

Document:	<u>EB 2020/130/R.11/Add.3</u>
Agenda:	<u>7</u>
Date:	<u>8 September 2020</u>
Distribution:	<u>Public</u>
Original:	<u>English</u>

**E**



Investing in rural people

## **2020 President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA)**

### **Addendum**

### **Management's response to Member States' comments**

Executive Board — 130<sup>th</sup> Session  
Rome, 8-11 September 2020

---

For: **Information**

Comments from Brazil	Management response
<p>Brazil deems the Management's intention of high relevance to enhance IFAD's evaluation architecture, by revisiting the format and the structure of the PRISMA, turning it into a more comprehensive and strategic tool.</p> <p>Taking into consideration that the IOE agrees with the Management that revamping the PRISMA may enhance its usefulness, nonetheless recommends that PRISMA continues to provide full coverage of all assessments, including project-level and country evaluations, Brazil would like to know if Management intends to seek a consensus with the IOE on the upcoming format of the Report . Will a deadline be set for finalizing this review?</p> <p>We look forward to hearing Management's view on this matter.</p>	<p>Management intends to work collaboratively with the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE) through the amendment of the IFAD Evaluation Manual as well as in articulation of both IOE's new product range and Management's study on self-evaluation, and this will include the future format of the PRISMA. As the amended Evaluation Manual would be articulated in 2021, Management would anticipate that an agreed and updated format for PRISMA 2021 would be available by then.</p>
Comments from Canada	Management response
<p>Canada would like to thank Management for producing this comprehensive report. We noted a welcome emphasis on discussing emerging findings and recurrent themes drawn from the evaluations included in the report. While we agree and support this approach, we would like to urge the continuation in future reports of country-level information regarding evaluation recommendations and analysis. We believe such an approach would provide Members with a balanced understanding of both common thematic occurrences across evaluations as well as information on project development and implementation on the ground in countries where IFAD is/ has been active, providing a good sense of local and regional impact. We believe such an approach would also help strengthen the Board's ability to meet its responsibilities in terms of guiding and informing future programmes and projects in line with IFAD's strategic approach.</p>	<p>Management takes note of the concerns and considerations as expressed by Canada. The coverage of future PRISMA would ensure the continuation of follow-up reporting regarding recommendations and assessments provided by country-level evaluations.</p>
Comments from Japan	Management response
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Firstly, Japan thanks Management for re-opening the on-line comment, which provide the Board members to reflect on the discussion made in the Evaluation Committee session. Given the TOR of the Committee, this order should be arranged as much as practically applicable.</li> <li>2. Japan thanks Management for making PRISMA. As highlighted in the document, this is very important for the Board in terms of accountability and leaning point of view.</li> <li>3. We welcome the high follow-up rate of recommendations from IOE by Management. We also thank that these follow-ups includes the latest responses <u>in the context of Covid-19 pandemic</u> both in corporate level and in country level.</li> <li>4. We also thank IOE for the comments on PRISMA and conducting a good analysis of <u>follow-up actions presented in annex I</u>, which was not the case in the ARRI last year. I hope this will be another tool that Management and IOE exchange their view on the actions and additional follow up actions are taken if necessary and appropriate.</li> <li>5. Last but not least, <u>Japan expresses its full support to the comments made by the Netherlands, which captures the Members' interventions in the last Evaluation Committee.</u></li> </ol>	<p>Management would like to thank Japan for providing follow-up comments based on the discussion during the Evaluation Committee session prior to the Executive Board. We would fine-tune the arrangement, in particular the deadline set up for providing online comments, ensuring the feedback and insights of Board members could be adequately captured and recorded through the system.</p> <p>Management also believes the analysis of follow-up actions presented in annex I of the comments by the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD for PRISMA is very useful. It presents the ongoing actions and follow-ups that could be improved or require further review at the implementation stage. As it is foreseen that a web-based system tracking the implementation status of the evaluation recommendations would be developed, Management would continue the collaboration with IOE during this process and looks forward to receiving feedback and suggestions from IOE through the platform.</p>

Comments from Netherlands	Management response
<p>Like IOE, the Netherlands welcome the PRISMA as an important instrument within IFAD's evaluation architecture for promoting accountability and organizational learning.</p> <p>Overall we are quite satisfied with the response Management and therefore we do not have many questions or comments. But still a few.</p> <p>First, on the proposal of Management to limit from now on the follow-up reporting in to thematic/corporate and strategic evaluations and to skip the follow up on the portfolio-level evaluations. We have sympathy for this proposal given the generally long period of time between the completion of a program and the availability of the evaluation results, which means that the added value of the evaluation for application in a subsequent phase of the program is very limited.</p> <p>But evaluations are not only relevant from the perspective of what can be learned from them for the future. We also want to know whether there was 'value for money' with respect to the investments made in the past. And we also understand the remark of IOE that it does not support the proposal as portfolio level evaluations look not only at completed projects but also at ongoing programmes that have been designed recently.</p> <p>As a compromise, IOE suggests that IFAD will make much more use of the lessons learned from other UN organizations and IFIs that are usually shared on web-based platforms. On these platforms, IFAD could also place its own portfolio evaluation results and recommendations. We can support this suggestion of IOE.</p> <p>On the Actionable recommendations: we fully agree with the observation in the PRISMA that there is room for improvement when it comes to formulation of recommendations from a strategic, a relevance and actionable perspective. Therefore, it is good to read that IOE will take up this challenge.</p> <p>Furthermore we also strongly support the suggestions to include in future PRISMA reporting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Challenges to implementing past and existing recommendations and;</li> <li>(ii) A clear list of IOE recommendations that are not agreed by Management.</li> </ul>	<p>Management would like to thank the Netherlands for providing written comments that summarized the discussion made during the Evaluation Committee session prior to the Executive Board. Management would explore a feasible approach to set up a web-based database for Management responses by learning from experiences of other IFIs. The automated system tracking Management's responses would be accessible and visible to staff across divisions to enhance learning and knowledge management.</p> <p>The format of future PRISMA reports would be further developed in collaboration with IOE when amending the IFAD Evaluation Manual scheduled for 2021. Management would anticipate that the two proposed items: (i) challenges to implementing past and existing recommendations; and (ii) a clear list of IOE recommendations that are not agreed by Management would be included therein.</p>