned, with IOE comments; (ix) procedure for drafting, clearance and sharing of Evaluation Committee records; and (x) other business.
6. The Chairperson noted that some agenda items had been reordered to ensure that key IFAD staff due to leave on duty travel were present for the discussion of specific items. Therefore the CPE for Turkey would now be discussed under agenda item (iv); the IFAD9 Impact Assessment Initiative: A Synthesis of Lessons Learned, with IOE comments, would be discussed as item (v); and IFAD's approach to a strategy for engagement in countries in fragile situations, with IOE comments, as item (vi). The CPE for Brazil and the draft approach paper for the CLE on IFAD's decentralization would be discussed on the second day as items (vii) and (viii), respectively.
7. The provisional agenda was amended to include, under other business, a proposal by IOE to hold an additional session of the Evaluation Committee in November 2016 to discuss the corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's decentralization.

8. The agenda contained in document EC 2016/91/W.P.1, amended to include one item under other business (to be issued as EC 2016/91/W.P.1/Rev.1), was adopted by the Committee.

Agenda item 3: Corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's performance-based allocation system (PBAS)

9. The Committee reviewed document EC 2016/91/W.P.2, containing the corporate-level evaluation (CLE) on IFAD's performance-based allocation system (PBAS), and Management's response to the evaluation (EC 2016/91/W.P.2/Add.1). The Committee noted with satisfaction the quality of the CLE and its recommendations.
10. The evaluation highlighted that the PBAS had contributed to a more systematic, transparent, accessible, predictable and flexible system of resource allocation, as well as to a fairer allocation of IFAD's resources across developing Member States than prior to its introduction. The evaluation analysed the country needs component, finding that rural population was the major driver in determining allocations. It also deemed that the country needs component of the PBAS formula had a limited focus on rural poverty, which was at the core of IFAD's mandate. Moreover, the PBAS formula in general did not take into account emerging challenges such as climate change, fragility and vulnerability. It also did not comprehensively capture two key aspects of IFAD's mandate: food security and nutrition.
11. At the same time, the influence on the final allocations of the country performance component – which included three complementary variables, Rural Sector Performance (RSP), Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) and project-at-risk (PAR) – was possibly less than desired and carried less weight than the performance component in the allocation systems of other international financial institutions (IFIs).
12. The Committee noted that overall the evaluation rating of the PBAS was satisfactory in terms of relevance, and moderately satisfactory with regard to effectiveness and efficiency.
13. The Committee acknowledged the number of positive adjustments made to the PBAS system over the years – such as aligning the three-year allocations with the IFAD replenishment cycles and including the rural population variable in the country needs component of the formula, instead of the total population – to further improve the system as a resource allocation tool.
14. The Committee supported the evaluation's recommendations to: (i) fine-tune the design of the PBAS by sharpening its objectives, strengthening its rural poverty focus, refining the indicators embedded in the RSP variable and reassessing the balance between country needs and country performance in driving country allocations; (ii) streamline processes for greater effectiveness, for example by considering whether to retain the CPIA variable given unavailability of the score; (iii) improve efficiency by calculating the RSP score less frequently and carrying out reallocations earlier in the three-year cycle, (iv) adjust management and governance, for example by establishing an interdepartmental committee on the PBAS, and enhance transparency in the implementation of the system by developing and sharing more comprehensive annual reports; and (v) generate learning through monitoring and sharing experiences across countries.
15. Committee members noted that details on important elements such as climate vulnerability were only included in the CLE appendices and not in the main report, and recognized the need to introduce additional variables like climate vulnerability and fragility into the PBAS formula, but called for maintaining its simplicity. They also underlined the need to further develop the gender indicators in the RSP variable, taking into account the priorities captured in IFAD's gender policy.

16. Acknowledging the complexity of adding different aspects, the Committee called upon Management to consider reliable statistics from other sources for the purposes of efficiency when selecting possible new variables or indicators to include in the PBAS. With regard to the latter, particular care was needed in deciding which variables and/or indicators to include and what impact these would have on the performance and needs components of the formula.
17. On another issue, the Committee further echoed the CLE recommendation to enhance learning across countries and regions, and underscored the need to streamline the generation of RSP scores across the board.
18. The Committee appreciated Management's concise and focused response to the CLE. It also noted Management's satisfaction with the overall evaluation findings and its commitment to use the sophisticated statistical analyses developed for the CLE to further operationalize three key recommendations, namely: reassessing the balance between the country needs and country performance components of the PBAS formula; strengthening the rural poverty focus of the country needs component; and refining the RSP variable by revisiting the underlying indicators and questions provided. Moreover, Management would reflect on ways to strengthen the effectiveness of the PBAS formula and process as an incentive for better country performance, and would present an update on the proposed way forward to the 119<sup>th</sup> session of the Executive Board in December 2016.
19. While noting Management's reservations with regard to some of the evaluation recommendations, the Committee upheld the recommendations, especially on management and governance, and urged Management to enhance transparency by sharing more robust documentation on why countries were or were not included in a given cycle; strengthen the link between PBAS allocations, administrative budget and project pipeline development; establish an interdepartmental committee; develop a database system for PBAS information; facilitate cross-regional learning; and enhance engagement and information sharing with the Executive Board for example with regard to a country's inclusion in or exclusion from a given PBAS cycle, capping of allocations, etc. This could be done without compromising Management's independence in implementing the PBAS. Management clarified that it agreed with the need for greater transparency, and informed members that a system was being developed to make all PBAS-related information available online and ensure that the calculations were carried out in a more automated fashion. The system would benefit from the CLE findings and recommendations and the ongoing discussions. Management was also developing comprehensive guidelines for PBAS implementation.
20. The Committee took note of Management's response to the CLE recommendation that earlier reallocations in the three-year cycle might be difficult to implement and might inhibit the flexibility of the PBAS because government priorities changed from time to time. Such changes did not necessarily coincide with the three-year replenishment cycle, hence the need to maintain as much flexibility as possible. Management explained that reallocations occurred only when countries indicated that they would forgo their allocations and this rarely happened in the first year, if ever. However, Management stated that it proactively monitored the likelihood of projects not being prepared in a timely manner for financing through earmarked country allocations or of countries forgoing their allocation, and engaged with them to ensure timely reallocation.
21. The Committee drew attention to the importance of creating a healthy balance between needs and performance in resource allocation.
22. On the question of the Board's involvement in the PBAS process, Management explained that information on allocations was presented to the Board annually as part of the budget document. Noting the evaluation finding that the Board was not sufficiently involved in the PBAS process, the Committee requested IOE to provide a

specific recommendation that addressed how the Board dealt with the PBAS and the related working group, and how this could be improved in the future. Two suggestions were made by IOE in this regard, namely to ensure more comprehensive reporting to the Board, also on systemic and strategic issues and on lessons learned in implementing the PBAS; and to strengthen the role of the PBAS Working Group.

23. Working group members, participating in the discussion as observers, expressed appreciation for joining the Committee and for the comprehensive evaluation undertaken and the innovative approaches used by IOE. They noted Management's commitment to fine-tune the PBAS and requested that they be fully consulted and engaged in the planned review process. They expressed support for the main CLE recommendations, especially those related to the need for a stronger and more detailed focus on rural poverty, adding that if performance were to remain a key component, the robustness, fairness and standardization of performance assessment across countries would need to be enhanced.
24. Working group members requested that IOE provide more comprehensive and objective analyses of data on the performance component to enable the Board to establish whether the weight allocated to performance was higher or lower than in other IFIs, considering that IFAD could not be compared with other IFIs generally given that it targeted the poorest rural farmers, and the fact that 65 per cent of the allocations were driven by country needs and not performance.
25. It was noted that while the evaluation showed that the CPIA scores were unavailable in many countries, it did not provide an alternative to these scores, without which their elimination would leave a gap in the formula. To avoid confusion, the working group cautioned against adding more variables to the formula as this would make it even more complicated and less elastic, without necessarily responding to the needs of IFAD target groups.
26. IOE clarified that before a comparison was undertaken with other IFIs, an internal analysis of the formula had been conducted based on the PBAS objective that countries that perform better receive higher allocations. This had shown that the needs component was much stronger than the performance component. On the question of CPIA, considering that 38 per cent of IFAD's portfolio did not have a CPIA index and that this trend continued to increase as the overall situation of IFAD's Member States improved, the RSP variable could be strengthened and compensate potentially for the CPIA.
27. In response to whether the Human Development Index (HDI) could replace the GNI per capita indicator in the formula, IOE indicated that HDI, although imperfect in addressing rural poverty dimensions such as access to water, had the advantage of being a composite index that included GNI per capita and life expectancy, which was a determinant of various social factors and thus a closer measurement of the well-being of a population.
28. Overall, it was agreed that the PBAS formula was serving its purpose well but it needed some refinement to ensure that it reflected IFAD's current priorities and a balance between the needs and performance elements. In refining the PBAS, Management would need to focus on increasing transparency, further reducing subjectivity, communicating more adequately to the Board on decisions taken; and ensuring adequate involvement of staff. Lastly, members looked forward to the update document to be presented to the Board in December 2016.

Agenda item 4: Country programme evaluation for Turkey

29. The Committee discussed document EC 2016/91/W.P.5 and its addendum, related to the CPE for Turkey. The CPE covered 13 years of IFAD operations in Turkey, which included two country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs) since 2000. The Committee noted with appreciation that the country programme had

been effective in increasing the incomes and the quality of life of rural poor people through improved rural infrastructure, agricultural productivity and commercialization.

30. The Committee also noted the key findings of the CPE, namely that the valued and strategic partnership between IFAD and Turkey could be strengthened and adjusted to better reflect Turkey's middle-income status; future partnerships could be built around South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC), innovation and knowledge-sharing; IFAD visibility should be enhanced; and, although its financing was relatively limited, IFAD was highly valued as an important institution for addressing rural poverty pockets in the country.
31. While it was acknowledged that project objectives were consistent with government priorities and gave appropriate attention to marketing and agricultural commercialization, there was some concern regarding targeting of poorer farmers, women and youth. Specifically, increased income did not translate into employment opportunities and this, coupled with insufficient collaboration with the rural financial sector, challenged sustainability and hampered inclusive rural development. In this regard, the Committee drew attention to the CPE recommendation to develop gender action plans during the design of future IFAD-supported projects.
32. The Committee was appreciative of Management's and the Government's agreement with the CPE's conclusions and recommendations, and that the new COSOP was prepared on the basis of these. In particular, according to Management, the COSOP reflected more focused targeting of poorer farmers, women and youth; an emphasis on knowledge management and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems to track participation, benefits and community empowerment; and greater attention to scaling up, more effective partnerships and policy dialogue with the Government and others. To address sustainability, Management was adopting a programmatic approach: the pipeline of projects under the two PBAS cycles would consist of a planned rural development programme and the value chain approach would be adopted for enhanced employment.
33. The Committee highlighted the need for special attention in project design to ensure that benefits did not go to bigger and wealthier farmers. On a related matter, Management explained that through negotiations with the Government, the contribution ratio for beneficiaries for specific project activities had been reduced from 50 per cent to 20 per cent to ensure more specific targeting of poor farmers.
34. The representative for the Government of Turkey expressed appreciation for the CPE and informed the Committee that while the country had made great strides in agriculture and rural development, the Government still regarded the multifaceted partnership with IFAD as a key factor in addressing rural poverty, eliminating disparities and bringing about improvements in the agricultural sector.
35. The Committee sought clarification on the implications of the view that IFAD had limited visibility in the country and the need to strengthen its partnership with Turkey to reflect the country's middle-income status. Since Turkey considered its partnership with IFAD as a test lab to introduce innovations, members also requested clarification on why this partnership was relevant to IFAD, and on the reasons behind IFAD's limited partnership with the other Rome-based agencies (RBAs) at the country level. Management explained that its partnership with Turkey yielded valuable experience which could be shared and transferred to neighbouring countries through capacity-building and SSTC. Finally, it was pointed out that partnerships with regional partners were being pursued, and that the establishment of an IFAD Country Office (ICO) would lead to more active engagement in non-lending activities, including partnerships, SSTC, knowledge management and policy dialogue.

36. IOE highlighted Turkey's dual role as a donor and a borrower, which offered new opportunities to partner with IFAD clients outside traditional cooperation avenues. IFAD and Turkey shared a common agenda and interest in pursuing inclusive and sustainable rural transformation. IFAD was best positioned to contribute to this goal in terms of knowledge, experience and innovation. The country programme should therefore be shaped accordingly.
37. Finally, it was noted that the agreement at completion point signed with the Government reflected agreement with all five recommendations of the CPE, and these would be captured in the new COSOP under preparation.
- Agenda item 5: IFAD9 Impact Assessment Initiative: A synthesis of lessons learned, with IOE comments
38. The Committee reviewed document EC 2016/91/W.P.7 on the IFAD9 Impact Assessment Initiative: A synthesis of lessons learned, and IOE's comments thereon, as contained in the addendum.
39. The Committee noted that the purpose of the assessment was to gauge impact on issues such as resilience, and to measure to the degree possible the number of people reached by IFAD projects. The assessment revealed that 139 million beneficiaries had received services through IFAD-funded projects – a figure well beyond the target of 90 million people set for the IFAD9 period – and that 44 million rural people had seen substantial increases in agricultural revenue. The assessment also provided a good account of lessons learned. On the indicator of the 80 million people to be brought out of poverty, Management informed members that the lesson learned from the exercise was that the indicator "people brought out of poverty" – measured as a single, money-metric indicator as the number of people crossing the poverty line – was flawed and inadequate; it failed to capture the substantial and important welfare benefits transferred to, and generated by, IFAD's beneficiaries. Assessing IFAD's project impact required a broader range of indicators against which to measure its project and programme interventions.
40. The Committee welcomed the report but underscored that the assessment was not just a learning opportunity but also an accountability exercise, hence the need to report on all indicators as agreed to during the replenishment process. As highlighted in IOE's comments on the assessment, three issues emerged, namely: (i) the inability of the synthesis report to explicitly report on three of the new IFAD indicators agreed with Member States in February 2012, i.e. number of people moved out of poverty, length of hungry season and child malnutrition; (ii) the absence of a section on systemic issues, best practices and lessons on the proximate causes of good or less-than-good performance of IFAD development interventions; and (iii) the importance of striking the required balance between promoting accountability and learning in selecting projects for impact assessments in the future. Some committee members focused on the importance of assessing and learning from both well-performing and poorly performing projects. The Committee's view was that assessment should start out by looking at the commitments made under IFAD9, the achievements for the period 2009-2013 and the results obtained in this regard, and then the lessons learned for the future.
41. Members acknowledged both the complexity of determining the poverty count, length of the hungry season and state of nutrition, and the view that "people taken out of poverty" was perhaps not the only indicator that truly reflected IFAD's work. Nevertheless, given that the same indicator was included in the IFAD10 matrix, it was important to agree on a way forward on how to continuously report on the agreed indicators to make comparison between replenishment periods possible. The Committee therefore requested that Management provide them with an estimate of the number of people moved out of poverty in line with the IFAD9 commitments even if this figure entailed a margin of error, and provide justification and options for improving the measurement of results in the future.

42. In response, Management pointed out that the extensive results presented in the report on improvements in poor people's assets showed that IFAD is accountable for the investments made in IFAD9. Focusing on a single indicator failed to capture the nature of IFAD investment. To address data quality issues, Management was working to create a broader framework for development effectiveness that incorporated ongoing initiatives and added new activities. These included working with the Information and Communications Technology Division to develop real-time data-processing systems, training IFAD staff and governments on M&E, and improving project design. Management also noted that the lessons and results of the impact assessment initiative would be shared with like-minded agencies. Going forward therefore, the midterm review of the Results Measurement Framework would reflect the points raised and ensure the inclusion of indicators that adequately reflected the results foreseen in the IFAD Strategic Framework 2016-2025.

Agenda item 6: IFAD's approach to a strategy for engagement in countries in fragile situations, with IOE comments

43. The Committee considered document EC 2016/91/W.P.6 and its addendum, containing IFAD's approach to a strategy for engagement in countries in fragile situations prepared by IFAD Management and IOE's comments thereon, and welcomed it as a positive first step towards developing a strategy to address fragility.
44. While acknowledging that the approach paper would enable Management to obtain feedback and useful comments to shape the strategy, the Committee recalled the commitment made to present a strategy in April 2016 and requested that this matter be discussed at the upcoming Convenors and Friends meeting. Management responded that given the strategic nature of the paper, it would be useful to obtain the Board's feedback before presenting the final strategy.
45. The Committee discussed in detail the proposed new definition of fragility, which Management had revised in an attempt to ensure alignment with other partners and to internalize emerging challenges of working in fragile situations. As recommended by the CLE on the topic completed by IOE in 2015, the Committee welcomed the emphasis on fragile situations moving forward.
46. The Committee expressed concern that the new definition focused on vulnerability of individuals as opposed to institutions, noting that bad governance was one of the drivers of increased fragility. It was also felt that the definition could allow for subjectivity. The Committee requested that the definition be aligned with those of other United Nations organizations or the World Bank and then be customized to IFAD. Management noted that a review of international organizations and their approaches had been conducted, and that no internationally agreed definition existed. IFAD's approach, while being IFAD-specific, was in line with those of other IFIs.
47. In response to a question on whether the "shocks" cited in the definition were economic, climatic, or violence-related, Management clarified that the term covered all these aspects.
48. Members sought clarification on the differentiated approaches, and whether the "crisis response window" would be part of the planned revisions to PBAS or be funded by complementary resources. They also highlighted the need to ensure coherence between this and other IFAD corporate strategies and policies, such as the partnership strategy. Moreover, it was noted that future country strategies would serve as an instrument to analyse fragility, while still maintaining simplicity in the objectives and activities of IFAD operations in fragile situations.
49. Management further clarified that the fragility index would be used for all countries; that the differentiated approaches for fragile situations would be applied to only the



bottom 20 per cent (about 20 countries); and that only root causes falling within IFAD's comparative advantage would be addressed by the strategy. In conclusion, Management assured the Committee that the comments provided would be given due consideration.

Agenda item 7: Country programme evaluation for Brazil

50. The Committee reviewed the CPE for the Federative Republic of Brazil (EC 2016/91/W.P.4), which covered the partnership with Brazil from 2008-2015, including eight projects, the 2008 COSOP and country programme management.
51. The Committee noted Brazil's high cofinancing rate in IFAD-funded projects, which portrayed the country's commitment and the high value it placed on its partnership with the organization. Although IFAD financing was comparatively limited, it remained important in terms of contribution to rural poverty alleviation. The Committee noted that there had been a marked improvement in performance since the last CPE in 2007, and welcomed, in particular: (i) the satisfactory rating for the relevance of the 2008 COSOP and ongoing projects, and the achievements of closed projects; (ii) the focus on non-lending activities such as policy dialogue, partnerships, knowledge management and SSTC; (iii) the satisfactory rating for promotion of gender equality in completed projects, and the need for improved gender mainstreaming in ongoing projects; and (iv) the positive impact of the establishment of the ICO with two Professional staff members and one programme assistant.
52. The Committee commended IOE for the high quality of the CPE and noted that Brazil was a good example of IFAD's engagement with middle-income countries. The Committee noted the recommendations to devote more explicit attention to smallholder agricultural activities, while maintaining a focus on essential non-agricultural inputs for rural transformation; to determine the cost of the new COSOP; to strengthen engagement and resource allocation to non-lending activities including SSTC; to create a better balance between lending and non-lending activities; and to outpost the country programme manager (CPM) to Brazil.
53. Management acknowledged the thoroughness of the CPE and the efficiency and quality of the overall process. In welcoming the recommendations made, Management assured the Committee of a continued focus on smallholder agriculture and non-lending activities. However, the costing of the COSOP would require the development of a corporate strategy and methodology. Outposting of the CPM would be considered in the context of the corporate decentralization plan scheduled for submission to the Board in December 2016. In this regard, the Committee suggested that IFAD consider creating a regional hub in Brazil for the Latin America and the Caribbean region.
54. The Committee requested additional information on:
  - The time lag between project approval and project implementation: Management attributed this to the multiple layers of project approval required because of the federal nature of the country, noting however that the situation had improved for more recent projects;
  - Any negative efficiency implications of the large number of IFAD-supported projects in the country and the plan to expand geographically in the future. Management clarified that given the approach to target the north-east region of the country, there would be no fragmentation.
  - The differentiation between small-scale agriculture and commercial agriculture, the relationship between the two different ministries (the Ministry of Agrarian Development and Ministry of Agriculture) and what this meant for IFAD in terms of policy engagement and dialogue. In this regard, Management underlined that discussions had started with the Ministry of Agriculture, and coordination would be strengthened with both ministries.

55. In addition, the Committee noted that it would be helpful for projects to pay more attention to linking smallholder farmers to markets, build more private-sector partnerships, and strengthen collaboration with the other RBAs and partners. Management assured members that special emphasis would be placed on specific value chains to link farmers to markets. Regarding RBAs and other partners, the close collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations on sharing of knowledge and documentation was highlighted, as was the collaboration with the World Food Programme's Brasilia-based centre of excellence for the Food Purchase Programme (PAA) for Africa, and with Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA) research centres through the Africa-Brazil Innovation Market Place. The overall budget assigned to policy dialogue activities made up only 10 per cent of the administrative budget of the portfolio, and the Government of Brazil had committed significant cofinancing for all grants provided.
56. The Committee noted that IFAD could do more to fully realize its potential to contribute to rural poverty reduction in Brazil. In this regard, IOE noted that there were opportunities in the areas of IFAD's visibility and policy dialogue.
57. On a specific query, IOE explained that while CPEs by IOE could report on the number of people reached by IFAD operations, impact assessments of all projects in a given country would be needed in order to report on the number of people brought out of poverty.
58. In conclusion, the Committee commended the well-developed projects on the ground; the good work carried out by IFAD, and the quality and dedication of the two country programme officers in Salvador, who coordinated and carried out direct supervision of projects and portfolio monitoring and evaluation, and ran the ICO.
- Agenda item 8: Draft approach paper on the corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's decentralization
59. The Committee discussed the draft approach paper on the corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's decentralization as contained in document EC 2016/91/W.P.3, and provided IOE with comments, which were also welcomed by Management. Management had also shared detailed comments with IOE on the draft approach paper, for example on the need for the CLE to include analytical feedback on how IFAD's decentralization approach fared on key aspects (cost, results measurement, human resource allocation, level of delegation of authority, etc.) in comparison to how IFIs (the Asian Development Bank and African Development Bank) and United Nations agencies approached decentralization.
60. The Committee noted that the evaluation would cover the period 2003–2015 and would review the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of IFAD's decentralization including the country presence policy framework and the different ICO models, while devoting attention to learning from comparator organizations. In this context, the evaluation would consider the evolution of country presence from the outset as a field presence pilot programme, to the development of a country presence policy and strategy and adoption of the 2013 Country Presence Strategy. Given the formative nature of the evaluation with added attention to learning, the latter would also consider – to the extent possible - ongoing measures being introduced by Management in 2016 to ensure effective and efficient decentralization.
61. In assessing effectiveness, the Committee considered it important for the CLE to consult partners to collect feedback on IFAD's engagement in national policy dialogue and knowledge-sharing as well as on the mobilization of cofinancing. Furthermore, stronger collaboration with the RBAs in decentralized contexts could be particularly advantageous. The need to consider a cost-benefit model of decentralization was also highlighted, because despite the opportunities it presented for networking and policy dialogue, it nonetheless had a considerable impact on a CPM's time. IOE reiterated that attention would be paid to these

aspects and to RBA collaboration, and that a comparison would be undertaken between countries with an ICO and those without.

62. Finally, the Committee enquired about the negotiating time for host country agreements, and requested that this be addressed in the evaluation. It also encouraged IOE to involve private-sector partners in the planned country-level workshops in order to obtain their views. In closing, IOE underlined that it would take on board the additional guidance provided by the Committee in the evaluation's design and implementation.

Agenda item 9: Procedure for drafting, clearance and sharing of Evaluation Committee records

63. It was noted that, at its ninetieth session, the Committee – while endorsing the proposed procedure for drafting, clearance and sharing of Evaluation Committee records – had requested that the document be revised to provide additional information on the proposed timeline for sharing session minutes with members. The Committee thus considered and approved the timeline as provided in paragraphs 14 and 15 of document EC 2016/91/W.P.8.

Agenda item 10: Other business

64. The Committee endorsed the proposal made by IOE to hold an additional half-day session of the Evaluation Committee on the morning of 28 November 2016, to discuss the corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's decentralization.
65. Before closing the session, the Chairperson conveyed gratitude, on behalf of the Committee and on his own behalf, to Mr Ashwani K. Muthoo, Deputy Director, IOE, who had been appointed Director, Global Engagement and Research Division in SKD, effective 15 April 2016. Mr Muthoo was highly commended for his diligence and dedication and the valuable service he had provided to the Evaluation Committee.
66. The Committee concluded its deliberations with the Chairperson expressing his appreciation to members, IOE, Management, staff, interpreters and messengers for their hard work and patience throughout what had been a very fruitful session.