



FIDA
FONDO INTERNACIONAL DE DESARROLLO AGRÍCOLA
Junta Ejecutiva – 78º período de sesiones

Roma, 9 y 10 de abril de 2003

**INFORME DEL PRESIDENTE DEL COMITÉ DE EVALUACIÓN SOBRE LA
EVALUACIÓN EXTERNA INDEPENDIENTE DEL FIDA**

1. El presente informe contiene un resumen de los debates mantenidos durante: a) tres reuniones oficiales del Comité de Evaluación que se celebraron el 26 de marzo y el 7 y 9 de abril; y b) una reunión de la Lista de Coordinadores y amigos, celebrada el 10 de abril, con la finalidad de examinar el proyecto de mandato para la evaluación externa independiente (EEI) del FIDA.
2. Se convino, en general, en que el proyecto de mandato, elaborado por el Sr. Peter Smith (el consultor designado por el Comité en diciembre de 2002 con el cometido de preparar el mandato), aún necesitaba mejorarse y perfeccionarse en diversos aspectos. Desde entonces, el mandato se ha perfeccionado y se ha convertido en un documento conceptual para la EEI. Este documento no se debatió durante dichas reuniones y, por tanto, hasta la fecha no ha habido la oportunidad de alcanzar un consenso general sobre el documento. Sin embargo, se consideró que, en la forma en que se adjunta a este informe, podría ser útil como referencia para producir un mandato más concreto y detallado, sobre cuya base contratar al equipo de consultores.
3. El Comité también hizo notar la urgencia con que debe llevarse a cabo la EEI, y a este respecto convino en que era preciso ultimar lo antes posible el mandato específico y detallado necesario para contratar a los consultores, a fin de poder emprender la EEI tan pronto como fuera posible tras concluir el período de sesiones de la Junta Ejecutiva de abril de 2003. Esto proporcionaría el tiempo suficiente para realizar la EEI y completarla antes de septiembre de 2004, de acuerdo con lo convenido en el proceso de consulta sobre la Sexta Reposición del FIDA.
4. Las deliberaciones del 26 de marzo y del 7 y 9 de abril abarcaron todos los aspectos del mandato que ahora se reflejan en el documento conceptual.
5. Durante las diversas deliberaciones, el Comité de Evaluación llegó a un consenso acerca de numerosas cuestiones contenidas en el documento conceptual. Se convino en que la Junta Ejecutiva era el cliente fundamental de la EEI –que cuenta asimismo con muchas otras partes directamente

interesadas— y que la evaluación debía centrarse en el impacto producido por las actividades del FIDA sobre el terreno y en determinados procesos institucionales y administrativos. Asimismo, el Comité destacó que era muy importante tener presente que, al evaluar y determinar el impacto, la EEI se enfrentaría a los consabidos obstáculos a los que tiene que hacer frente todo evaluador. También se expresó la opinión unánime de que, en principio, la evaluación debería abarcar aproximadamente los últimos 10 años, a menos que los evaluadores tuvieran motivos justificados para decidir otra cosa, ya que así podría evaluarse el impacto y su sostenibilidad sin hacer excesivo hincapié en los elementos que caracterizaron las primeras intervenciones del FIDA. Se consideró que el período de tiempo escogido permitiría a la EEI producir unos resultados útiles y contribuir eficazmente al ulterior desarrollo del Fondo.

6. Los participantes se mostraron de acuerdo en la necesidad de que el documento conceptual no contuviera una exposición detallada de la metodología de EEI. A este respecto, el Comité convino en que la elaboración de la propuesta de metodología debía incumbir al equipo de consultores que se designara para realizar la evaluación. También se opinó que los proyectos y países que abarcara la EEI debían seleccionarse mediante técnicas de muestreo aleatorio, lo que permitiría determinar con mayor objetividad e imparcialidad las actividades del FIDA que habrían de evaluarse. En este contexto, se consideró fundamental realizar una estimación de la “evaluabilidad” de los proyectos y países seleccionados, a fin de disponer de datos e información consistentes para efectuar un análisis del impacto satisfactorio y rentable. Ahora bien, está previsto que la evaluación ponga de manifiesto los proyectos y programas que carecen de los datos, la información y los sistemas de seguimiento y evaluación necesarios para analizar el impacto. El Comité reputó también importante que la EEI incluyera un número razonable de proyectos del FIDA cofinanciados por otros donantes. La necesidad de que la EEI examinara proyectos tanto en curso como cerrados también fue objeto de consenso.

7. El Comité de Evaluación acordó que en el documento conceptual debía figurar un número limitado de preguntas de evaluación esenciales, que sirvieran de orientación para los evaluadores. Estas preguntas deberían tener en cuenta los criterios de evaluación internacionales, entre otros los reconocidos por el Grupo de Trabajo sobre Evaluación de la Ayuda del Comité de Asistencia para el Desarrollo (CAD) de la Organización de Cooperación y Desarrollo Económicos (OCDE) y los bancos de desarrollo multilaterales. Entre esos criterios se hallaban el impacto, la sostenibilidad, la pertinencia, la eficacia, la eficiencia y los resultados. También se reconoció que en el mandato detallado del equipo de evaluación era preciso hacer más hincapié en la evaluación de la labor de las instituciones cooperantes del FIDA, en consideración de la función crítica que desempeñan en las actividades de apoyo a la ejecución y de administración de los préstamos de los proyectos respaldados por el FIDA. El Comité estuvo de acuerdo en que era importante que la EEI evaluara los resultados obtenidos por los asociados clave en cuanto al impacto logrado.

8. Durante las diversas reuniones oficiosas, los miembros del Comité debieron examinar con mayor detenimiento diversos aspectos importantes, como los ya mencionados procedimientos de organización y estructura de gobierno de la EEI, las modalidades para seleccionar al equipo de consultores encargado de la evaluación y los requerimientos presupuestarios para llevarla a cabo. A fin de facilitar los debates sobre los temas mencionados, la lista A elaboró una propuesta escrita, sobre la que se basaron las deliberaciones mantenidas por el Comité de Evaluación en su reunión oficiosa del 9 de abril.

9. El Comité consideró favorablemente la propuesta de la Lista A y aportó algunas modificaciones al texto. En los párrafos 10 a 15 que figuran a continuación se resume la propuesta revisada, que incluye las sugerencias formuladas por el Comité, y que sustituye a las secciones correspondientes del documento conceptual.

Procedimientos de organización/estructura de gobierno de la evaluación

10. La evaluación se realizará bajo la supervisión general del Director de la Oficina de Evaluación (OE) del FIDA, en nombre de la Junta Ejecutiva del FIDA, ante quien responderá, y de conformidad con las disposiciones detalladas en este informe del Presidente.

11. De conformidad con la política de evaluación del FIDA, aprobada por la Junta Ejecutiva el 9 de abril de 2003, el personal directivo velará por que los funcionarios del FIDA y los proyectos que reciben asistencia del Fondo presenten con prontitud todos los documentos y demás información necesaria y participen y cooperen dinámicamente en la EEI. Además, antes de publicar el informe de la EEI, éste se distribuirá al personal directivo del FIDA y, cuando proceda, a los países prestatarios interesados para que formulen sus observaciones. El personal directivo del FIDA también tendrá ocasión de formular observaciones sobre el informe final y presentar las medidas adoptadas al respecto por la administración, que se incluirán en un apéndice del informe final de la EEI.

12. Un Comité Directivo, integrado por representantes de los Estados Miembros del FIDA, actuará como asesor del equipo de evaluación y el Director de la OE, para lo cual formulará observaciones sobre los proyectos de documento y demás asuntos que se describen a continuación. Además, el Comité Directivo refrendará la selección del equipo de evaluación, conforme a la recomendación del Director de la OE en virtud de los procedimientos descritos más abajo.

13. El Director de la OE será responsable, entre otras cosas, de lo siguiente:

- a) *Selección del equipo de evaluación:* El Director de la OE dirigirá el proceso de selección del equipo de evaluación externo e independiente. El equipo de evaluación se contratará como una unidad en su conjunto mediante un proceso abierto de licitación internacional realizado por conducto de una empresa profesional de contratación o directamente por el Director de la OE. De una lista final de tres equipos candidatos cualificados, como mínimo, el Director de la OE recomendará un candidato para que el Comité Directivo lo ratifique. El equipo se elegirá teniendo en cuenta, entre otras cosas, el equilibrio regional, el idioma y el sexo de los miembros del equipo que reúna las cualificaciones profesionales. Los miembros del Comité Directivo tendrán acceso a toda la información relativa a la selección del equipo de evaluación.
- b) *Administración y presupuesto:* El Director de la OE supervisará el suministro de servicios administrativos (contratación, preparativos de viaje y reembolsos, preguntas, etc.) al equipo de evaluación. La prestación de dichos servicios será competencia del personal que los Directores estimen necesarios, ya sea personal contratado directamente por el Director o que ya esté contratado por el FIDA para desempeñar dichas funciones. Asimismo, el Director propondrá a la Junta, para que lo apruebe en septiembre de 2003, un presupuesto general para evaluación, sujeto a un límite máximo de USD 1,7 millones (incluidas las contribuciones bilaterales) como se había calculado provisionalmente en el documento conceptual. (Se prevé que el costo general será inferior desde el punto de vista material al previsto en esta estimación, a menos que esté plenamente justificado). El Director podrá empezar a utilizar los fondos según sea necesario antes del período de sesiones de septiembre de la Junta.
- c) *Supervisión general y enlace:* El Director de la OE actuará como la contraparte principal del equipo de evaluación, asegurándose de que el equipo realice su labor de conformidad con su mandato y poniéndose a su disposición para contestar a las preguntas que se planteen y resolver los problemas con los que se enfrente el equipo de evaluación en el curso de su labor. En tal calidad, el Director podrá recurrir al asesoramiento del Comité Directivo o de cualquier otro especialista externo que considere adecuado o necesario. Si



en un momento dado durante la evaluación el Director considera que el equipo de evaluación se está desviando materialmente de los requisitos estipulados en su mandato, podrá exigirle que adopte las medidas correctivas oportunas. El Director informará al Comité Directivo y a los Directores Ejecutivos o los Directores Ejecutivos Suplentes de la adopción de cualesquiera de estas medidas. Además presentará un informe sobre la situación de la evaluación a la Junta Ejecutiva en cada período de sesiones mientras esté en marcha la evaluación.

14. El Comité Directivo se establecerá lo antes posible, y a más tardar el 15 de mayo, y estará compuesto por representantes de nueve (9) Estados Miembros del FIDA, elegidos de las Listas A (4 miembros), B (2 miembros) y C (3 miembros). En la medida de lo posible, los miembros del Comité no deberán ser también miembros de la Junta Ejecutiva. En cualquier caso se prevé que, al examinar y formular observaciones sobre los proyectos de documento y otros asuntos, los miembros del Comité recabarán las aportaciones de sus especialistas nacionales respectivos. Asimismo, el Comité de Evaluación convino en que debería ofrecerse apoyo financiero con cargo al presupuesto de la EEI a los miembros del Comité Directivo que proceden de países en desarrollo para que puedan participar en el Comité Directivo.

15. Los miembros del Comité Directivo estarán a disposición del equipo de evaluación y el Director de la OE para facilitar las observaciones y el asesoramiento necesarios, previa solicitud. Se pedirá a los miembros del Comité que, como mínimo, faciliten observaciones en relación con el informe inicial del equipo de evaluación, el informe de la primera fase (que se prepara después de los estudios teóricos y antes de los estudios sobre el terreno) y el primer borrador del informe final. (El penúltimo borrador se presentará a los Directores Ejecutivos o los Directores Ejecutivos Suplentes para recabar sus observaciones y someterlo a examen). Todos los Directores Ejecutivos y Directores Ejecutivos Suplentes podrán acceder libremente a los documentos examinados y las observaciones facilitadas por los miembros del Comité Directivo, previa solicitud.

16. El Comité de Evaluación recomienda a la Junta Ejecutiva que ratifique los procedimientos de organización y la estructura de gobierno, así como todas las otras disposiciones que figuran en el presente informe del Presidente. Asimismo recomienda a la Junta que confíe al Director de la OE la preparación de un mandato detallado, que constituirá la base de la licitación internacional, y que lo presente al Comité Directivo para que lo examine y lo ratifique antes de finales de mayo de 2003. En caso de no haberse alcanzado un consenso para esa fecha, el Director de la OE, junto con el Presidente del Comité Directivo, ultimarán el mandato teniendo en cuenta las observaciones recibidas.

17. Por último, el Comité propone a la Junta que autorice la financiación de la EEI y sus desembolsos por una cuantía máxima de USD 1,7 millones como gasto único y excepcional del presupuesto del FIDA correspondiente a 2003, conforme a lo aprobado por el Consejo de Gobernadores en febrero de 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.

HEADING	Persons	Units	Number of Items	Amount/ rate	Item total
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
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	14000
Country visits & visit CIs, Project Management Specialist	1	Trips	17	2000	34000
Sub-total, US\$					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
Field assts/ Interpreter - In-country, Elsewhere	3	Weeks	20	30	1800
Technical Specialists	3	Weeks	20	8	480
Sub-total, US\$					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
Provisional total					
Administration charge				1.025	
Contingencies				1.05	
GRAND TOTAL, US\$					