

Date: 25 April 2014
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Investing in rural people

Updated CLEE Matrix of governance recommendations

Note: The attached matrix reflects the outcome of deliberations on the recommendations regarding the efficiency of IFAD governing bodies as contained in the Corporate-level evaluation of IFAD's institutional efficiency and efficiency of IFAD-funded operations (CLEE).

As advised at the 110th session of the Executive Board, where Management has been tasked with follow-up and/or review on these recommendations, regular feedback will be provided at Convenors and Friends meetings and/or to the Board, as appropriate.

CLEE Governance Recommendations Matrix

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
Governing Council					
Frequency of GC sessions	<p><u>Paragraph 108:</u></p> <p>"However, the evaluation raises the question whether it is essential to hold the Governing Council on an annual basis. Holding the Governing Council less frequently (e.g. every two years) would save further resources and would only require Governors to delegate authority to the Board of some recurrent functions (e.g. approval of the Fund's annual administrative budget)."</p>	<p><u>EC 77 minutes:</u></p> <p>"...Diverse views were expressed regarding the frequency of sessions, i.e. whether they should be held annually or biennially. Some members proposed that, at least in years in which a Consultation on the Replenishment of IFAD's Resources was being held, the Governing Council could be foregone. Management reiterated its view that annual Governing Council sessions were important as they provided a unique opportunity for all Member States to interact with Management and with each other, and an occasion to advocate for smallholders and ensure their place on the international agenda. There was broad support for the need to conduct a study on the role, objectives and value-added of Governing Council sessions. This study would analyse the advantages and disadvantages – also in terms of cost-effectiveness – of retaining the current scheduling pattern and of altering the frequency of the session, and consider how to render the Council more strategic. It was recalled that this issue was scheduled for consideration by Convenors and Friends."</p> <p><u>EB108 minutes:</u></p> <p>"Divergent views were expressed with</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>"Building on its discussion during EC77, the Committee recommends that a study be undertaken to examine the role, objectives and value-added of Governing Council sessions.</p> <p>This study should analyse the advantages and disadvantages – also in terms of cost-effectiveness – of retaining the current scheduling pattern and of altering the frequency of the session, and consider how to render the Council more strategic. It is suggested that the study include a survey of non-EB members."</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>"...Management pointed out that Governing Council sessions were a key opportunity for the majority of IFAD Member States to engage with IFAD on institutional governance and policy matters. While noting some representatives' wishes to consider changes in the frequency and format of Governing Council meetings, Management pointed out that any proposal for change would need to be decided upon by the Governing Council."</p> <p><u>Timeline and next steps:</u></p> <p>"Members supported further discussion of this topic at Convenors and Friends."</p>	<p><u>EB110 Minutes:</u></p> <p>"... the importance of holding annual sessions of the Council had been recognized by all Lists as a fundamental opportunity for IFAD Member States to gather together and have their voice heard (especially for those not represented on the Board), as well as for the rebranding of IFAD."</p> <p>"The possibility of conducting a study of the Governing Council had not been deemed an efficient use of resources and, as an alternative, List A had suggested that the Office of the Secretary consider different options taking into account the replenishment cycles."</p>

UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
		<p>regard to, inter alia: – Frequency of Governing Council meetings, which may be taken up by Convenors and Friends; ... Members highlighted that, in their view, the Governing Council should continue to be held on a yearly basis.”</p>			
<p>Review of format – balance between governance and discussion of agricultural issues</p>	<p><u>Paragraph 107:</u> “The format of the Governing Council has evolved over the years, with more attention and space to the organization of panel discussions and side events on key topics related to global agriculture and rural development. This has been appreciated by many Member States, but has reduced time for governance issues and related business items.”</p>	<p><u>EC77 minutes:</u> “There was broad support for the need to conduct a study on the role, objectives and value-added of Governing Council sessions. This study would analyse the advantages and disadvantages – also in terms of cost-effectiveness – of retaining the current scheduling pattern and of altering the frequency of the session, and consider how to render the Council more strategic. It was recalled that this issue was scheduled for consideration by Convenors and Friends.”</p>	<p>As per above</p>	<p>As per above</p>	<p>“... many members did not see a contradiction between agricultural and governance issues in the Governing Council format; indeed, the need had been expressed for the Council to provide strategic guidance to IFAD on these issues.”</p> <p>“The possibility of conducting a study of the Governing Council had not been deemed an efficient use of resources and, as an alternative, List A had suggested that the Office of the Secretary consider different options taking into account the replenishment cycles.”</p>

**UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014**

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
Delegation of authority to the Board of some recurrent functions (including approval of the administrative budget)	<p>Paragraph 108:</p> <p>"Holding the Governing Council less frequently (e.g. every two years) would save further resources and would only require Governors to delegate authority to the Board of some recurrent functions (e.g. approval of the Fund's annual administrative budget)."</p> <p>Appendix I, paragraph 167:</p> <p>"A majority of respondents to the survey of Executive Board members agreed or partially agreed that the above-mentioned approval of the annual budget could be delegated to the Board"</p>	<p><u>EB108 minutes:</u></p> <p>"Divergent views were expressed with regard to, inter alia: ... Delegation of authority for approval of the Fund's administrative budget to the Executive Board."</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>"Noting the trade-offs inherent to increasing the level of discussion of policy matters and/or the potential reduction in the frequency of Governing Council sessions, the Committee recommends that Convenors and Friends be tasked with deliberating on these issues and developing recommendations for the Executive Board."</p>	As per above	<p>"There had been divergent views with respect to the suggestion to delegate approval of the annual budget to the Board, as in other international financial institutions (IFIs), and it had been noted that, in any case, this matter would need to be decided upon by the Governing Council."</p>
Executive Board					
Review of Board agendas to focus on results, policy, strategy, evaluation and lessons learned	<p><u>Paragraph 112:</u></p> <p>"Meetings are carefully structured and current chairmanship is strong. However, the evaluation finds that the Board agendas are overambitious, and there is relatively little space for discussion on results, policy and strategy, evaluation and lessons learned, as compared to the amount of discussion on process- and input-oriented documents. The IEE came to a similar conclusion</p>	<p><u>EB108 minutes:</u></p> <p>"The representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela requested that the minutes of the Board session reflect her country's disagreement with limiting the oversight of the governing bodies to mainly strategic issues, as proposed under recommendation 6 of the CLE. She expressed her support for Management's response to the CLE in this respect."</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>"The Committee reiterated that this topic was highly interrelated with the recommendations relating to the Governing Council. The Committee recommends further deliberation on this matter by Convenors and Friends, including reflection on the related strategic issues, the possibility of a dedicated informal meeting with the President to consider strategic matters, the possibility of conducting background seminars on issues of particular technical complexity, and the need</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>"With respect to country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs), Management reminded the Board that these were negotiated between IFAD and the respective countries, based on a collaborative process involving civil society and non-governmental organizations, and</p>	<p>" On the review of Board agendas and their focus on results, policy, strategy, evaluation and lessons learned, reference had been made to the agreement reached at the September session to test the approach of holding informal seminars on country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs) prior to their formal presentation to the Board. The subsequent informal seminar on the Sudan COSOP that had</p>

UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	<p>and recommended a shift in balance towards the former type of topics.”</p> <p><u>Appendix I, paragraph 170:</u></p> <p>“The low frequency of Board meetings has helped to keep them focused. ...However the fact remains that there is relatively little space for discussion on results, policy and strategy, evaluation and lessons learned, as compared to the amount of discussion on process- and input-oriented documents. The need to concentrate on major issues in the scarce time available should give the Board pause for thought.”</p>	<p><u>EC77 minutes:</u></p> <p>“Effectiveness of Executive Board sessions.</p> <p>...the Committee expressed a common desire to explore ways to render Board sessions more effective and strategic. One member commented on the potential value of conducting a survey among IFAD staff to ascertain their views on the role of the Executive Board; another suggested the possibility of convening a working group to consider possible areas for efficiency gains. A suggestion was also made by one member that an extra session be added to the Board’s annual calendar to ensure that issues were considered in sufficient depth. Members underlined the importance of receiving Board documents in a timely manner, so as to facilitate thorough review by capitals. Furthermore, an Executive Board retreat with the President, Management and IOE would provide an opportunity for deeper self-reflection on the role and performance of the Board. Questions were raised with regard to the advisability of the President serving also as Chairperson of the Board.”</p>	<p>for greater focus on strategic issues in documents submitted to the Executive Board and this issue could also be considered in the study mentioned above.”</p> <p><u>Timeline and next steps:</u></p> <p>“The Committee recommends that Convenors and Friends be tasked with deliberating on these issues and developing recommendations for the Executive Board.”</p>	<p>often entailing subsequent parliamentary approval. Management stressed the value of comments on COSOPs to the implementation process, while clarifying that they were not subject to Board approval. The Executive Board underscored the strategic importance of the COSOPs, and expressed support for enhanced contributions to COSOP development by Member State field experts and capitals at an early stage in the development process, as well as the inclusion of local experts in country programme management teams. A Member described the practice at another international financial institution of holding informal workshops at an early stage to discuss country strategies.”</p> <p><u>Timeline and next steps:</u></p> <p>“It was agreed that this approach could be discussed at a future meeting of Convenors and Friends.”</p>	<p>been duly organized on 25 October had received positive feedback and there was general consensus that this practice should continue. It was also a shared view that technology should be used more effectively to share timely information on COSOP-related missions and dates to facilitate in-country discussions with donors and partners. Regarding Board agendas, efforts were being made to avoid heavy agendas and the clustering of items for December Board sessions. In addition, documentation could be reviewed to ensure shorter documents with the focus on key issues and tighter executive summaries.”</p>

**UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014**

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
<p>Delegate authority to the President to approve new loans and grants</p>	<p><u>Paragraph 113:</u></p> <p>“One way to free up space on the Board’s agenda would be to delegate authority to the President to approve new loans and grants. A system could be put in place for the Board to be enabled to have a discussion on a specifically innovative project or otherwise of particular, including political, interest, but this would be an exception rather than the rule. This is consistent with the recommendation of the IEE and it would lead to cost savings, including in the translation of documents.”</p> <p><u>Appendix I, paragraph 170:</u></p> <p>“However, there are still items on the agenda that in principle could be delegated to the President, particularly the approval of loans and grants. After the introduction in 2011 of lapse-of-time approval for loans below US\$15 million, recently raised to US\$25 million, about 60 per cent of them are still scheduled for discussion. The survey of EB members showed that a large majority do not favour cutting back on this item or delegating it fully to the President”</p>	<p><u>EB108 minutes:</u></p> <p>“Divergent views were expressed with regard to, inter alia: ... Delegation to the President of approval of projects and programmes;... she [The representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela] did not support the proposal to delegate approval of all loans and grants to the President, since the approval of resources for projects was one of the main functions of the Executive Board. Concerns in this regard were also echoed by other Board members.”</p> <p><u>EC77 minutes:</u></p> <p>“Delegation of authority to the President for the approval of project and programme proposals.</p> <p>There was broad agreement that approval of project and programme proposals should remain within the purview of the Executive Board, as this fostered greater involvement in IFAD’s core operations and interaction with country offices and staff. However, consideration could be given to increasing the financing ceiling for proposals submitted for Board approval under the lapse-of-time procedure and by correspondence. IOE provided clarification that the spirit of the recommendation was that the Executive Board would nonetheless retain the right to request that a particular proposal be considered during a formal Board session. In addition, it was suggested that due consideration be given to the option of having the Board approve country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs), inclusive of resource frameworks.”</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>“The Evaluation Committee reiterated the trade-offs mentioned above and some members indicated their willingness to consider further delegation of authority to the President to approve new loans and grants, while others were reluctant.</p> <p>The Committee underlined the importance of considering Board approval of COSOPs.”</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>As per above, and;</p> <p>“Management pointed out that project approval under the lapse-of-time (LOT) procedure did not constitute a delegation of authority to the President. The President underscored that approval of projects presented in-session and submitted under the LOT procedure remained the responsibility of the Executive Board.”</p>	<p>“The Lists had shared the view that the status of the delegation of authority to the President with respect to the approval of projects and programmes should remain unchanged, and the President fully concurred with this view.”</p>

**UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014**

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
Code of Conduct for Board members	<p><u>Paragraph 114:</u></p> <p>“the evaluation notes the lack of a Code of Conduct for Board members – a normal integrity requirement in other IFIs. For example, there have been instances when IFAD Board members have applied for staff positions at IFAD. There is no reason why Board members should not be allowed to join as staff members through the regular competitive process, but as in other institutions, this should be allowed only following an established “cooling off” period after completion of their Board assignment.”</p> <p><u>Appendix I, paragraph 172:</u></p> <p>“Basic governance standards demand a Code of Conduct for Board members as an integrity requirement and such a Code is a normal feature for an IFI.</p> <p>Particular importance is attached by Management and a number of Board members to the introduction of a cooling-off period. For example, there have been instances of pressure to appoint sitting members to</p>	<p><u>EB108 minutes:</u></p> <p>“Divergent views were expressed with regard to, inter alia: ... Development of a Code of Conduct for the Executive Board (it was agreed that this issue, which had been the subject of an Executive Board informal seminar, would be considered by Convenors and Friends with a view to reverting to the Executive Board)”</p> <p><u>EC77 minutes:</u></p> <p>“Code of conduct for Executive Board representatives.</p> <p>A number of members expressed their support for this initiative and the Committee noted that this issue would be considered by Convenors and Friends at its forthcoming meeting on 30 July.”</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>“The Committee expressed its strong support for the development of a Code of Conduct for Board Members, and noted that this item is currently under discussion by Convenors and Friends, including the consideration of concrete options prepared by the Office of the General Counsel.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Committee endorsed the value of benchmarking with other institutions.”</p>	<p><u>Timeline and next steps:</u></p> <p>“... Management reported that the issue was on the agenda for the November meeting of Convenors and Friends and that this timing would allow for consultation among lists members and with capitals.”</p>	<p>“The Code of conduct for Executive Board representatives had been discussed and it had been agreed that the List Convenors would work together to come up with a proposal for discussion at their first meeting in February 2014. Should consensus be reached on this proposal, it would be submitted for the Board’s consideration in April 2014.”¹</p>

¹ At the meeting of Convenors and Friends on 3 February 2014, it was agreed that further clarification was required in order to reach consensus on this issue. As such, an informal seminar will be organized before presenting the document to a formal Board session, and ultimately to the Governing Council for approval. The seminar, which will aim to clarify outstanding issues, will be facilitated by resource people and be open to all IFAD Membership. The Board will be apprised of the outcome of these discussions and the next steps envisaged.

UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	<p>staff and management positions in IFAD, including in IOE. This contravenes the separation of powers needed for the supervisory role of the Board. The issue of a Code of Conduct has been around for a number of years. A code should at least rule on conflict of interest, acceptance and granting of gifts, and a cooling-off period."</p>				
<p>Introduction of broad guidelines to facilitate the selection by Member States of their Board representatives</p>	<p><u>Paragraph 115:</u></p> <p>"The heterogeneity of the background of IFAD Board members – due to its hybrid nature as both a specialized agency of the United Nations and an IFI – enhances diversity of views and perspectives in the deliberations. At the same time, IFAD also lacks guidelines for the qualifications (e.g. in terms of experience and expertise) of Board representatives in contrast notably to other IFIs. Though sovereign Member States are entitled to nominate anyone they deem suitable as their Board representative, the introduction of broad guidelines to facilitate the selection by Member States of their Board representatives could contribute to the quality of the debate and efficiency."</p>	<p><u>EC77 minutes:</u></p> <p>"Code of conduct for Executive Board representatives.</p> <p>... With respect to the proposal to establish terms of reference for Executive Board representatives, IOE clarified that broad guidelines rather than detailed terms of reference were envisaged. One member suggested that targeted introductory orientation sessions could be organized for Board members."</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>"The Committee noted that a complex variety of factors figure in the selection of Executive Board representatives. The Committee recommended that further consideration of the guidelines be delayed pending the approval of a Code of Conduct by the Executive Board."</p> <p><u>Timeline and next steps:</u></p> <p>"Once the question of the Code of Conduct is resolved, the Committee recommends that Management draft proposed guidelines for consideration by Convenors and Friends, before submission to a future session of the Executive Board."</p>	<p>No further deliberations</p>	<p>No further deliberations</p>

UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	<p><u>Appendix I, paragraph 171:</u></p> <p>“The non-residence of the Board and the fact that Member States rather than individuals with fixed-term appointments are members may explain the absence of qualification guidelines and a Code of Conduct for representatives of Member States in the Board.</p> <p>While the heterogeneity of the Board must be accepted, a job description or broad qualification guidelines could be helpful to Member States in selecting their representatives and improve the available expertise in the Board. On the occasion of a necessary amendment to the Agreement, the Governing Council may wish to make up for the absence of guidelines.”</p>				
<p>Allow ex-officio access to the Board room to Committee chairs when these are not the same as EB representatives</p>	<p><u>Paragraph 116:</u></p> <p>“Currently, only the Board representative or his/her designated representative is permitted to take part in Board meetings. There have been instances when the Chairs of the Evaluation and/or Audit Committee have been based in their country’s embassy in Rome, but are not</p>	<p><u>EB108 minutes:</u></p> <p>“Divergent views were expressed with regard to, inter alia: ... Number of Member State representatives having access to Board meetings”</p> <p><u>EC77 minutes:</u></p> <p>“Effectiveness of Executive Board sessions.</p> <p>... On a logistical point, a number of</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>“The Committee strongly recommends that the Chairpersons of the Audit and Evaluation Committees be invited to sessions of the Executive Board in those cases where the Chairpersons are not the designated Executive Board representatives of their respective countries.</p> <p>Consideration could be given to the</p>	<p>No further deliberations</p>	<p>No further deliberations</p>

UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	<p>the designated Board representative. This has caused challenges during Board meetings when the actual Board representative attends, as the Chairs of the Committee under the above circumstances would not be allowed into the Board session, unless the Board representative vacates his/her seat. This limits efficiency and effectiveness, and could be easily resolved if Committee chairs were allowed ex-officio access."</p> <p><u>Appendix I, paragraph 173:</u></p> <p>"The Board suffers from weaknesses that are inherent in non-residence, IFAD's hybrid nature as both an IFI and a United Nations organization, and the fact that it works in a politically inconspicuous niche.</p> <p>... At times the anomaly arises that a committee chairperson, based in Rome, is not the formal appointee of his country to the Board. In that case, the limitation of access to Board meetings to the appointee precludes the chairperson from attending. A practical solution would be to grant committee chairs ex officio access."</p>	<p>members expressed support for the recommendation that two representatives for each country on the Executive Board be allowed access to Board sessions. Moreover, the Chairpersons of the Audit and Evaluation Committees should have permanent seats in the Board room in addition to those already held by their countries' Board representatives. One member called for Board representatives to be granted access to sessions of the Governing Council."</p>	<p>inclusion of more than one delegate per country, subject to logistical limitations."</p>		

**UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014**

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
Audit Committee					(including the AC Chairperson's Report to the EB110 – EB 2013/110/R.29)
Full disclosure of AC documents	<p><u>Paragraph 117:</u></p> <p>"...In addition, they [the AC] review other important documents that are not placed before the Board. All Evaluation Committee documents are made publicly available through the IFAD website, which is not the case for the Audit Committee and this might be worth considering towards strengthening efficiency in communication, transparency and accountability."</p> <p>Appendix I, paragraph 175: "All EC documents are made publicly available through the IFAD website, which is not the case for the AC. This might be worth considering towards strengthening transparency and accountability."</p>	<p><u>EC77 minutes:</u></p> <p>"Disclosure of Audit Committee documents. Committee members were advised that while these documents were not subject to disclosure under the IFAD Policy on the Disclosure of Documents, the Board could decide to expand the policy in the interests of increased transparency. However, given the nature of some documents presented to the Audit Committee, a certain restriction on disclosure might need to be retained."</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>"The Evaluation Committee sought clarification on the nature of Audit Committee documents for which disclosure would be restricted."</p> <p><u>Timeline and next steps:</u></p> <p>"The Committee noted that the Action Plan and IOE comments have been provided to the Audit Committee as background for the discussion of the 2014 budget proposal at its September meeting.</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Audit Committee review the Disclosure Policy as it relates to Audit Committee documents and report back to the Executive Board."</p>	Pending AC guidance	<p>"The President took the opportunity to inform the Board that in view of the concerns raised regarding the access of Board members to Audit Committee documents, the Office of the Secretary had clarified that all Board members may access Audit Committee documents by using their personal user identification and passwords to enter the Audit Committee site on the Member States Interactive Platform."</p> <p>EB 2013/110/R.29 "Members [...] requested that a document reviewing practices at other international financial institutions in this regard be presented at the March 2014 meeting of the Audit Committee for consideration."</p>
Acquire outside professional/technical expertise to support its oversight of IFAD's finances	<p><u>Paragraph 118:</u></p> <p>"The evaluation finds that, in line with the trend in the financial and business sectors in general, the Audit Committee should consider</p>		<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>"The Evaluation Committee requested the guidance of the Audit Committee on the need for technical support, and the costs that this would imply."</p>	Pending AC guidance	<p>EB 2013/110/R.29 "On the use of external expertise, the Committee indicated the need to avoid unnecessary costs. The Committee underscored its</p>

**UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014**

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	<p>acquiring outside professional/technical expertise to support its oversight of IFAD's finances."</p> <p><u>Appendix I, paragraph 174:</u></p> <p>"Committee preparation in support of the Board, as in all the IFIs, proves to be essential to the Board's ability to deal with strategic and policy issues and carry out its fiduciary duties.</p> <p>... There are opportunities to strengthen the role of the AC in IFAD. Present-day audit committees of companies and financial organizations, including the IFIs, require expertise on controls and risk management among their membership. Recent professionalization and reform of the financial management of IFAD have raised the level at which financial issues need to be discussed. The experience in the business sector is that benefits can be gained from attracting outsiders with the requisite background as members of or advisors to ACs. The 2009 TOR of the AC only allow it to bring in external expertise in exceptional circumstances subject to budgetary space. An amendment to the TOR would be needed to make the presence of outside advice the</p>		<p><u>Timeline and next steps:</u></p> <p>"The Committee recommends that the Audit Committee review this issue and report back to the Executive Board, paying special attention to the possible cost implications of utilizing external expertise."</p>		<p>ability to access external expertise if needed, as contained in the Terms of Reference of the Audit Committee. Overall, the Committee felt that the current arrangement was acceptable and, if required, it would be prepared to access outside expertise on a case-by-case basis."</p>

UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	norm for those meetings in which the AC's oversight of financial issues is at stake."				
Enhance reports of AC to the EB, highlighting recs and remaining controversial issues	<p><u>Paragraph 118:</u></p> <p>"However, the reports of the two Committees to the Board do not always indicate clearly the recommendations they would like the Board to adopt and remaining controversial issues for the Board to consider. To do so systematically would allow the Board to focus on selected issues and enhance efficiency."</p> <p><u>Appendix I, paragraph 177:</u></p> <p>"The rapidly evolving demands on Governing Body members for strategic guidance and oversight of IFAD's changing business model are not yet receiving adequate attention from Board members and Management itself.</p> <p>... The scope, quality and timeliness of its reporting to the Board are a major determinant of the Board's ability to fulfil its supervisory duties adequately and hold Management accountable. Committee discussion must focus on what matters and chairpersons' reports to the Board on the recommendations of the Board and on what requires</p>	<p><u>EC77 minutes:</u></p> <p>"Clarity of Committee reports to the Board. The Secretariat took note of suggestions for improved clarity, particularly with respect to recommendations for the Board."</p>	<p><u>Deliberations:</u></p> <p>"The Evaluation Committee strongly supports the enhancement of official records submitted for to the Executive Board for consideration."</p> <p><u>Timeline and next steps:</u></p> <p>"The Office of the Secretary will ensure observance of this recommendation."</p>	No further deliberations	"Turning to the Board's subsidiary bodies, that is, the Audit Committee and the Evaluation Committee, the need to produce shorter but focused reports of both Committees' meetings had been noted. Management was already working with the Committees to ensure that their reports to the Board were enhanced along the lines proposed in the CLEE."

**UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014**

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EB78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	further discussion."				
Evaluation Committee					
Enhance reports of the EC to the EB, highlighting recommendations and remaining controversial issues	<p><u>Paragraph 118:</u> "However, the reports of the two Committees to the Board do not always indicate clearly the recommendations they would like the Board to adopt and remaining controversial issues for the Board to consider. To do so systematically would allow the Board to focus on selected issues and enhance efficiency."</p> <p><u>Appendix I, paragraph 177:</u> "The rapidly evolving demands on Governing Body members for strategic guidance and oversight of IFAD's changing business model are not yet receiving adequate attention from Board members and Management itself. ... The scope, quality and timeliness of its reporting to the Board are a major determinant of the Board's ability to fulfil its supervisory duties adequately and hold Management accountable. Committee discussion must focus on what matters and chairpersons' reports to the Board on the recommendations of the Board and on what requires</p>	<p><u>EC77 minutes:</u> "Clarity of Committee reports to the Board. The Secretariat took note of suggestions for improved clarity, particularly with respect to recommendations for the Board."</p>	As per above	No further deliberations	As per above

**UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014**

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	further discussion.”				
Convenors and Friends					
Document decisions in the minutes of Convenor and Friends meetings to provide transparency to the process as well as improve flow of communication and information	<u>Paragraph 119:</u> “Given the Board’s non-resident nature, IFAD has an informal mechanism for ensuring continuity of dialogue among Member States and IFAD Management between Board meetings, known as the “List Convenors and Friends”. Important matters are raised and often resolved through this platform. However, it remains an informal platform. It may be worth considering establishing a practice of documenting decisions in the minutes of their meetings to provide transparency to the process as well as improve flow of communication and information, as is done by the other subsidiary bodies of the Board.”	<u>EC77 minutes:</u> “ Convenors and Friends. In answer to some queries regarding reporting procedures for Convenor and Friends meetings, the Committee was advised that notes of the meetings of Convenors and Friends with the President were drawn up and distributed to meeting participants. Such notes could be distributed within the Lists by the respective Convenors; this would also have the benefit of allowing all members to provide input to the agendas of these meetings.”	<u>Deliberations:</u> “The Evaluation Committee strongly supports enhancing the guidance provided in the records of Convenors and Friends meetings.” <u>Timeline and next steps:</u> “List Convenors have been encouraged to share notes from Convenors and Friends with list members.”	No further deliberations	No further deliberations
Classification of IFAD Member States into three Lists					
Review the relevance of the List system	<u>Paragraph 121:</u> “This concerns the classification of IFAD Member States into three Lists (A, B and C). This is a fundamental question, as the List system has far-reaching implications	<u>EB108 minutes:</u> “Divergent views were expressed with regard to, inter alia: The List structure; ... – Rotation and membership of governing bodies.”	<u>Deliberations:</u> “The Evaluation Committee, considering the vital importance, sensitivity, and complexity of this issue, noted that information to be included in the corporate-level evaluation of the replenishment	No further deliberations	No further deliberations

UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	<p>for governance, voice and representation, and therefore effectiveness and efficiency of the entire Governing Bodies architecture of IFAD. The List system (or Categories I, II and III as they were previously called) was appropriate when IFAD was established. However, it might be worth considering if the List system is still relevant in today's global context, especially in light of the economic, developmental and geopolitical evolution of IFAD Member States over the years. The evaluation has not dwelled on this extensively, but it is a topic that has efficiency implications and will need to be addressed in the future."</p> <p><u>Appendix I, paragraph 163:</u></p> <p>"One of IFAD's strengths is that the constituent elements of its Governing Bodies, particularly of the Board, do not feel underrepresented.</p> <p>... The division of the membership into A, B and C Lists ensures that the three groupings (roughly OECD, OPEC and developing countries) which constituted IFAD from the start are always represented in meetings. The role of constituencies in the A and B</p>		<p>process would provide further input on this topic. The Committee noted that this issue is likely to become more salient as IFAD looks to the future."</p> <p><u>Timeline and next steps:</u></p> <p>"The CLEE recommends that the issue be revisited subsequent to the submission of the final CLE on replenishments.</p> <p>Following this discussion, the issue may be an appropriate topic for consideration during the IFAD10 Consultation."</p>		

**UPDATED CLEE GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX
April 2014**

Recommendations and actions	CLEE reference	Deliberations at: EB108 (April 2013) and EC77 (June 2013)	Deliberations at: EC78 (Sep 2013)	Deliberations at: EB 109 (Sep 2013)	Conclusions reached at Convenors and Friends on 20 November 2013, as communicated at the EB110 (December 2013)
	<p>Lists is complementary to the List system and consists in regulating alternation between members and alternates or temporary absence from the Board. In the C List, three sub-Lists fulfil a similar role. At the same time, it should be noted that the List structure has entailed a rigidity in Board (and committee) representation by allocating a fixed number of chairs to each List. This would not be a problem if the relative contributions of the Lists to replenishments had remained steady. However, the contribution of the B List has declined severely over time and that of the C List has strongly increased. While perhaps not of acute urgency, this issue should not be neglected."</p>				