

A

FIDA

FONDS INTERNATIONAL DE DÉVELOPPEMENT AGRICOLE

Conseil d'administration - Soixante-dix-huitième session

Rome, 9-10 avril 2003

RAPPORT DU PRÉSIDENT DU COMITÉ D'ÉVALUATION SUR L'ÉVALUATION EXTERNE INDÉPENDANTE DU FIDA

1. Le présent rapport résume les délibérations a) des trois sessions informelles du Comité d'évaluation tenues les 26 mars, 7 avril et 9 avril; et b) d'une réunion des coordonnateurs de liste et amis tenue le 10 avril pour examiner le cadre de référence de l'évaluation externe indépendante (EEI) du FIDA.
2. Il a été largement reconnu que le cadre de référence, tel qu'établi par M. Peter Smith (consultant sélectionné par le Comité en décembre 2002 et chargé de préparer le cadre de référence), nécessite d'être retravaillé et amélioré dans divers domaines. Ce cadre de référence a été depuis remanié et transformé en document d'orientation pour l'EEI. Le document d'orientation n'ayant pas été examiné lors des réunions susmentionnées, il n'a pu en l'occurrence faire l'objet d'un large consensus. Cependant, on a estimé que le document d'orientation, tel que joint au présent rapport, peut servir de référence utile à l'élaboration d'un cadre de référence plus spécifique et détaillé, et par conséquent au recrutement de l'équipe de consultants.
3. Par ailleurs, le Comité a pris note des contraintes du facteur temps dans la conduite de l'EEI. À cet égard, les membres du Comité sont convenus qu'il fallait mettre au point rapidement le cadre de référence spécifique et détaillé, indispensable pour le recrutement des consultants, afin que l'EEI puisse démarrer au plus vite après le Conseil d'administration d'avril 2003. Cela ménagerait un délai suivant pour conduire et achever l'évaluation d'ici septembre 2004, comme décidé lors du processus de consultation sur la sixième reconstitution des ressources du FIDA.
4. Les délibérations des 26 mars, 7 et 9 avril ont porté sur tous les aspects du cadre de référence qui sont maintenant pris en compte dans le document d'orientation.
5. Lors de ses diverses délibérations, le Comité de l'évaluation est parvenu à un consensus sur de nombreux points exposés dans le document d'orientation. Il a été reconnu que le Conseil d'administration est le client clé de cette évaluation aux multiples parties prenantes et que l'étude devrait être principalement centrée sur l'impact des opérations du FIDA sur le terrain et sur certains processus relevant de l'institution et de la direction. Le Comité a également souligné l'importance d'admettre qu'une telle étude ne saurait éluder les difficultés bien connues de tous les évaluateurs

Document #: 326635

Library:DMS

*Par souci d'économie le présent document a fait l'objet d'un tirage limité.
Les délégués sont priés d'apporter leurs exemplaires aux réunions et de s'abstenir d'en demander d'autres.*

lorsqu'il s'agit de mesurer l'impact et son origine. Sauf indication contraire pleinement motivée par les évaluateurs, l'étude devrait, de l'avis général, porter en principe sur les dix dernières années environ, ce qui permettrait de mesurer l'impact et sa durabilité sans accorder une place excessive aux caractéristiques des premières interventions du FIDA. On a estimé que la période choisie pour l'examen assurerait la pertinence des conclusions de l'EEI et contribuerait efficacement à l'évolution future du Fonds.

6. Les participants ont jugé que le document d'orientation ne devrait pas détailler la méthodologie de l'EEI. À cet égard, le Comité a considéré que c'était à l'équipe des consultants finalement sélectionnés pour réaliser l'évaluation d'en proposer la méthodologie. On a également estimé qu'il fallait sélectionner par échantillonnage aléatoire les pays et projets qui feront partie de l'évaluation. La représentation des opérations du FIDA soumises à l'étude serait ainsi plus objective et impartiale. À cet égard, on a considéré important de procéder à un examen de "l'évaluabilité" des projets et des pays retenus de manière à disposer de données et d'informations solides permettant de réaliser une analyse d'impact sérieuse et efficace en terme de coût. Toutefois, l'évaluation est censée attirer l'attention sur les projets et programmes pour lesquels les données, les informations et les systèmes de suivi et d'évaluation nécessaires à l'analyse d'impact font défaut. Le Comité a aussi estimé important d'inclure à l'EEI un nombre raisonnable de projets appuyés par le FIDA qui sont cofinancés par d'autres donateurs. On s'est aussi accordé à reconnaître que l'EEI devrait examiner à la fois des projets en cours et clos.

7. De l'avis du Comité de l'évaluation, le document d'orientation devrait contenir un nombre limité de questions d'évaluation primordiales qui constitueraient le fil directeur du travail des évaluateurs. Ces questions d'évaluation devraient s'appuyer sur des critères internationaux d'évaluation, entre autres ceux qui sont reconnus par le groupe de travail du CAD/OCDE sur l'évaluation de l'aide et les banques multilatérales de développement. Ces critères d'évaluation comprennent, notamment, l'impact, la durabilité, la pertinence, l'efficacité, l'efficience et la performance. On a également reconnu qu'il fallait s'attacher davantage dans le cadre de référence destiné à l'équipe d'évaluation à évaluer le travail des institutions coopérantes du FIDA, compte tenu du rôle critique qu'elles jouent dans l'appui à l'exécution des projets financés par le FIDA et dans l'administration des prêts y afférents. Le Comité est aussi convenu de l'importance d'évaluer dans le cadre de l'EEI la performance des partenaires clés dans la réalisation d'un impact.

8. Plusieurs domaines importants dans le document d'orientation nécessitaient un examen plus approfondi de la part des membres du Comité au cours de ses diverses sessions informelles. Il s'agissait, comme indiqué plus haut, des modalités de gouvernance et d'organisation de l'EEI, et des procédures de sélection de l'équipe de consultants chargée de l'évaluation et des besoins budgétaires. Pour faciliter les délibérations sur les sujets susmentionnés, la liste A a préparé une proposition écrite qui a servi de base aux travaux de la session informelle du Comité de l'évaluation tenue le 9 avril.

9. Le Comité a examiné favorablement la proposition de la liste A et a apporté quelques modifications au texte. La version révisée de la proposition, qui intègre les suggestions du Comité, est résumée ci-dessous dans les paragraphes 10 à 15, qui remplacent les parties correspondantes du document d'orientation.

Organisation/gouvernance de l'évaluation

10. L'évaluation sera conduite sous la supervision générale du Directeur du Bureau de l'évaluation (OE) du FIDA, au nom du Conseil d'administration auquel il rendra compte et conformément aux dispositions exposées dans le présent rapport du Président.

11. Conformément à la politique d'évaluation du FIDA, approuvée par le Conseil d'administration le 9 avril 2003, la direction du FIDA veillera à ce que ses fonctionnaires et les projets auxquels il

apporte son aide fournissent rapidement tous les documents et autres informations nécessaires et participent et coopèrent activement à l'EEI. En outre, avant que le rapport sur l'EEI ne soit publié, il sera communiqué à la direction du FIDA et, le cas échéant, aux pays emprunteurs intéressés pour qu'ils présentent leurs observations. La direction du FIDA aura aussi la possibilité de formuler des observations sur le rapport final et de présenter sa réponse, qui sera jointe en annexe au rapport final sur l'EEI.

12. Un comité de pilotage, composé de représentants des pays membres du FIDA, jouera un rôle consultatif auprès de l'équipe d'évaluation et du directeur d'OE, auquel il donnera des avis sur les projets de documents et autres questions indiquées ci-dessous. En outre, le comité de pilotage entérinera la sélection des membres de l'équipe d'évaluation, recommandés par le Directeur d'OE conformément aux procédures décrites ci-dessous.

13. Les attributions du Directeur d'OE comprendront, notamment:

- a) *La sélection de l'équipe d'évaluation*: le Directeur d'OE dirigera le processus de sélection des membres de l'équipe d'évaluation externe indépendante. L'équipe d'évaluation sera recrutée collectivement par voie d'appel à la concurrence public et international, conduit soit par un cabinet de recrutement spécialisé soit directement par le Directeur d'OE. Le Directeur d'OE recommandera un choix sur une liste restreinte d'au moins trois équipes de candidats qualifiés et le soumettra au Comité pour approbation. L'équipe sera sélectionnée compte tenu, entre autres, de l'équilibre régional, de la langue et du sexe des éléments ayant les compétences professionnelles requises. Les membres du Comité de pilotage auront accès à toutes les informations concernant la sélection de l'équipe d'évaluation.
- b) *L'administration et le budget*: le Directeur d'OE supervisera la fourniture de services administratifs (contrats, voyages et remboursements, demandes de renseignements, etc.) à l'équipe d'évaluation. La prestation de ces services sera assurée par le personnel que le Directeur juge nécessaire, qu'il l'engage directement ou qu'il soit déjà employé par le FIDA dans les mêmes fonctions. Le Directeur proposera aussi au Conseil d'administration pour approbation en septembre 2003 un budget général de l'évaluation dans la limite d'un plafond de 1,7 million de USD (y compris les contributions bilatérales), selon l'estimation préliminaire fournie dans le document d'orientation (sauf justification circonstanciée, le coût total devrait être sensiblement inférieur à cette estimation). Le Directeur peut commencer à engager les dépenses nécessaires avant la session de septembre du Conseil d'administration.
- c) *Supervision générale et liaison*: le Directeur d'OE sera le principal interlocuteur de l'équipe d'évaluation. Il veillera à ce que l'équipe conduise ses travaux conformément à son cadre de référence et se tiendra à sa disposition pour répondre à ses demandes de renseignements et résoudre les problèmes qu'elle pourrait rencontrer dans l'exécution de sa tâche. À ce titre, le Directeur peut solliciter l'avis du comité de pilotage ou de tout autre expert externe qu'il juge compétent ou nécessaire. Si à un moment quelconque de l'évaluation, le Directeur estime que l'équipe d'évaluation s'écarte notablement des exigences de son cadre de référence, il peut lui demander de prendre des mesures correctives. Il informera le comité de pilotage et les administrateurs/suppléants de tout fait de ce genre. Il remettra également pendant toute la durée de l'évaluation un rapport sur l'état d'avancement de celle-ci à chaque session du Conseil d'administration.

14. Le comité de pilotage sera créé dès que possible d'ici au 15 mai et comprendra des représentants de neuf États membres du FIDA, choisis dans les listes A (4 membres), B (2) et C (3). Dans la mesure du possible, les membres du comité ne devraient pas être aussi membres du Conseil

d'administration. En tout état de cause, il est prévu qu'aux fins de l'examen des projets de documents et autres questions et de la formulation des observations, les membres du comité recourent à leurs experts nationaux respectifs. Le Comité de l'évaluation est également convenu qu'un soutien financier provenant du budget de l'EEI devrait être accordé pour permettre aux membres des pays en développement de participer aux travaux du comité de pilotage.

15. Les membres du comité de pilotage se tiendront à la disposition de l'équipe d'évaluation et du Directeur d'OE pour leur fournir sur demande des commentaires et avis. Au minimum, les membres du comité seront invités à formuler des observations sur le rapport initial de l'équipe d'évaluation, le rapport de la phase I (établi après les études sur dossiers et avant les études sur le terrain) et le premier projet de rapport final (l'avant-dernier projet sera présenté aux administrateurs/suppléants pour observations et examen). Tous les administrateurs et administrateurs suppléants auront, sur demande, librement accès aux documents examinés ainsi qu'aux observations formulées par les membres du comité de pilotage.

16. Le Comité de l'évaluation recommande au Conseil d'administration pour approbation les dispositions relatives à l'organisation et à la structure de gouvernance, ainsi que toutes les autres dispositions mentionnées dans le présent rapport du Président. Il recommande aussi au Conseil de confier au Directeur d'OE l'établissement du cadre de référence détaillé qui servira de base à l'appel international à la concurrence et de le soumettre au comité de pilotage pour examen et approbation d'ici la fin de mai 2003. Si à cette date aucun consensus ne s'est dégagé, le Directeur d'OE, en collaboration avec le président du Comité de pilotage, finalisera le cadre de référence en tenant compte des observations qui auront été reçues.

17. Enfin, le comité propose au Conseil d'autoriser le financement de l'EEI et les décaissements jusqu'à concurrence de 1,7 million de USD en tant que dépense exceptionnelle dans le budget 2003 du FIDA, comme l'a approuvé le Conseil des gouverneurs en février 2003.

APPROACH PAPER:

IFAD INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL EVALUATION.

1. BACKGROUND.

A rapid external review of IFAD's operations was completed in February 2002, in connection with Sixth Replenishment. The conclusions of this review were favourable to IFAD in a number of areas: its special expertise in combating rural poverty; its work in capacity and institutions building; its promotion of a number of important innovations; and its contributions to policy dialogue and to improving strategy formulation at the national level. It also recorded a number of problem areas, including the sustainability of projects, and the dominance of a culture which focuses on approval, disbursement, and inputs, rather than on performance, results, and impact.

However, the 2002 review was carried out at short notice, with limited resources, and had to rely largely on IFAD-generated data, with only brief field visits. As a result, it was widely felt among donors and members that the review was insufficiently rigorous, objective, and independent. It was therefore agreed that a full Independent External Evaluation (IEE) would be completed by September 2004, to feed into the Seventh Replenishment.

2. OBJECTIVES.

The objectives of the evaluation are:

- To determine IFAD's effectiveness in meeting its stated objectives as they have evolved over time,
- To compare that achievement with IFAD's own targets,
- To establish the causes of any underachievement, whether these be in IFAD itself, or in its partners, and
- To assess whether those targets exist in a sufficiently clear and explicit form, and are realistic, reasonably challenging, and measurable.

3. THE CLIENT, AND MAJOR STAKEHOLDERS.

The client for the IEE are the Directors and Alternate Directors of IFAD's Executive Board. Its chief requirement is an evaluation of the organization's effectiveness.

Within the organization, the Office of Evaluation and Studies (OE) has a special role as an independent unit reporting direct to the Board. Other major stakeholders are: the Co-operating Institutions (CIs), national governments and other partners, co-financing agencies, the beneficiaries, and the professional staff of IFAD. The modus operandi of the evaluation is to maintain the IEE's objectivity and independence.

4. SCOPE AND FOCUS.

4.1 Activities

The evaluation will focus on the factors determining effectiveness in field operations; this necessarily includes the majority of IFAD's own internal procedures. However, there are a number of areas of the organization's internal procedures which are excluded. These are:

- investment management;
- public relations and fund raising;

- certain aspects of personnel management: recruitment policy, and pay and conditions (but overall staffing levels and factors affecting morale and use of time are included); and
- IT, legal, and translation services, and routine procurement and maintenance.

Although each of these functions is linked to field effectiveness, none of them interact with it; as a result, each of these excluded functions can be evaluated separately from the topics covered in the IEE. There are advantages in keeping them separate: they require specialised expertise, which is largely unrelated to that required for the primary objective; and separating them off will simplify the management of the evaluation. The Evaluators may however comment on the impact of any of these areas on the main inquiry, where this is necessary to the achievement of the main objectives..

4.2 Time Horizon.

To best gauge the effectiveness of IFAD's activities, the evaluation will cover activities over the longest time period possible for which there is sufficient and reliable data and should go back at least 10 years. It should include projects both completed and initiated during that period.

4.3 General Approach

The IEE will examine how resources have been used to convert IFAD's philosophy into effective measures to alleviate poverty amongst its target groups. The results of the February 2002 Review suggest that simple technical deficiencies in project design do not form an important part of the overall picture; however, provision has been made for a limited amount of technical evaluation in critical areas, according to need; tentatively, these have been identified as microfinance, small rural businesses, and agronomy. Provision has also been made for a gender specialist under this heading, in case additional in-depth work proves necessary.

It is not intended to evaluate IFAD against the performance of other agencies, because this would imply evaluating all agencies which might be used as standards of comparison. However, an assessment of the general level of performance of other major agencies will also be made for each sample country, for purposes of comparison.

5 ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS/GOVERNANCE OF EVALUATION

5.1. The Evaluation will be conducted under the overall supervision of the Director of IFAD's Office of Evaluation (OE), on behalf of, and accountable to, the Directors and Alternate Directors of IFAD's Executive Board, and in accordance with the Terms of Reference (TOR) approved by the Board.

5.2. A Steering Committee, composed of representatives of IFAD member countries, will serve in an advisory capacity to the Evaluation Team and the OE Director, providing comment on draft documents and other issues as further described below. In addition, the Steering Committee will endorse the selection of the Evaluation Team, as recommended by the OE Director under procedures described below.

5.3. The OE Director's responsibilities will include, inter alia:

(a) *Selection of the Evaluation Team:* The OE Director will manage the process for selecting the external and independent evaluation Team. The Evaluation Team will be recruited as a unit through an open and competitive international bidding process conducted either through a professional recruiting firm or directly by the OE Director. From a short list of qualified candidate teams, the OE Director will recommend a selection for the Steering Committee's endorsement.

(b) *Administration and Budget:* The OE Director will oversee the provision of administrative services (contracting, travel arrangements and reimbursements, inquiries, etc.) to the Evaluation Team. The services themselves will be performed by such personnel as the Director deems necessary, whether hired directly by the Director or already employed by IFAD in such capacities. The Director will also propose for the Executive Board's approval in September, 2003, an overall budget for the Evaluation, subject to a ceiling of \$1.7 million (including bilateral contributions) as preliminarily estimated in the original draft TOR. (It is expected that the overall cost will be materially less than this estimate, unless otherwise fully justified.) The Director may begin to expend funds as necessary prior to the September Board meeting.

(c) *Overall Supervision and Liaison:* The Director will serve as the Evaluation Team's primary counterpart, ensuring that the Team conducts its work in accordance with the TOR and available to answer inquiries and solve problems encountered by the Evaluation Team during the course of its work. In this capacity, the Director may seek the advice of the Steering Committee or any other outside experts he deems appropriate or necessary. If at any point during the Evaluation the Director believes that the Evaluation Team is deviating materially from the requirements of the TOR, he may require that the Team take corrective measures. He will inform the Steering Committee and Executive Directors/Alternatives of any such actions. He will also provide a status report on the progress of the evaluation at each Executive Board meeting while the evaluation is underway.

5.4 The Steering Committee will consist of representatives of nine (9) IFAD member states, chosen by Lists A (4 members), B (2) and C (3). To the extent possible, Committee members should not also be members of the Executive Board. In any event, it is expected that, in reviewing and commenting on draft documents and other issues, Committee members will seek the input of their respective national experts

5.5. Steering Committee members will be available to provide comment and advice, upon request, to the Evaluation Team and the OE Director. At a minimum, Committee members will be requested to provide comment on the Evaluation Team's Inception Report, Phase One Report (prepared after desk studies and prior to field studies) and first draft of the Final Report. (The penultimate draft will be submitted to Executive Directors/Alternates for comment and discussion.) Upon request, all Executive and Alternate Directors will have access to documents reviewed and comments provided by members of the Steering Committee.

6. GENERAL RECRUITMENT CRITERIA

6.1 Conflict of Interest.

In all cases, the existence of any significant conflict of interest would be an absolute disqualification for the post. "Conflict of interest" means any concurrent assignment with IFAD; any involvement in as a staff member or consultant in the management, re-engineering, or strategic change processes which have taken place in the agency during the evaluation period; any

of the earlier reviews/ evaluations; or a work history in which more than 15 percent of working days were spent working, directly or indirectly, for IFAD.

6.2 Head of Evaluation Mission.

The Head of Evaluation Mission should have excellent knowledge of international development issues, with an emphasis on poverty reduction, preferably with a Ph.D. in development economics. This person should have experience in evaluating development projects and processes, preferably in one of the multilateral development banks, and is familiar with best practices that have been established by the evaluation of the co-operation group (which includes MDBs, UNDP, bilateral aid agencies and the IMF). The person should also be experienced with policy formulation, project preparation and have a proven track record of managing teams of professionals, and producing high-quality, objective products on a timely basis.

6.3 Evaluation Team Composition

In addition to the Head of Evaluation Mission, organizations submitting proposals will specify the number, skills and expertise, and terms of reference for all members of the Evaluation Team deemed necessary to effectively carry out the evaluation.

7. THE MAJOR EVALUATION QUESTIONS.

In carrying out the evaluation, the Evaluation Team will ensure that the following questions are addressed:

7.1 Impact.

1. What impact -- in quantitative terms¹ -- has IFAD made on poverty levels amongst its target groups? To which groups (by gender and income level) have the benefits mainly accrued?
2. What other significant impacts has IFAD made, particularly through institution building, capacity building, policy dialogue, and changes in the political priority given to the poor, directly, or through catalytic effects?

7.2 The Contribution of Identification and Design.

4. Has impact been limited by the quality of the models used in converting IFAD's philosophy and theories about poverty into concrete measures to help the poor? Specifically:
 - (i) In the case of production and income-oriented projects, has the support offered been taken up by beneficiaries, and has it had the expected effects; if not, what are the most common patterns of failure; and do these have any implications for the processes by which IFAD initiatives are identified?
 - (ii) In the case of other types of initiative, was there a thorough review of the diagnosis of the situation, a thorough search for alternative models (both inside the organization's habitual range of information sources, and more widely), generation of a number of viable alternatives, and

¹ It should be noted that quantitative estimates of impact will be required to assess progress against the Millennium Development Goals.

evaluation of those alternatives against carefully thought out criteria? If not, what pattern of activities was followed, and how might this be improved upon?

(iii) How effective has IFAD been in producing (or catalyzing) innovations to cope with institutional and technical problems? What are the limitations on improving the innovation function in the organization?

(iv) What is IFAD's model of the how replication and catalytic effects are achieved? Is it an effective one?

(v) What have IFAD's targets been for each of the above types of activity, 6.2 (i) to 6.2 (iv)? Are these reasonably challenging, clear, specific, and have they been well communicated to staff? What are the principal causes of deviation of actual performance from targets?

5(i) How well do the designs of individual initiatives fit into the respective COSOPs, CCA/ UNDAFs, and national poverty reduction strategies? Do they capture synergies with the activities of other agencies?

5(ii) How effective have co-financing arrangements been in generating synergies between IFAD and the co-financer?

7.3 The Contribution of Implementation Strategies and Management.

6. Have implementation agencies been effective in implementing IFAD activities? If not, what are the shortcomings of the implementing agencies? How have these shortcomings effected project impact?

7. How far has the impact of all types of IFAD initiative been limited by failures -- in quantity, quality, or timeliness -- to carry out key technical operations as planned? What have been the main sources of any deficiencies in this area? Do directly-supervised projects differ from others in these respects?

8. Where substantial problems have emerged during implementation, were these responded to promptly and effectively by the parties involved? If not, what were the commonest causes of difficulties? (For example, are difficulties most commonly concerned with solving technical problems, financial problems, dealing with legal/ professional/ contractual relationships with the borrower and other parties, or elsewhere?) How effective have (i) IFAD's M&E systems, and (ii), the supervision arrangements been in dealing with such issues?

9. How far are any problems identified in Key Questions 6, 7, and 8 associated with the method of implementation of IFAD's activities? Could they be remedied by developing the project management skills of the staff of the Borrower and other implementing agencies, rather than through heavier investment in organizational infrastructure?

10. With particular reference to those sample projects which have been completed, or are nearing completion, have adequate steps been taken to ensure sustainability? What are the chief factors limiting sustainability of IFAD projects?

7.4 The Contribution of the Detailed Design and Planning Processes.

11. Given the quality of the processes by which IFAD's initiatives are identified, how effective are the organization's detailed planning and design procedures, with particular reference to the following areas: the production of realistic and feasible implementation schedules; the production of phased expenditure forecasts which minimise subsequent financial turmoil; technical quality (e.g., in economy, irrigation, credit, small rural business development, etc); and timeliness, with respect to both agricultural and administrative deadlines in-country?
12. What are the main time pressures on IFAD staff (eg, arising from workload in relation to staff numbers)?
13. Which aspects of IFAD's culture are most important, in terms of their impact of the organization's effectiveness?
14. A large proportion of IFAD's design, planning, supervision and M&E work is done through consultants. Is this resource used in the most effective way, and are the procedures for recruiting, supervising, and supporting the on-going professional development of the organization's pool of consultants (particularly those from developing countries) satisfactory? Is there a need for any form of in-house accreditation of consultants needed in those multi-disciplinary areas for which no formal qualifications exist?

7.5 Knowledge Management.

15. What formalised knowledge management systems are in existence, both for capturing important lessons from field experience, and (in relation to the multi-disciplinary nature of much of IFAD's sphere of operations) ensuring that staff are kept up-to-date with recent developments in related disciplines? How effective has the evaluation component of IFAD's M&E systems been in identifying needs for changed practices and new information, and have the knowledge management systems been effective in supplying and applying these?

7.6 Long-Term Organizational Issues.

16. What have been the main impacts of the two phases of the re-engineering process and the ongoing strategic change process on IFAD's ability to produce and manage a large portfolio of high-quality anti-poverty initiatives? Have these processes led to the establishment of an appropriate niche for IFAD? Judged on criteria similar to those set out in Key Question 3(ii), above, are the expectations of future improvement in IFAD's performance well founded?

8. METHODOLOGY

Proposals should include detailed explanation of methodologies proposed for undertaking the evaluation. Inter alia, methodologies will involve a random sampling of IFAD's activities that is objective and consistent with international standards. Methodologies will include in-country investigations and investigation at IFAD headquarters. Unless otherwise indicated, the investigations are to rely on primary data collected by the team members. (Additional discussion of methodological approaches and suggested methodology are included in Appendices I and II.)

9. REPORTING

The Head of Evaluation Mission will prepare the following reports, with inputs from other members of the Evaluation .:

(i) *Inception Report*. This is to be submitted to the OE Director and Steering Committee as soon as practicable after the completion of the reconnaissance visits; it will say which countries are to be visited, present a revised version of the skeleton timeframe in Section 8 of these TOR, and outline any refinements to the methodology which the Head of Mission intends to make.

(ii) *Phase I Report*. This is to be submitted to the OE Director and Steering Committee after completion of desk studies and prior to field studies and will include a statement of progress, including preliminary conclusions, field studies to be undertaken, and note any issues which are likely to affect progress of the ongoing evaluation.

(iii) *First Draft Report*. The Head of Mission will collate the inputs of the team members, and prepare a draft report to the Steering Committee. This report will be prefaced with an executive summary; its structure will, as far as possible, follow the content and sequence of the Key Questions set out in Section 6, and must address each of those questions, and explain the methods and information sources used to answer each.

(iv) *Penultimate Draft Report*. A penultimate draft report will be submitted to Executive Directors/Alternates for comment and discussion.

(v) *Final Report*. A Final Report will be submitted to Executive Directors/Alternates by the last Friday of August 2004.

Each of these reports will conform to the following standards: it will be clear; it will be written in a direct style, avoiding euphemisms when describing problems and performance; it will be concise and as brief as possible, consistent with clarity; and, except for explicit quotations, will avoid the use of cut-and-paste.

10. BUDGET DETAILS.

The total budget is estimated at a maximum of US\$ 1.7 million (including donor contributions). This includes IFAD's charge for administering the funds contributed by members, calculated on the assumption that these will amount to half the total, and using the standard charge of 5% (plus retained interest). It also includes a 5% allowance for contingencies). The estimates for the Technical specialists assume that only 3 of the 4 will actually be needed. The cost breakdown is set out below.

IFAD IEE: Budget Details

| HEADING | Persons | Units | Number of Amount/ | | Item total | Sub-totals |
|---|---------|---------------|-------------------|-------|------------|------------|
| | | | Items | rate | | |
| Honoraria & salaries: | | | | | | |
| Head of Evaluation Mission | 1 | Months | 16 | 18000 | 288000 | |
| Project Management Specialist | 1 | Months | 12 | 16500 | 198000 | |
| Economist/ Statistician | 1 | Months | 12 | 15000 | 180000 | |
| Rural Livelihoods Specialist | 1 | Months | 11 | 12000 | 132000 | |
| Farming Systems Specialist | 1 | Months | 11 | 12000 | 132000 | |
| Technical Specialists | 3 | Months | 2 | 12000 | 72000 | |
| Administrator | 1 | Months | 12 | 6000 | 72000 | |
| Secretarial Assistant | 1 | Months | 16 | 3000 | 48000 | |
| Interpreter | 1 | Months | 7.5 | 4800 | 36000 | |
| Field Assistants | 2 | Months | 7.5 | 2400 | 36000 | |
| Sub-total, US\$ | | | | | 1194000 | 1194000 |
| Airfares | | | | | | |
| Assignments of HoEM & Core Team | 6 | Trips | 1 | 1300 | 7800 | |
| HoEM Reconnaissance visits | 1 | Trips | 2 | 2000 | 4000 | |
| Country visits, all except Project Management Specialist | 5 | Trips | 14 | 2000 | 140000 | |
| Country visits & visit CIs, Project Management Specialist | 1 | Trips | 17 | 2000 | 34000 | |
| Sub-total, US\$ | | | | | 185800 | 185800 |
| DSA | | | | | | |
| Rome: | | | | | | |
| Head of Evaluation Mission | 1 | Weeks | 32 | 1470 | 47040 | |
| Project Management Specialist | 1 | Weeks | 14 | 1470 | 20580 | |
| Economist/ Statistician | 1 | Weeks | 14 | 1470 | 20580 | |
| Rural Livelihoods Specialist | 1 | Weeks | 12 | 1470 | 17640 | |
| Farming Systems Specialist | 1 | Weeks | 12 | 1470 | 17640 | |
| Technical Specialists | 3 | Weeks | 1 | 1470 | 4410 | |
| In-country | | | | | | |
| HoEM & Core Team - In-country, Maj City | 6 | Weeks | 20 | 150 | 18000 | |
| HoEM & Core Team - Elsewhere | 6 | Weeks | 20 | 40 | 4800 | |
| Fields assts/ Interpreter - In-country, Elsewhere | 3 | Weeks | 20 | 30 | 1800 | |
| Technical Specialists | 3 | Weeks | 20 | 8 | 480 | |
| Sub-total, US\$ | | | | | 152490 | 152490 |
| Vehicle Hire & Miscellaneous | | | | | | |
| Vehicle hire | 1 | Vehicle-weeks | 70 | 700 | 49000 | |
| Misc expenses for country visits | 1 | Trip | 16 | 500 | 8000 | |
| Software, acquisition of external documentation, etc | 1 | Lump sum | 1 | 3000 | 3000 | |
| Recruitment fee for HoEM | 1 | Lump sum | 1 | 7500 | 7500 | |
| Sub-total, US\$ | | | | | 67500 | 67500 |
| Provisional total | | | | | | 1599790 |
| Administration charge | | | | 1.025 | | |
| Contingencies | | | | 1.05 | | |
| GRAND TOTAL, US\$ | | | | | | 1721773.99 |