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Key milestones of IFAD’s Decentralization efforts

2016
• 18% IFAD staff based in ICOs
• CLE decentralization 2016 completed
• Hubs established

2017
• OPEX established to implement IFAD’s decentralization

2018
• 25% IFAD staff based ICOs
• IFAD11 approved

2019
• 31% IFAD staff based ICOs
• CDI created to spearhead Decentralization
• Hubs reviewed and lessons learned

2020
• 32% IFAD staff based ICOs
• IFAD discusses IFAD12: Strategic Directions
• New metrics for ICO typology

2021
• 36% IFAD staff based ICOs
• 2024 target: 45% IFAD staff based on ICOs
• New ICO Typology
• Regional directors, technical staff based in Regional Offices

Decentralization Plans
IFAD12
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Evaluation coverage and approach

• From 2003-2015
• Assessment of IFAD’s policy framework
• Review of different ICO models
• Formative CLE, with attention to learning and feedback throughout the evaluation
• Mixed methods for data collection and analysis using triangulation

Main findings

• Decentralization was relevant, but areas for improvement remained
• ICOs contributed to enhancing IFAD’s portfolio
• Not all opportunities for cost-efficiency gains were explored

2016 CLE IFAD’s Decentralization Experience
Objective

Asses the extent to which decentralization contributed to IFAD delivering better development results in an effective and efficient manner.

- Follows the 2016 CLE of IFAD’s decentralization experience
- Asses decentralization efforts since 2016
- The CLE will identify contributions of decentralization to improving development results.
- The evaluation to be completed in 2022, to inform IFAD13
Theory of Change

Impact: Contributing to achieving the SDGs

Outcome
- Improved development results
  - Larger PoW and better COSOPs, projects, NLAs and cross-cutting / thematic work
  - Empower ICOs and improve IFAD’s ability to align project designs with the local context and provide the appropriate support, supervision and focus on NLAs and cross-cutting/thematic work
  - Decentralization management, implementation, monitoring and risk assessment

Outputs
- Improved operational effectiveness and organizational efficiency
  - Inputs and activities were used efficiently and contributed to improving IFAD’s operational efficiency and effectiveness

Activities
- Effectiveness
  - Improved operational effectiveness and organizational efficiency led to better outcomes and development results
- Efficiency
  - Decentralization strategy was a coherent package of consistent and reinforcing actions to achieve its objectives
- Relevance and Coherence
  - The organizational decentralization strategy was a relevant way to plausibly achieve the desired outcomes efficiently and effectively

Inputs
- Coverage and types of ICOs
- HQ’ structure
- Human and financial resources
- Decentralization 2.0 and work of OpEx and CDI
- Decision making, delegation and accountability
- ICT, corporate services and admin policies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria and Questions</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>To what degree was organizational decentralization relevant for improving IFAD’s operational performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td>Is decentralization strategy a coherent package to transform IFAD from a headquarters-centered into a decentralized organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Did organizational decentralization contribute to IFAD delivering better development results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Did IFAD efficiently plan, manage and implement decentralization towards IFAD becoming a more efficient organization while avoiding unnecessary incremental costs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of Evidence

- Management self-assessment workshop/CLP Discussions
- Document review (including IOE evaluations)
- Portfolio analysis
- Electronic survey (IFAD+ country stakeholders)
- RO/ICO Case studies
- Key informant interviews (HQ)
- Comparator organizations
### CLE Decentralization: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2021</td>
<td>Draft approach paper discussed in the 115th session of the Evaluation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2021</td>
<td>Design workshop to finalize design (consultations with stakeholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2021</td>
<td>Management self-assessment workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December - March 2022</td>
<td>ICO case studies including a formative assessment of Regional Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December - March 2022</td>
<td>Headquarters study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December - March 2022</td>
<td>E-survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2022</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2022</td>
<td>Presentation of the evaluation report with Management response to the 137th session of the Executive Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumption:** Key processes related to Decentralization 2.0 are functioning and their performance can be assessed during the data collection period.
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Questions/Observations?