

---

## **2022 President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA)**

### **Volume I: Main Report**

---

Document: EC 2022/118/W.P.5

Agenda: 6

Date: 5 August 2022

Distribution : Public

Original: English

**FOR: REVIEW**

**Useful references:** IFAD Revised Evaluation Manual ([EC 2022/116/W.P.5](#))

**Action:** The Evaluation Committee is invited to review the 2022 President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA)

---

---

#### **Technical questions:**

**Chitra Deshpande**

Lead Adviser, Results and Resources  
Operational Policy and Results Division  
e-mail: [c.deshpande@ifad.org](mailto:c.deshpande@ifad.org)

**Dimitra Stamatopoulos**

Policy and Results Specialist  
e-mail: [d.stamatopoulos@ifad.org](mailto:d.stamatopoulos@ifad.org)

---

---

## **2022 President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA)**

### **Volume I: Main Report**

---

Document: EB 2022/136/R.18

Agenda: 11(a)

Date: 5 August 2022

Distribution : Public

Original: English

**FOR: REVIEW**

**Useful references:** IFAD Revised Evaluation Manual ([EC 2022/116/W.P.5](#))

**Action:** The Executive Board is invited to review the 2022 President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA)

---

---

**Technical questions:**

**Chitra Deshpande**

Lead Adviser, Results and Resources  
Operational Policy and Results Division  
e-mail: [c.deshpande@ifad.org](mailto:c.deshpande@ifad.org)

**Dimitra Stamatopoulos**

Policy and Results Specialist  
e-mail: [d.stamatopoulos@ifad.org](mailto:d.stamatopoulos@ifad.org)

---

## Contents

<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>I. Objectives, structure and methodology</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Objectives	1
B. Methodology	1
<b>II. Promoting accountability</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Evaluation coverage and classification of recommendations	1
B. Implementation status	3
<b>III. Internalizing learning</b>	<b>8</b>
A. Areas where follow-up is complete or on track	9
A. Areas where follow-up is in progress	10
<b>IV. Conclusions</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	
I. Methodology	12
II. Evaluation coverage of the 2022 PRISMA	13
III. Evaluation recommendations, by sub-theme	14
IV. List of project-level evaluations, by date of entry into force, closing date and evaluation date	15
V. Follow-up to IOE comments on the 2021 RIDE	16

## Executive summary

1. The President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA) tracks Management's follow-up on recommendations made by the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE). The 2022 PRISMA covers a total of 13 evaluations (containing 69 recommendations), 11 of which are new evaluations (containing 60 recommendations) and two of which are for historical follow-up (containing 9 recommendations). As with past reports, IOE and Management have worked together to agree on the evaluations to cover in this year's edition. The 2022 PRISMA reflects three main points.
2. First, **Management agrees with all of the IOE recommendations considered in this edition of the PRISMA** (69 recommendations), out of which 65 recommendations (94 per cent) are totally agreed upon, and four recommendations (6 per cent) are partially agreed upon. Management has addressed all recommendations.
3. Second, **follow-up action is complete for 67 per cent of recommendations, and is ongoing for the remaining 33 per cent.** Ongoing action mainly relates to country strategy and programme evaluation recommendations, with Management having initiated actions to adapt corporate strategies, country strategies and projects in line with the recommendations. Ongoing follow-up also relates to non-lending activities, many of which are continuous by nature. For the corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture, ongoing action relates to the establishment of specific metrics for "innovation in sustainable agrifood systems" and the knowledge-sharing and dissemination aspect, which requires a longer timespan.
4. Third, **IFAD has been able to apply the lessons learned from evaluations to country strategic opportunities programme and project design, in building partnerships, and proceeding with its ambitious decentralization agenda.** Areas where learning requires additional time and resources are policy engagement, innovation and knowledge management.

# 2022 President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA)

## Introduction

1. The President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA) is Management's tool to report yearly on follow-up to recommendations from selected evaluations conducted by the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE). This is the nineteenth edition of the PRISMA – the third and final during the Eleventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD11).
2. PRISMA volume I outlines the recommendations and the status of follow-up actions implemented by Management. Substantively, it consolidates the most relevant findings and explains how IFAD has internalized this knowledge to achieve better results. Volume II provides the full list of individual recommendations, together with the specific actions undertaken to address them.

## I. Objectives, structure and methodology

### A. Objectives

3. The PRISMA has two objectives:
  - (i) **Promote accountability** through rigorous follow-up with the relevant teams and consolidated reporting to the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board on Management actions in response to independent evaluation recommendations; and
  - (ii) **Internalize learning** by identifying recurrent issues at the portfolio and corporate levels that require targeted attention from Management in order to enhance development effectiveness.

### B. Methodology

4. The PRISMA analyses follow-up and the key characteristics of the independent evaluations selected for the report, namely: their level (corporate or country), their nature (operational, strategic or policy) and their theme (according to the recurrent topics). For comparability purposes, annex I details the methodology applied for the analysis of data, which remains unchanged from previous years.

## II. Promoting accountability

### A. Evaluation coverage and classification of recommendations

5. The 2022 PRISMA covers 13 evaluations (with a total of 69 recommendations), jointly selected by Management and IOE. Of these, 11 are new evaluations finalized in 2020 and 2021, and two are for historical follow-up.
6. New evaluations include one corporate-level evaluation (CLE), three country strategy and programme evaluations (CSPEs) and seven project performance evaluations (PPEs). This year's edition also follows up on outstanding recommendations with ongoing follow-up action from two historical CSPEs (from 2020) – Mexico and Sierra Leone.

Table 1  
**2022 PRISMA: First-round and historical follow-up\***

<i>New evaluations 2022</i>		<i>Evaluation recommendation actions</i>			
Evaluation level	Evaluation type	CLE	CSPE	PPE	Total
<b>Portfolio</b>					
Asia and the Pacific	3 PPE	-	-	11	11
East and Southern Africa	1 CSPE + 1 PPE	-	14	3	17
Latin America and the Caribbean	2 CSPE + 1 PPE	-	10	4	14
Near East, North Africa and Europe	1 CSPE + 2 PPE	-	8	9	17
West and Central Africa	1 CSPE	-	4	-	4
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>12</b>	-	<b>36</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Corporate</b>					
CLE on IFAD's support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture	1 CLE	6	-	-	6
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1</b>	-	-	-	<b>6</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	-	-	-	<b>69</b>

\* For a detailed breakdown, see table 1 of annex II.

7. In 2021, IOE made the following comments on the PRISMA:<sup>1</sup>
- (i) Management should change follow-up status for three recommendations stemming from PPEs<sup>2</sup> from “fully followed up” to “ongoing”, because country teams are still implementing some aspects included in the recommendations;
  - (ii) Management should improve the description of follow-up action reported for selected recommendations from one PPE (Sierra Leone)<sup>3</sup> and one CSPE (Mexico), to cover all aspects detailed in the recommendations.
8. Management agrees with the above comments and the justification provided by IOE. In compliance with the first comment, Management has updated follow-up status in the PRISMA database. In response to the second, volume II includes updated follow-up action for the Sierra Leone PPE. However, the Sierra Leone PPE is not included in the portfolio for analysis in line with the rules agreed with Member States for reporting on historical evaluations.<sup>4</sup> In addition, this year's PRISMA includes updated follow-up on outstanding recommendations for the historical Mexico CSPE.

#### **A.1 In focus: recommendations from new evaluations**

9. **Nature of recommendations.** As shown in table 2, the majority of new recommendations (60 per cent or 36 recommendations) are of operational nature, meaning they suggest a specific course of action in the short or medium term. The remaining 40 per cent (24 recommendations) are of strategic nature, suggesting an approach to be adopted in the medium term and the long term. While CSPE recommendations exhibit a balance between the two categories of recommendations, PPEs are mainly operational, in line with their narrower coverage, and those for the CLE on innovation are entirely strategic.
10. **Follow-up level of recommendations.** The majority of new recommendations (80 per cent or 48 recommendations) are for follow-up at country level, focusing on new country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs), country strategy notes and projects. A minority of recommendations (17 per cent or 10 recommendations) are for follow-up at IFAD corporate level. They include all six recommendations for

<sup>1</sup> EB 2021/133/R.18/Add.2.

<sup>2</sup> PPE of the Small Irrigation Development Project – Phase II (Haiti) and PPE of the Smallholder Tree Crop Revitalization Support Project (Liberia).

<sup>3</sup> PPE of the Rehabilitation and Community-based Poverty Reduction Project (Sierra Leone).

<sup>4</sup> Management reports follow-up on outstanding recommendations from historical CLEs and CSPEs, but not from historical PPEs or impact evaluations.

the CLE, in line with its corporate focus and broader scope. Furthermore, they include one recommendation from the Ecuador CSPE, dealing with decentralization, and three recommendations from the Türkiye PPE, dealing with corporate instruments for quality assurance at design. Only 3 per cent (2 recommendations) are for follow-up at project level, through supervision and implementation support.

Table 2  
**2022 PRISMA: Number of recommendations by level assigned and nature of recommendation (first-round follow-up)**

Level	Nature of recommendations		Total	%
	Operational	Strategic		
<b>Corporate</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17%</b>
CSPE	1	-	-	10%
CLE	-	6	-	60%
PPE	3	-	-	30%
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>83%</b>
<b>Country</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>80%</b>
CSPE	14	12	-	
PPE	16	6	-	
<b>Project</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3%</b>
PPE	2	-	-	
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>100%</b>	

## B. Implementation status

11. Management agrees with the totality of recommendations included in this year's PRISMA and is making good progress in addressing them. More specifically, Management fully agrees with 65 recommendations (94 per cent), and partially agrees with the remaining four recommendations (6 per cent) stemming from the CLE on IFAD's support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture, the India PPE and the Bangladesh PPE. Management has addressed all 69 recommendations.

### B1. Overview of implementation status by evaluation type

12. Management has completed follow-up action on 67 per cent of recommendations. The remaining 33 per cent are ongoing, with follow-up action initiated, but not yet complete. More specifically:
- (i) **For PPEs, Management has completed follow-up action for 24 out of 27 recommendations**, by addressing them in the design of new operations (and in some cases, COSOPs) and the implementation of ongoing projects and non-lending activities. The two recommendations partially agreed upon (India and Bangladesh) also count, with full follow-up for the portion that was agreed upon by Management. Three recommendations have remained ongoing, dealing with the establishment of partnerships and policy dialogue initiatives, and, in one case, with adjusting the targeting strategy for the country.
  - (ii) **For CSPEs, follow-up is complete on approximately half of the recommendations.** Outstanding recommendations deal with actions that are ongoing by nature, such as policy engagement, knowledge management, capacity-building and monitoring.
  - (iii) **For the CLE on IFAD's support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture, half of the recommendations are fully followed up while the remaining half are ongoing.**<sup>5</sup> Given the strategic nature and broader scope of such recommendations and the cultural

<sup>5</sup> For the two partially agreed upon recommendations, Management followed up on the portion of the recommendation agreed upon, as further detailed in section B.3.

shift implied in actions that mainstream a renewed concept of innovation for rural development, implementation will require a longer timespan.

Table 3  
**2022 PRISMA: Implementation status of evaluation recommendations, by evaluation type (first-round and historical follow-up)\***

	<i>Full follow-up</i>	<i>Ongoing</i>	<i>Total</i>
<b>Corporate</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>
CLE on IFAD's support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture	3	3	6
<b>Portfolio</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>CSPE</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>36</b>
<i>Mexico**</i>	5	-	5
<i>Sierra Leone**</i>	1	3	4
<i>Ecuador</i>	1	4	5
<i>Madagascar</i>	6	8	14
<i>Sudan</i>	6	2	8
<b>PPE</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27</b>
<i>Bangladesh</i>	2	1	3
<i>China</i>	4	-	4
<i>Dominican Republic</i>	2	2	4
<i>India</i>	4	-	4
<i>Tajikistan</i>	3	-	3
<i>Türkiye</i>	6	-	6
<i>Uganda</i>	3	-	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>69</b>
	<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* For a detailed breakdown, see volume II.

\*\* Historical follow-up.

13. The share of recommendations fully followed up has been gradually improving over IFAD11, shifting from 53 per cent in 2019 to 67 per cent in 2022. Both the high degree of acceptance and the proactive follow-up on recommendations are related to the closer collaboration that IOE and Management have achieved through the common evaluation policy and manual, while maintaining full mutual independence. In this way, IFAD complies with the key finding from the 2019 external peer review, stating that "effective evaluation at the institutional level also needs constructive ongoing engagement among the three key "owners" of evaluation – IOE, Management and the Board."<sup>6</sup>
14. Sections B.2 and B.3 detail the implementation status of all recommendations for the 13 evaluations under review.

## **B.2 Follow-up at portfolio level**

### **B.2.1 Countries with full follow-up on recommendations**

15. In **Mexico**, IFAD has completed follow-up on the five CSPE historical recommendations that had remained outstanding from 2021. Three of them dealt with design quality and knowledge management (KM) mechanisms. To ensure design quality for the Balsas Basin – Reducing Climate Vulnerability and Emissions through Sustainable Livelihoods project, the country team enhanced synergies with ongoing government projects as well as projects being implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Global Environment Facility, while also leveraging increased support from IFAD and FAO technical specialists. As a result, quality-at-entry ratings were very high. To address weakness in KM mechanisms, the National Forestry Commission of Mexico, the implementing agency of the Rural Development Project in the Mixteca Region and the Mazahua Zone has institutionalized knowledge stemming from the project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and developed a strategy specific to semi-arid zones. The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean is

<sup>6</sup> EC 2019/106/W.P.7.



working on knowledge products based on the lessons learned from the Social Economy Project: Territory and Inclusion on inclusive production, inclusive finance and gender, to be disseminated at international events.

16. Remaining recommendations focused on the integration between the loan and the grant portfolio and decentralization. On the former, the grant portfolio has facilitated knowledge-sharing on exit strategies that was later applied to other projects in the region; and allowed for collection and systematization of results from the loan portfolio. On decentralization, the new country director is based in the Panama office. This will reinforce dialogue with government counterparts and United Nations personnel.
17. Recommendations from the **Uganda PPE focused on design and programme management arrangements**; IFAD completed follow-up action for all of them. The design of the new National Oilseeds Project included a detailed targeting process to leverage IFAD's comparative advantage in reaching the rural poor. In addition, it took into account political drivers, carried out a thorough political economy analysis and included mitigation measures by applying the integrated project risk matrix (IPRM) tool. The project design established that M&E data would be consolidated by a single project management unit under the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries to enhance consistency.
18. The **Tajikistan PPE highlighted the importance of capacity-building of community organizations** and provided detailed recommendations for infrastructure projects. All of these recommendations were fully followed up. The implementation framework of the Community-Based Agricultural Support Project (CASP) and the design of CASP+ build on the lessons learned from the Khatlon Livelihoods Support Project to strengthen community-based organizations and establish new ones (such as pasture users' unions, common interest groups, and women's income-generating groups). New and ongoing projects also included activities related to water access under multi-use schemes, a key point in the PPE.
19. The **Türkiye PPE recommendations focused on quality at entry, targeting, gender and partnerships** and required follow-up at both corporate and country levels. IFAD has completed follow-up action for all of these recommendations. On quality at entry, the Near East, North Africa and Europe Division (NEN) developed a subregional M&E action plan and applied the IPRM to all projects. Ongoing projects in NEN now benefit from innovative mechanisms to target the most vulnerable and from collaboration with IFAD gender specialists for a regional gender strategy and action plan. NEN also established a steering committee with stakeholders (such as the Ministry of Family and Social Services and the Ministry of Youth and Sports) to promote youth development and women's empowerment.
20. Follow-up is now complete for the **China PPE recommendations focused on value chain and policy engagement**. The Hunan Rural Revitalization Demonstration Project (H2RDP) fosters economic gain from value chains of local specialities for vulnerable rural people, particularly youth and women, and builds sustainable linkages between smallholders and agro-entities along the value chains. The project will serve as a pilot in the context of the Government's rural revitalization strategy. With the Poor Areas Development Office integrated into the Department of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (the implementing agency), IFAD has ensured direct access to the national poverty reduction programme database and monitoring tools, as means of enhancing policy engagement.
21. **Two other important aspects in the China PPE were gender and innovation**, on which follow-up is also complete. Both the Yunnan Rural Revitalization Demonstration Project and the H2RDP pursue gender equality and empowerment in the rural economy by creating new employment opportunities for women, providing business services and stimulating women's entrepreneurship, and enhancing the participation of women farmers in the national professional farmer training

programme. In addition, both projects introduce innovations such as inclusive private sector investment models, business incubation centres, disbursement against results, and climate-proofed design of infrastructure.

22. **Two of the India PPE recommendations focused on gender** and are fully followed up. Drawing on lessons learned, the Nav Tejaswini Maharashtra Rural Women's Enterprise Development Project addresses the root causes of gender inequalities, such as workload distribution, participation in institutions, and titling of land. The project will build on the successful model of community-managed resource centres to enable women to transform their initiatives into profitable enterprises. It will leverage successful partnerships with commercial banks to provide microenterprise loans to women entrepreneurs.
23. In addition, the **India PPE's one recommendation on climate change adaptation and project management** is fully followed up. The Nav Tejaswini project design integrates climate change into its theory of change and budget, and foresees climate resilience measures through climate-smart agricultural strategies, collaboration with extension and weather/climate monitoring institutions, and use of appropriate crops and breeds.
24. Finally, **one partially agreed upon recommendation from the India PPE focused on the need to ensure continuity in senior project management.** As government officials need to comply with Indian civil service procedures on mobility, the implementing agency has mitigated the effects of turnover by ensuring continuity of staff and of the deputy director, and mechanisms for the delegation of authority.

#### **B.2.2 Countries where follow-up is ongoing**

25. In **Sierra Leone, IFAD fully followed up on the recommendation that called for pursuing diversification more vigorously as a strategy for improving nutrition and building economic resilience.** This is one of the four recommendations that had remained outstanding from the historical CSPE. The Agricultural Value Chain Development Project (AVDP) includes a focus on value addition and marketing through agricultural business centres, with multi-stakeholder platforms in place to strengthen value chain dynamics. The COSOP focuses on resilience and nutrition, and supports vegetable production. The IFAD Country Office (ICO) engaged closely with the Government to support investment in livestock development during IFAD12, as a means of improving nutrition and the livelihoods of poor rural farmers.
26. **Action on the three outstanding recommendations is ongoing.** One recommendation relates to strengthening partnership with stakeholders on such issues as food security, gender equality and resilience. Actions of this type are ongoing by nature; for example IFAD, in close collaboration with the European Union, has been working to establish an agricultural donor working group.
27. **Action on the remaining two recommendations – focusing on youth and on access to rural finance – will require a longer implementation timespan.** IFAD, in collaboration with the Government, is modifying the apex business model to make rural financial institutions competitive and sustainable. The Livestock and Livelihood Development Project to be developed under IFAD12 foresees strong private sector engagement using matching grants. The AVDP has a youth empowerment strategy and action plan, which includes building capacity in using ICT for agriculture, supporting their innovations and sustaining their engagement in agriculture without external support.
28. **The Ecuador country team has adjusted the new COSOP timeline according to the country's electoral cycle, which fully follows up on one CSPE recommendation.** Action is ongoing for the remaining four recommendations, which touched upon the need to reinforce policy dialogue, adopt a differentiated

territorial approach to project implementation, and sustain enterprises. The new country strategy note includes a policy dialogue element to strengthen the policy and regulatory framework for farmers' organizations and rural enterprises. The country team also held roundtable meetings with diverse public and private actors to create and strengthen relationships with other partners.

29. **Action on the territorial approach and support to enterprises is ongoing in the two projects:** Sustainable and Appropriate Development Project in Rural Territories (DESATAR) (newly approved) and Strengthening the Productive Capacities of Rural Entrepreneurs in the Territory (EMPRENDER) (pipeline); for the latter, the Ecuador country team sought a route to work directly with decentralized autonomous governments. DESATAR will promote smallholders' adoption and appropriation of innovations and best practices (technical, technological and socio-cooperative). EMPRENDER strengthens the productive capacity of rural entrepreneurs in the territories, and foresees the creation of local economic development centres to provide training on productive activities, business management and marketing for agribusiness.
30. With regard to the **Sudan CSPE, IFAD completed follow-up action on six out of the eight recommendations.** At country level, in line with IOE's indications, inclusive rural finance is part of the policy dialogue specified in the COSOP. Moreover, Sudan has now a new microfinance strategy for 2021-2026 that will guide the implementation of ongoing and future interventions in this area. IFAD also formulated a regional KM strategy in line with the new COSOP. Projects now have sufficient budget allocation for supervision.
31. **At project level, the Sustainable Natural Resources and Livelihoods Programme has an inclusive and differentiated targeting strategy, and incorporates capacity-building on M&E** in its annual workplan and budget to deliver training. The project also benefited from an improved theory of change at midterm review.
32. **Resource mobilization and partnership-building are ongoing.** The former has been challenging, with the ICO in Sudan seeking cofinancing from Arab funding organizations; the latter has shown better results, with partnerships with microfinance institutions yielding good outcomes in terms of scaling up and sustainability.
33. In **Madagascar, follow-up action is complete for six recommendations and ongoing for the remaining eight.** Completed actions include: concentrating interventions in the south of the island, within the poorest regions and also those most vulnerable to the impact of climate change; strengthening the capacities of producers' organizations at all levels; aligning project interventions to improve financial inclusion; better linking the grant portfolio with loans; and strengthening country presence.
34. The **country team is following up on the remaining recommendations, which focus on KM, partnership, M&E and capacity-building for producers,** among other areas. Ongoing action also encompasses the themes of value chain and gender. On the former, ongoing projects have facilitated producers' access to inputs and markets through contract farming promotion and enhanced partnerships with private operators. On gender, the upcoming Programme for Strengthening Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Economic Integration of Rural Youth will incorporate support to pro-poor value chain development including improving the access of young women and men to inputs, infrastructure and facilitation services to provide the most vulnerable groups with better access to markets.
35. The **Dominican Republic country team has completed follow-up action on two out of the four PPE recommendations.** The PPE called for businesses to adapt to the capacities of the most vulnerable groups and for the promotion of synergies with other interventions to address the multiple factors underlying rural

poverty in the country. In response, the Productive Inclusion and Resilience Projects (PRORURAL) are based on identifying and clustering factors (economic, social and environmental) that strengthen the resilience of the rural poor. An entire component of PRORURAL is devoted to policy dialogue, aiming to scale up its targeting model through an interdisciplinary platform.

36. **The remaining two recommendations called for inclusion of the poorest in projects based on the value chains approach and expanding partnerships to support rural organizations.** For PRORURAL Inclusivo (rural families), the country team developed specific mechanisms to ensure inclusion of differentiated target groups, build the capacity of producers' organizations through the development and implementation of business plans and collaborate with the country's "unique beneficiary system" to ensure effective targeting of the country's poorest groups. Similarly, PRORURAL Joven (poor rural youth) incorporates a direct targeting mechanism to identify the most vulnerable and marginalized youth. Both projects have broadened their range of partners to ensure expertise on off-farm enterprises, youth empowerment and tourism.
37. **Two of the three Bangladesh PPE recommendations that are fully followed up revolved around incorporating the climate change adaptation aspect into infrastructure components and policy engagement.** The Promoting Resilience of Vulnerable through Access to Infrastructure, Improved Skills and Information project offers broader support for climate-resilient livelihoods, while also including activities for value chain development and enhanced women's participation in labour markets. On policy engagement, the Bangladesh ICO is working with the local government engineering department to strengthen the capacity of market management committees and ensure sustainability of the markets.
38. **One recommendation also called for the establishment of partnerships with NGOs that have expertise in gender and social inclusion issues.** Management did not find this viable because of the lack of grant resources and therefore only partially agreed. The country team has nevertheless ensured that NGOs were duly consulted during project design and implementation.

### **B.3 Follow-up at corporate level**

39. **The Fund is on track to implement recommendations stemming from the CLE on IFAD's support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture.** It has adopted the United Nations Innovation Toolkit as the guidelines to mainstream innovation and has established mechanisms to recognize champions at IFAD. The set-up for follow-up action in these areas is complete, but activities will continue over future years. Ongoing activities include: adopting principles and metrics for innovation in sustainable agrifood systems; fostering partnership with the other Rome-based agencies and other international financial institutions; and working with the Knowledge Management Coordination Group to streamline KM tools for accessing and sharing innovation and making them more easily available on a centralized platform. Management did not agree on adopting frameworks that focus on the success of innovations and the use of one platform to promote innovations. Instead, it opted to create metrics on innovations tested and set up a range of user-centric platforms. Section III further expands on the learning drawn from the CLE.

## **III. Internalizing learning**

40. Management has classified the 60 new recommendations considered in this edition of the PRISMA according to their thematic focus, as illustrated in table 4. This section presents the learning emerging from these main thematic areas, while explaining how it has been applied at the corporate and country levels.

Table 4  
**2022 PRISMA: First-round follow-up on portfolio-level recommendations, by thematic area\***

Thematic area	All recommendations		Follow-up complete		Follow-up ongoing	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Cross-cutting (innovation, targeting, capacity-building, supervision, etc.)	17	28%	12	71%	5	29%
Non-lending activities (partnerships, policy engagement, KM, grants)	15	25%	6	40%	9	60%
COSOP and project design	13	22%	11	85%	2	15%
Technical and mainstreaming themes (gender; infrastructure; environment and natural resource management and climate change; market and value chain)	13	22%	10	77%	3	23%
Corporate issues (decentralization)	2	3%	1	50%	1	50%
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>33%</b>

\* Disaggregated data by thematic area are presented in annex III, tables 1 and 2.

## A. Areas where follow-up is complete or on track

41. **CSPEs continue to be a key input in the development of new COSOPs**, as indicated by the large share of recommendations completely followed up. IOE and Management have been agile in planning CSPEs prior to new COSOP designs to maximize relevance and uptake. According to both COSOP completion reports (CCRs) and stakeholder surveys, the relevance of COSOPs at the end of the IFAD11 period is already rated above the targets set in the Results Management Framework for the Twelfth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources,<sup>7</sup> testifying to a high-quality analysis of the needs of target groups and the country context, and a well-articulated theory of change. In 2022, IFAD is updating its COSOP design and review guidelines to bring further improvements. One of them is to provide guidance to reduce complexity, an issue that has been raised in evaluations in 2022. The new COSOP guidelines will be aligned with the action plans on sustainability and scaling up, which are key evaluation criteria in all project and country-level evaluations. IFAD is also working on developing a COSOP module in the Operational Results Management System (ORMS). The module will make it possible to track how corporate priorities are mainstreamed into COSOPs and to aggregate results at country level.
42. **Project design is also a strong area of uptake, as reflected in the very high-quality ratings assigned at design in 2020-2021.** The Quality Assurance Group's review found high relevance and strong targeting, with the latter being a recurrent issue in recommendations. In line with recommendations, IFAD introduced the IPRM for design in 2020, and integrated it into project supervision reports in 2021. Updating the IPRM will contribute to better risk management and to bridging the gap between expectations at design and actual results from implementation.
43. **Partnership is an area where most recommendations are ongoing, yet very good results have been already achieved.** Traditionally, strengthening partnerships takes a longer time to implement and many activities are ongoing by nature. This partially explains the prevalence of ongoing versus fully completed follow-up actions. The progress report on the IFAD Partnership Framework<sup>8</sup> shows that most of the actions foreseen in the framework action plan have been completed, with partnerships now integrated into: COSOPs, project guidelines, and regional and global engagement strategies. Evidence from CCRs and stakeholder feedback also shows positive performance, which is substantiated by very high

<sup>7</sup> See the Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness (RIDE) 2022.

<sup>8</sup> EB 2022/135/R.23.

cofinancing ratios over 2019-2021.<sup>9</sup> Areas for improvement include engagement in global and regional policy forums, as well as expanding and deepening IFAD's engagement with the private sector. Improvements are also needed to strengthen overall monitoring and reporting of partnership results and building the partnering capacity of staff.

44. **Regarding decentralization, IFAD has been rapidly progressing on its ambitious Decentralization 2.0 agenda.** Outposted staff positions now account for 36.5 per cent of all positions.<sup>10</sup> Recommendations from CSPEs have been instrumental in the process by linking decentralization with specific strategic considerations on the country portfolio and contributing to the prioritization exercise. In line with recommendations related to strengthening technical expertise, IFAD is also planning to relocate decentralized technical staff in the regional offices to provide faster and better tailored technical support to policy engagement and advisory activities.

## **B. Areas where follow-up is in progress**

45. **Half of the recommendations on innovation have been fully followed up.** In 2022, IFAD adopted a new corporate definition of innovation, which focuses on sustainable, equitable and inclusive solutions for rural development. To improve the operating model that supports its innovation processes, IFAD adopted the United Nations Innovation Toolkit, which assesses "readiness to innovate" across five critical pillars: strategy, partnerships, architecture, culture and evaluation (SPACE). The SPACE model presents tools and guidelines for IFAD staff on how to integrate innovation into business operations, identify new partners to improve innovation outcomes, design and manage partnerships, manage risk and prioritize partners through the creation of an evaluation framework.
46. **Ongoing follow-up action mainly relates to the establishment of specific metrics for innovation in sustainable agrifood systems** and the equally important knowledge-sharing and dissemination part. The incorporation of a renewed innovation concept into IFAD's business model will require additional time to be considered fully implemented and also adequate resource allocation. IFAD is in the process of learning from other institutions, including the Rome-based agencies, and capitalizing on best practices in innovation.
47. **Policy engagement is identified during IFAD11 as a weak area and a key priority for IFAD12.** Follow-up action shows that country teams have been including policy dialogue in country strategy notes and using country presence to engage with local government. In 2022, IFAD is developing companion tools for the existing guidelines for country-level policy engagement, and producing training material under IFAD's Operational Academy upskilling programme. Interestingly, regional stocktakes have brought to light the possibility that IFAD may have achieved results, but not effectively measured them. In line with IFAD12 commitments, the new COSOP guidelines introduce indicators at the country programme level to measure policy impact related to IFAD's strategic objectives, in order to better document this area.
48. **Knowledge management recommendations have been instrumental for project teams to enrich COSOPs and project design.** IFAD also invested in upgrading the ORMS module on lessons learned, in order to feed project design with operational evidence in a more effective way. Yet the gap between knowledge generation and knowledge use is still present. In the process of reviewing IFAD's KM strategy, stakeholders identified a focus on "process" knowledge and not enough focus on "substantive" knowledge from/for operations. Stakeholders also identified the lack of dedicated budget as a major constraint. Moving forward, IFAD

---

<sup>9</sup> See RIDE 2022.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

will assess how to redefine knowledge and knowledge management, with an enhanced focus on operationally relevant, substantive knowledge.

## IV. Conclusions

49. **Enhanced focus on development effectiveness is partly due to the unified evaluation architecture created by the common evaluation policy and manual.** In March 2022, IFAD issued its Revised Evaluation Manual.<sup>11</sup> For the first time, the manual applies to both self- and independent evaluation, thus marking a shift in IFAD's approach to the evaluation function. The focus has changed from evaluation itself – a "means" to reach IFAD's mandate – to IFAD's overall development effectiveness, which is the purpose of IFAD's mission: the impact that it has on the livelihoods of poor rural people. Collaboration and constructive exchange between IOE and Management have continued throughout 2022.
50. **The high level of uptake of IOE's recommendations reflect the continuous improvement in the engagement between IOE and Management,** with special emphasis on the product mix, the timing of evaluations, and their learning element. The application of the revised evaluation manual is expected to further close the gap between accountability and learning and reduce disconnect in evaluation ratings. The numerous interactions before the release of final evaluation reports, and the learning events on evaluation products are also improving ownership and the quality of follow-up.
51. **Learning from the PRISMA is expected to be further strengthened in 2022.** In 2021, Management started the design phase of the online version of volume II of the PRISMA. Given the timing of the data collection process, for this year's edition, volume II is still presented in the traditional format. During 2022, Management will continue the development and testing phases. Once available, the online tracker will be instrumental in further improving collaboration on evaluation products and swift uptake of recommendations. In parallel, Management will continue to constructively engage with IOE and leverage evaluation products to maximize compliance with IFAD12 commitments.

---

<sup>11</sup> EC 2022/116/W.P.5.

## Methodology

### A. Extraction of recommendations

1. The President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA) tracks Management's follow-up to recommendations made in the following independent evaluation products:
  - For corporate-level evaluations (CLEs), evaluation synthesis reports (ESRs), impact evaluations (IEs) and project performance evaluations (PPEs), commitments are made in IFAD Management's responses to those evaluation reports;
  - For country strategy and programme evaluations (CSPEs), the agreements at completion point signed by IFAD and government representatives are used to track follow-up actions that signatories have agreed to implement; and
  - The current PRISMA also follows up on IOE's comments on the Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness (RIDE) for 2021.<sup>12</sup>

### B. Classification of recommendations

2. In order to facilitate the analysis, and in line with the practice in previous years, this report classifies the recommendations according to the following criteria:
3. **Evaluation level.** This refers to the entity which is targeted by the recommendation and is primarily responsible for implementation. The levels are:
  - **Corporate level;** and
  - **Country level** (including IFAD, government authorities and the project).
4. **Nature.** This categorizes the recommendation as per the revised IFAD Evaluation Policy:
  - **Operational,** if the recommendation proposes a specific action;
  - **Strategic,** if it suggests an approach or course of action; and
  - **Policy,** if it is related to the principles guiding IFAD.
5. **Theme.** Recommendations are categorized under broad thematic blocks comprising 32 sub-themes. The sub-themes are listed in annex III.

### C. Process

6. Once the country teams (and cross-departmental resource people in the case of CLEs and ESRs) communicate the latest status, the degree of compliance is assessed using the following criteria:
  - **Full follow-up:** recommendations fully incorporated into the new phase/design of activities, operations or programmes and the relevant policies or guidelines;
  - **Ongoing:** actions initiated in the direction recommended;
  - **Partial:** recommendations followed up partially, with actions consistent with the rationale of the recommendation;
  - **Not yet due:** recommendations that will be incorporated into projects, country programmes or country strategic opportunities programmes or policies yet to be designed and completed;
  - **Not applicable:** recommendations that have not been complied with because of changing circumstances in country development processes or IFAD corporate governance contexts, or for other reasons;
  - **Pending:** recommendations that could not be followed up; and
  - **Not agreed upon:** recommendations that were not agreed to by Management or the respective country team or government.

---

<sup>12</sup> See EB 2021/133/R.9/Add.1.



## Evaluation coverage of the 2022 PRISMA

Table 1  
Evaluations for first-round follow-up included in the 2022 PRISMA

	CLE	CSPE	ESR	IE	PPE	Total
<b>Portfolio</b>	-	27	-	-	27	54
<b>Asia and the Pacific</b>	-	-	-	-	11	11
Bangladesh - Coastal Climate-Resilient Infrastructure Project	-	-	-	-	3	3
China - Hunan Agricultural and Rural Infrastructure Improvement Project	-	-	-	-	4	4
India - Tejaswini Women's Empowerment Programme	-	-	-	-	4	4
<b>East and Southern Africa</b>	-	14	-	-	3	17
Madagascar country strategy and programme evaluation	-	14	-	-	-	14
Uganda - Agricultural Technology and Agribusiness Advisory Services Project	-	-	-	-	3	3
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>	-	5	-	-	4	9
Ecuador country strategy and programme evaluation	-	5	-	-	-	5
Dominican Republic - Rural Economic Development Project in the Central and Eastern Provinces	-	-	-	-	4	4
<b>Near East, North Africa and Europe</b>	-	8	-	-	9	17
Tajikistan - Khatlon Livelihoods Support Project	-	-	-	-	3	3
Türkiye - Ardahan-Kars-Artvin Development Project	-	-	-	-	6	6
Sudan country strategy and programme evaluation	-	8	-	-	-	8
<b>Corporate</b>	6	-	-	-	-	6
Corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's support to innovations for inclusive and sustainable smallholder agriculture	6	-	-	-	-	6
<b>Total</b>	6	27	-	-	27	60

Table 2  
Evaluations for historical follow-up included in the 2022 PRISMA

	CLE	CSPE	ESR	IE	PPE	Total
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>						
Mexico	-	5	-	-	-	5
<b>West and Central Africa</b>						
Sierra Leone	-	4	-	-	-	4
<b>Total</b>	-	9	-	-	-	9

## Evaluation recommendations by sub-theme

Table 1  
Portfolio-level evaluation recommendations in the 2022 PRISMA classified by sub-theme (first-round follow-up)

<i>Block</i>	<i>Sub-theme</i>	<i>CLE</i>	<i>CSPE</i>	<i>PPE</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>
Technical and mainstreaming themes	Climate change	-	-	2	2	-
	Gender	-	1	4	5	-
	Natural resource management	-	1	-	1	-
	Markets and value chains	-	1	1	2	-
	Infrastructure	-	-	3	3	-
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>13</b>	<b>22%</b>	
COSOPs and design	COSOPs	-	5	-	5	-
	Project design	-	2	6	8	-
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>13</b>	<b>22%</b>	
Non-lending activities	Policy engagement	-	2	2	4	-
	Knowledge management	1	2	-	3	-
	Partnerships	1	3	3	7	-
	Grants/Regular Grants Policy	-	1	-	1	-
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>15</b>	<b>25%</b>	
Cross-cutting	Innovation	4	-	1	5	-
	Project management and administration (incl. financial management)	-	-	2	2	-
	Supervision	-	1	-	1	-
	Training and capacity-building	-	2	1	3	-
	Targeting	-	3	2	5	-
	Results measurement, monitoring and evaluation	-	1	-	1	-
<b>Subtotal</b>				<b>17</b>	<b>28%</b>	
Corporate	Decentralization	-	2	-	2	3%
<b>Total</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 2  
Portfolio-level evaluation recommendations in the 2022 PRISMA, classified by regional distribution (first-round follow-up)

<i>Block</i>	<i>Sub-theme</i>	<i>APR</i>	<i>ESA</i>	<i>LAC</i>	<i>NEN</i>	<i>Corporate</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>
Technical and mainstreaming themes	Climate change	2	-	-	-	-	2	-
	Gender	3	1	-	1	-	5	-
	Natural resource management	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
	Markets and value chains	1	-	1	-	-	2	-
	Infrastructure	1	-	-	2	-	3	-
<b>Subtotal</b>						<b>13</b>	<b>22%</b>	
COSOPs and design	COSOPs	-	4	1	-	-	5	-
	Project design	-	2	2	4	-	8	-
<b>Subtotal</b>						<b>13</b>	<b>22%</b>	
Non-lending activities	Policy engagement	2	-	1	1	-	4	-
	Knowledge management	-	1	-	1	1	3	-
	Partnerships	-	1	2	3	1	7	-
	Grants/Regular Grants Policy	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
<b>Subtotal</b>						<b>15</b>	<b>25%</b>	
Cross-cutting	Innovation	1	-	-	-	4	5	-
	Project management and administration (incl. financial management)	1	1	-	-	-	2	-
	Supervision	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
	Training and capacity-building	-	1	-	2	-	3	-
	Targeting	-	2	1	2	-	5	-
	Results measurement, monitoring and evaluation	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
<b>Subtotal</b>						<b>17</b>	<b>28%</b>	
Corporate	Decentralization	-	1	1	-	-	2	3%
<b>Total</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100%</b>

## List of project-level evaluations by date of entry into force, closing date and evaluation date

<i>Name of project</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Date of effectiveness</i>	<i>Loan closure date</i>	<i>Project completion report date</i>	<i>Evaluation date</i>
Coastal Climate-Resilient Infrastructure Project	Bangladesh	June-13	Mar-20	Mar-20	Mar-21
Agricultural Technology and Agribusiness Advisory Services Project	Uganda	Nov-11	Jun-19	Jun-19	Jun-21
Rural Economic Development Project in the Central and Eastern Provinces	Dominican Republic	Sep-12	Mar-21	Dec-19	May-21
Khatlon Livelihoods Support Project	Tajikistan	Apr-09	Jun-16	Mar-18	Apr-21
Ardahan-Kars-Artvin Development Project	Türkiye	Jul-10	Mar-18	Aug-18	Sep-20
Hunan Agricultural and Rural Infrastructure Improvement Project	China	Sep-12	Mar-18	Mar-18	Jul-20
Tejaswini Women's Empowerment Programme	India	Jul-07	Mar-19	Mar-19	Jul-20
<b>Average</b>		<b>Feb-11</b>	<b>Dec-18</b>	<b>Jan-19</b>	<b>Dec-20</b>

## Follow-up to IOE comments on the 2021 RIDE

1. IOE endorsed the overview of performance presented in the 2021 RIDE, which covered progress made during the second year of IFAD11. IOE acknowledged the analysis as being reflective of the interplay between achieving development results and institutional advances in IFAD. IOE also expressed appreciation for the collaboration on methodological alignment between the IOE's Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRI) and the RIDE. The following paragraphs present Management's feedback on IOE's comments.
2. **Aligning and harmonizing the RIDE and ARRI.** IOE suggested that use of ratings from independent evaluations would help the RIDE conform to international practices and lend more credibility to its reporting. Management would like to highlight that the RIDE is structured around indicators and targets set forth in the corresponding RMF, with very limited space and scope for examining additional indicators. The RIDE looks at ratings from self-evaluation because they are included in the RMF12, which IFAD negotiated with Member States as part of the IFAD12 Consultation. In parallel the ARRI, which became the Annual Report on the Independent Evaluation of IFAD (ARIE) in 2022, looks at ratings from independent evaluations and analyses the disconnect between self- and independent evaluation ratings, thus offering a complementary perspective. In addition, Management analyses carefully the disconnect during regional and corporate portfolio stocktakes and actively seeks to identify the underlying reasons in order to reduce the disconnect.
3. Analysing ratings from PCRs and from project supervision reports also allows the RIDE to keep its focus on recent performance. This way, Management maintains a proactive approach in identifying "red flags" that may hinder effectiveness of the portfolio and take corrective measures in time. A dedicated RIDE annex looks at 10-year trends and thus complements the analysis with a longer-term perspective.
4. During the 115<sup>th</sup> session of the Evaluation Committee, Management confirmed their agreement with the proposal that IOE should independently review the RMF for IFAD13.<sup>13</sup> On that occasion, Management and IOE will discuss with Member States the extent of inclusion of indicators from independent evaluations and jointly agree on the way forward.
5. With the adoption of the IFAD Revised Evaluation Manual in 2022, which provides a unified set of criteria and definitions for both self- and independent evaluation products, the disconnect is expected to further decrease. Management believes that the ongoing coordination with IOE should continue in order to reduce the space for different interpretations of the criteria, and eventually reach a point where the ratings coincide.
6. **Institutional readiness to deliver on IFAD11 commitments.** IOE commented that the RIDE is best positioned to report on the progress on implementing the related corporate risk management plan to ensure timely delivery of IFAD11 commitments under Decentralization 2.0. In 2022, the RIDE continued to capture recent performance at both portfolio and organizational level in order to monitor timely delivery of IFAD11 commitments. RIDE also touches on the causes of under- or over-achievement of targets where there is evidence available (including processes related to decentralization). However, RIDE is not the main instrument to report on implementation of the corporate risk management plan.
7. Starting from 2023 and in line with the RMF12, Management will start measuring decentralization effectiveness. This new indicator will be based on IFAD Country Office survey questions about whether IFAD staff and offices in the field are well equipped, capable and adequately empowered to deliver the expected results in order to enhance IFAD's impact on the ground. Within this context, the RIDE will elaborate on IFAD's capacity to deliver results in the context of Decentralization 2.0 and may touch upon elements of corporate risk if relevant.

---

<sup>13</sup> EC/115.