Investing in rural people

Evaluation Committee
133rd Session
Rome, 18 June 2026
Rome, 2 July 2026

Minutes of the 133rd and reconvened 133rd session of the Evaluation Committee

Document: EC/133/133R

Date: 11 August 2026

Distribution: Public

Original: English

FOR: INFORMATION

Technical questions:

Indran A. Naidoo
Director
Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
e-mail: i.naidoo@ifad.org

Carola Alvarez
Managing Director
Office of Development Effectiveness
e-mail: c.alvarez@ifad.org

Claudia ten Have
Secretary of IFAD
Office of the Secretary
e-mail: c.tenhave@ifad.org

Minutes of the 133rd and reconvened 133rd session of the Evaluation Committee

1. The deliberations of the Evaluation Committee at its 133rd session – held both in presence and virtually on 18 June 2026 and reconvened on 2 July – are reflected in the present minutes. The minutes have been approved by the Committee and are shared with the Executive Board for information.

Agenda item 1: Opening of the session

2. The session was attended by Committee members from Finland, Germany, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Nigeria (Chairperson) and Switzerland. Observers were present from China and the United States. Moreover, the session was attended by the Director, Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE); the Managing Director, Office of Development Effectiveness; the Associate Vice-President, Department for Country Operations; the Chief Legal and Governance Officer; the Associate Vice-President, External Relations Department; the Managing Director, Office of Technical Delivery; the Director and Controller, Financial Controller's Division; the Director, Environment, Climate and Peoples Division; the Director, Sustainable Production, Markets and Institutions Division; the Director, Planning, Organizational Development and Budget Division; the Regional Director, West and Central Africa Division (remotely); the Director, Latin America and the Caribbean Division (remotely); the Director, Global Engagement, Partnership and Resource Mobilization Division (remotely); the Secretary of IFAD; and other IFAD staff.

3. Mr Beounngar David Doudjim, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Representation of the Republic of Chad, provided remarks virtually on the country strategy and programme evaluation (CSPE) for Chad.

4. Mr Daniel Baptista Orellana, Head of State Enterprises, Vice Ministry of State Strategic Planning, Ministry of Development Planning of the Plurinational State of Bolivia, provided remarks virtually on the CSPE for the Plurinational State of Bolivia.

5. Mr Cande Reyes, Minister and Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Embassy of Honduras and Ms Giselle Canahuati, Alternate Permanent Representative of Honduras to the United Nations Organizations in Rome attended in presence. Ms Canahuati provided remarks on the CSPE for Honduras.

6. Ms Veronique Salze-Lozac'h, the former Chief Evaluator, Independent Evaluation Department, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and Chair of the External Peer Review Panel of IFAD's Evaluation Function (remotely); Ms Geeta Batra, Director, Independent Evaluation Office, Global Environment Facility; and Mr Per Øyvind Bastøe, Senior Consultant, participated in the deliberations on the report of the external peer review of IFAD's evaluation function.

Agenda item 2: Adoption of the agenda (EC 2026/133/W.P.1)

7. The Committee adopted the agenda as contained in document EC 2026/133/W.P.1, with the addition, under other business, of an update on the role of the Evaluation Committee in the selection process for the IOE Director.

Agenda item 3: Country strategy and programme evaluation for the Republic of Chad (EC 2026/133/W.P.2 + Add.1)

Key messages:

- The Committee welcomed the evaluation, noting positive results in agricultural productivity, resilience, food security and support to vulnerable rural groups, and supported recommendations to strengthen smallholder resilience, value chains, and economic inclusion of women and youth.
- Members stressed the need to move from project gains to systemic impact by improving access to finance, market linkages and private sector engagement, while strengthening sustainability through clear exit strategies, government-led scaling, and stronger governance and fiduciary oversight.
- Looking ahead, members called for stronger value chain development, better coordination with partners (both bilateral and multilateral) and the private sector, improved learning and capacity-building, and more integrated climate resilience approaches that include biodiversity co-benefits and incentive-based mechanisms.

8. The Evaluation Committee reviewed the CSPE for the Republic of Chad, covering the period 2013–2024, as contained in document EC 2026/133/W.P.2; and the agreement at completion point signed by IFAD and the Government, contained in the addendum. The government representative delivered an intervention.

9. Members welcomed the evaluation, noting that it provided a balanced assessment of IFAD’s impact in Chad, reflecting both achievements and challenges in a difficult context. Members commended the positive development results achieved, particularly in improving agricultural productivity, resilience, food security and supporting vulnerable rural populations. They expressed support for the recommendations, which were aimed at strengthening smallholder farmers’ resilience, advancing value chain development, and promoting women’s empowerment and the economic inclusion of young people.

10. At the same time, members highlighted the need to move beyond project-level success towards more systemic and transformative change. They noted persistent constraints in access to finance, market integration, private sector engagement and institutional capacity. Members underscored the importance of reinforcing sustainability, including through clearer exit strategies and stronger government-led scaling up. In addition, the implications of management costs for long-term sustainability needed to be taken into consideration. Members also encouraged improvements in governance and implementation, including timely identification and resolution of fiduciary issues, and strengthened oversight, supervision and accountability mechanisms.

11. Looking ahead, members highlighted the importance of improving the linkages between evaluation, learning and operational decision-making, alongside enhanced knowledge management and capacity-building. Members also encouraged closer coordination with development partners, more effective bilateral engagement, and greater complementarity between sovereign and non-sovereign operations. While welcoming the programme’s strong focus on climate resilience, they encouraged more systematic integration of biodiversity co-benefits and further exploration of incentive-based approaches, such as payments for ecosystem services.

12. With regard to market access, IOE clarified that while investments in road infrastructure had improved farmers’ physical access to production and market areas, market access was affected also by other factors. Securing sustainable market opportunities required stronger linkages with the private sector and other market actors, an area that was largely underdeveloped at present.

13. Management reaffirmed the importance of strengthening collaboration with the other Rome-based agencies (RBAs) and bilateral partners, while acknowledging the challenges of policy engagement in the absence of in-country representation. In response to concerns about sustainability and institutional capacity, Management highlighted measures introduced in recent years, including the multiphase adaptive programme approach, the establishment of a dedicated Fragility Unit, strengthened fragility assessments and project reviews, and increased resources for project design and supervision in fragile and conflict-affected situations.

14. Regarding climate and biodiversity, Management highlighted that innovative approaches were being pursued, including payments for ecosystem services, climate-smart agriculture, land restoration, and promotion of sustainable livelihoods, alongside continued private sector engagement. In response to fiduciary management concerns, Management outlined ongoing corrective actions including enhanced supervision and internal controls, revised procedures, digital payment solutions, additional technical assistance, and grievance redress mechanisms. It also clarified that while exit strategies were not consistently included in earlier designs, structured exit plans were now agreed with governments at completion to support transfer of responsibilities to national and local institutions.

Agenda item 4: Approach paper for the corporate-level evaluation of IFAD's supplementary resources (EC 2026/133/W.P.3)

Key messages:

- Members welcomed the planned corporate-level evaluation of IFAD's supplementary resources as timely and relevant for the Fourteenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD14), stressing the need to assess the impact of such resources on effectiveness and institutional coherence and the potential for fragmentation and earmark dependency.
- Members called for a structured review to assess alignment with IFAD's mandate and priorities, including the effectiveness, flexibility, cost and results of different funding modalities and their complementarity with core financing with the aim of drawing lessons on mobilizing more flexible and predictable resources while preserving strategic coherence and effectiveness.

15. Members welcomed the approach paper for the corporate-level evaluation (CLE) of IFAD's supplementary resources. The CLE was seen as timely and relevant, particularly in the context of IFAD14. It would allow for an assessment of how such resources could enhance effectiveness, and how the risks of fragmentation, inefficiency and reduced institutional coherence could be managed. The evaluation should also look at the longer-term implications of using such resources.

16. Members called for a clear assessment of alignment with IFAD's mandate and priorities, including a review of funding modalities – in particular earmarked and intermediary-managed funds – in terms of their effectiveness, flexibility, cost and results. The evaluation should also look at the balance between grants and loans, especially for capacity-building, in order to ensure complementarity with core financing and avoid distortion of priorities.

17. In addition, the evaluation should consider the effort-to-return ratio of smaller donor-specific funds relative to larger, more programmatic mechanisms. Members voiced some concern about the administrative burden, governance implications, staffing requirements and management costs associated with fragmented funding arrangements. The CLE should yield practical lessons on how IFAD can mobilize flexible and predictable resources while preserving strategic coherence and

institutional effectiveness. Members called for particular attention to country-level experiences, particularly in fragile and low-capacity contexts, to better understand the role of supplementary resources in supporting capacity-building, operational performance and development outcomes.

18. In response, IOE highlighted the centrality of supplementary resources within IFAD's financing architecture. Such resources had doubled over the past decade and now significantly complemented replenishment contributions. The evaluation would examine the key trade-offs between core and supplementary resources, including staffing, costs, mandate alignment, earmarking, flexibility and the effectiveness of different modalities. In response to questions on climate finance, IOE noted that climate-related funds had already been covered by other evaluations and would be addressed also by the CLE. Nonetheless, IOE was open to a broader assessment of climate-related interventions in the future.

19. Management highlighted the alignment of supplementary resources with IFAD's mandate and their contribution to concessionality, innovation and implementation capacity. Furthermore, to ensure coherence and avoid duplication, supplementary resources were integrated into country programmes and investment operations.

20. Management highlighted ongoing efforts to address fragmentation through a strategic action plan, strengthened internal coordination, and the integration of quality assurance and review processes into regular operations. Management emphasized that supplementary resources were a set of diverse instruments requiring a differentiated, granular analysis to reflect their varying objectives, modalities and trade-offs. Management also recalled that the supplementary resources strategy had introduced clearer priorities, governance arrangements, and performance monitoring mechanisms to guide their mobilization and use.

Agenda item 5: Proposed dates for sessions of the Evaluation Committee in 2027 (EC 2026/133/W.P.4)

21. The Committee approved the proposed dates for the sessions of the Evaluation Committee in 2027, as contained in document EC 2026/133/W.P.4, namely:

- 136th session – Tuesday, 6 April 2027
- 137th session – Wednesday, 23 June 2027
- 138th session – Friday, 3 September 2027
- 139th session – Wednesday, 27 October 2027

Agenda item 6: Draft report of the external peer review of IFAD's evaluation function (EC 2026/133/W.P.5 + Add.1 + Add.2)

Key messages:

- Members welcomed the external peer review (EPR) as comprehensive and forward-looking, noting that recommendations from the last review in 2019 had been implemented, resulting in a mature, credible and independent evaluation system, with the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD widely regarded as a benchmark.
- Members emphasized the need to sharpen strategic focus and selectivity in the evaluation function, better align evaluation products with IFAD's evolving business model, and strengthen linkages between evaluations, corporate processes (including replenishments), country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs), and decision-making, while expanding thematic and strategic work.
- Members highlighted as priorities the strengthening of Management-led self-evaluation, improved data quality and country-level monitoring and

> evaluation (M&E) capacity, reinforced follow-up on recommendations through stronger learning loops, and enhanced accessibility and use of evaluation knowledge, including through digital tools such as artificial intelligence (AI).

22. Members welcomed the EPR, describing it as comprehensive and forward-looking, and congratulated IOE and the Office of Development Effectiveness on the positive findings. They noted that the recommendations from the 2019 EPR had been implemented, and that these had resulted in institutional maturity and a well-functioning evaluation system. The EPR found that IFAD's evaluation function was widely recognized as credible and aligned with international standards and that IOE was seen as a benchmark and role model.

23. Members emphasized the importance of strengthening strategic focus, selectivity and the use of evaluation findings. This would entail refining the evaluation product mix to better align with IFAD's evolving model by expanding thematic and strategic evaluations while maintaining differentiated country-level work, and supporting meta-evaluations on emerging priorities such as private sector engagement and school feeding activities. Members also stressed the need for closer alignment with corporate processes, including replenishments, COSOPs and decision-making.

24. Members called for stronger Management-led self-evaluation, improved data reliability, and enhanced country-level M&E capacity, alongside more robust tracking of recommendation uptake and stronger learning loops to ensure that lessons were applied within IFAD and shared with partners. Members also emphasized the importance of facilitating access to regularly updated evaluation knowledge, including through AI.

25. Members commented that recommendations should be more focused, prioritized, and actionable. In this context, it was noted that there is potential to strengthen the use of agreements at completion point by bringing together IFAD, IOE and borrowing countries to make the agreements more operational, with clearer actions, responsibilities and timelines.

26. Management highlighted that the previous peer review had been transformative for IFAD; it had fundamentally reshaped the organization's approach to both self-evaluation and independent evaluation and continued to inform the evolution of the evaluation function. Management commended the peer review team for the high quality of their work, their professionalism and forward-looking approach, and the focus on building on and deepening the progress achieved through the earlier review. Management underscored the importance it attaches to peer reviews and reiterated its commitment to carefully consider and act on the recommendations.

27. IOE thanked members for their encouraging feedback and expressed appreciation to the peer review team for the quality of the report, noting that the 2019 peer review had been pivotal in shaping its work and development. IOE expressed confidence that the 2026 peer review would provide an equally important strategic guide for the future and reaffirmed its commitment to the timely implementation of its recommendations.

28. The EPR Chair and team expressed their appreciation for the constructive feedback and engagement of IOE, Management and members. They pointed out that the current financial context called for a more strategic evaluation focus, including on private sector engagement, blended finance and sustainability, and for more clustered country evaluations to strengthen cross-country learning.

29. The EPR Chair noted that sustainability remained a persistent challenge across multilateral organizations and encouraged greater attention to risk appetite, innovation and trade-offs between success rates and experimentation, alongside better alignment of evaluation products with institutional capacity to absorb and

apply lessons. Looking ahead, the EPR team also suggested periodic reviews of recommendation implementation. The team commended IFAD's evaluation function as being among the strongest across multilateral institutions, with a key role in informing policy, programming and replenishment discussions.

Agenda item 7: Country strategy and programme evaluation for the Plurinational State of Bolivia (EC 2026/133/W.P.6 + Add.1)

Key messages:

- Members welcomed the evaluation and the assessment of IFAD's country programme as highly relevant and aligned with IFAD and national priorities. Members stressed the need for more timely, actionable learning, including on innovation and AI use.
- Members requested more information about challenges related to political transitions and institutional change, especially in relation to country programme efficiency. They also called for stronger scaling-up pathways, clearer exit strategies and enhanced domestic resource mobilization to sustain results.
- Members emphasized the need to strengthen operational effectiveness through better field coordination with partners, greater synergy between loan and grant activities, and stronger M&E, knowledge management and policy engagement to support rural transformation. Members also noted the constraints arising from the absence of a dedicated country office.

30. The Evaluation Committee welcomed the CSPE for the Plurinational State of Bolivia, covering the period 2015–2024, as contained in document EC 2026/133/W.P.6; and the agreement at completion point signed by IFAD and the Government, contained in the addendum. The government representative delivered an intervention.

31. Members welcomed the evaluation, noting that IFAD's country programme was assessed as highly relevant and aligned with IFAD and national priorities, and expressed overall satisfaction with the programme's performance. At the same time, some questioned the value of assessing performance over a period of nearly 10 years, suggesting that shorter evaluation cycles could generate more timely and actionable insights. Other welcomed the long evaluation cycle as a way of assessing trends. Clarification was sought on the administrative complexity of public–private transfers, the role of innovation (including AI) in driving transformative change, political risk integration into project design, unmet cofinancing expectations, and the effectiveness of rural transformation approaches.

32. Members took note of the challenges related to political transitions, institutional restructuring and shifting government priorities, and sought clarity on how this was factored into the evaluation methodology. Several interventions emphasized the need for more scaling up of successful interventions, clearer exit strategies and enhanced domestic resource mobilization to support sustainability.

33. Members also acknowledged the constraints on establishing dedicated country offices and suggested leveraging those of other international partners, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Bank, to strengthen field engagement and coordination. Moreover, members called for greater synergies between loan and grant instruments, and improvements in M&E, knowledge management and policy engagement, in line with the country's natural resources endowment and evolving development priorities.

34. IOE clarified that the evaluation period (2015–2024) had been agreed with both Management and the Government to capture major contextual developments, including political changes and the COVID-19 pandemic, and to build on the

previous CSPE. IOE emphasized that the analysis compared performance across periods and portfolios to identify factors of efficiency. The increased administrative complexity of transfers was related to government approval procedures, which contributed to project implementation delays. IOE further specified that recommendation 4(b) on country presence was intended to strengthen in-country engagement, rather than propose the establishment of a permanent office. It noted that weaker policy dialogue reflected broader contextual constraints, while reductions in local government transfers stemmed from national fiscal decisions. Despite challenges in stakeholder consultations, IOE confirmed that all projects had been revisited.

35. Management welcomed the relevance of the evaluation to other countries as it highlighted the challenges posed by political transitions, shifting policy priorities and bureaucratic delays, which affected programme coherence, impact and policy dialogue. Management stressed that engagement at regional and subnational levels often yielded better results and noted IFAD’s early collaboration with the new government, including through a dedicated task force drawing on its in-country experience to support national planning and policy dialogue.

36. Management also outlined measures taken to enhance proximity and responsiveness, including increased supervision resources for more frequent field engagement, strengthened policy dialogue mechanisms, and deeper collaboration on public–private initiatives. Management further highlighted efforts being made in innovation, such as digital agriculture; stronger loan-grant integration; and partnerships, for example, IFAD’s collaboration with the World Bank and bilateral partners. Given the challenges encountered with the Adaptation Fund initiative, alternative climate-related activities were now being pursued, alongside continued agroecological innovation and closer alignment with national planning.

Agenda item 8: Country strategy and programme evaluation for the Republic of Honduras (EC 2026/133/W.P.7 + Add.1)

Key messages:

- The Committee welcomed the Honduras CSPE, noting the programme’s strong performance in terms of relevance, innovation, effectiveness and coherence, and the positive results in women’s participation. Members acknowledged its value as a basis for the next COSOP.
- To strengthen future country programmes, members identified improved portfolio coherence, scaling up, exit strategies and knowledge management as priorities, along with stronger targeting and inclusion, and more robust M&E systems.
- Members called for deeper and more strategic partnerships, clearer roles, stronger coordination – especially within the United Nations system and with the other RBAs, alongside agreements at completion point that are more action-oriented and foster accountability.

37. The Evaluation Committee welcomed the CSPE for Honduras, covering the period 2013–2024, as contained in document EC 2026/133/W.P.7; and the agreement at completion point signed by IFAD and the Government, contained in the addendum. The government representative delivered an intervention.

38. The Committee noted IFAD’s relevance and the positive results achieved in Honduras, including the high level of women’s participation and constructive government engagement. Members welcomed the strong performance in terms of innovation, effectiveness and coherence, which would form a solid basis for the next COSOP. The CSPE had identified opportunities to strengthen programmes through greater portfolio coherence; better knowledge management, policy

engagement and scaling up; the promotion of exit strategies; stronger targeting and inclusion of vulnerable groups, including persons with disabilities; greater use of disaggregated data; and more robust M&E systems. While appreciating the five recommendations, one member noted that they appeared somewhat generic.

39. Members called for more strategic and systematic partnerships, particularly within the United Nations system and with the other RBAs. While acknowledging existing collaboration, they noted untapped opportunities, including in the Dry Corridor. Members called for stronger coordination mechanisms, enhanced engagement through the United Nations Resident Coordinator system, and clearer delineation of roles to avoid duplication and maximize results. Members stressed the importance of articulating IFAD’s comparative advantage and contribution to rural transformation, as well as ensuring alignment between the COSOP cycle and national development strategies. The Committee suggested that agreements at completion point would benefit from being more action-oriented and setting out clearer responsibilities, timelines and accountability.

40. IOE acknowledged that many of the recurring issues identified were cross-cutting and required systemic responses. Regarding the specificity of recommendations, IOE noted that it deliberately provided broad strategic direction rather than prescriptive guidance; however, efforts were ongoing to strike a better balance in line with peer review feedback calling for more focused recommendations. Regarding IFAD’s role and contribution, IOE emphasized that IFAD was often better placed than its partners to demonstrate attribution, given the frequently limited number of actors operating in IFAD’s target areas.

41. Management acknowledged that several of the issues raised – particularly those related to knowledge management, M&E, policy engagement, scaling up, sustainability and exit strategies – were systemic across IFAD’s portfolios and that action was often constrained by limited resources and competing implementation priorities. Nonetheless, Management noted that corporate action plans on sustainability, scaling up, efficiency and exit strategies had already contributed to measurable improvements. Management further emphasized the importance of embedding sustainability and exit planning at the design stage, alongside stronger policy dialogue to translate project lessons into national policies and institutional reforms.

42. On governance and follow-up, Management clarified that agreements at completion point reflected IOE recommendations, which IFAD and governments could accept or reject, while agreeing they should be more concrete and action-oriented. Management highlighted IFAD’s contributions to national policy processes, including the agrifood systems transformation roadmap, and pointed to evidence of impact in areas such as household income, productivity, assets and employment. Management acknowledged the need to further strengthen collaboration with the other RBAs to enhance coordination and complementarities.

Agenda item 9: Other business

43. The Secretary outlined the role of the Evaluation Committee in the selection process for the IOE Director, as set out in the revised Evaluation Policy approved by the Executive Board in 2021, noting that the process reflected the independence of IOE and the Director’s direct reporting line to the Executive Board. It was recalled that the policy prescribed that the recruitment process must begin at least six months before the end of the incumbent’s term, which would conclude on 28 February 2027, and that preparatory work was under way to issue the vacancy announcement in a timely manner.

44. The Committee’s first step was to identify two independent evaluation experts – at least one with experience managing an independent evaluation department – to serve on the search panel alongside three Executive Board representatives, namely

Ms Nalan Yuksel of Canada (List A), Ms Estalina Aimara Baez Ramírez of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (List B), and Mr Kim Hogyun of the Republic of Korea (List C), and a non-voting representative of IFAD Management. The names of the two experts were expected to be shared with the Secretariat by 30 June so as to allow the panel's work to commence; following completion of that work, the Evaluation Committee would review the panel's report between October and November. The Chair would attempt to reach consensus and reflect such consensus in the Evaluation Committee's report. Should consensus not be reached, the differing views would be set forth in the report. The Evaluation Committee would then submit the report for presentation at the Executive Board session in December. The Executive Board would consider the report, deliberate on candidates' suitability, take into account the President's views, and make a decision accordingly.

45. Finally, it was noted that a detailed account of the procedures for the selection and appointment of the IOE Director is provided in annex I of the revised IFAD Evaluation Policy, available on the IFAD Member States Interactive Platform.

46. IOE recalled the various recommendations of the EPR, which included a recommendation on the annexes of the Evaluation Policy. IOE noted that a revision was necessary to strengthen the office's independence, in particular by removing consultation with the President from the final selection stage of the IOE Director. IOE questioned the rationale for identifying the external experts who would participate in the search panel eight months in advance and cautioned that proceeding under the current framework could undermine both the process and the authority of the incumbent Director.

47. In response to queries, the Chief Legal and Governance Officer clarified that the current Evaluation Policy governed the procedures for the selection process and that any amendments to the policy, including annexes, which were an integral part of the policy, would require Executive Board approval. Any proposal by the Evaluation Committee to delay the timeline prescribed by the policy – namely that the process begin at least six months before the end of the current incumbent's term of office with the issuance of the vacancy announcement by August – would deviate from the existing policy and should be reported to the Executive Board with the relevant justification. She noted that following the previous EPR, the Evaluation Committee had reviewed the recommendations and reported to the Executive Board, which then guided the way forward. The policy revisions had taken the requisite amount of time to complete, given the various technical proposals needing the Evaluation Committee's review and analysis, the iterative nature of the deliberations, and the fact that the Executive Board and Evaluation Committee had deemed it appropriate that the incoming IOE Director have time to review proposed changes before finalization via Executive Board approval.

48. IOE noted that the EPR did not call for a full policy revision as the previous EPR had, and that the proposed revisions to the annexes of the policy were limited and would not take significant time to review. It cautioned that proceeding with the process under the current policy annex would not reflect the EPR recommendation.

49. It was suggested that the two independent experts needed to be identified as soon as possible as they formed part of the search panel that would develop the vacancy announcement and decide on advertising modalities and the need for an executive search firm.

50. A member proposed that the process advance in accordance with the current policy noting that the involvement of the President in the process came at a later stage and that the Committee and the Board could discuss this matter in September and come to a decision.

51. In conclusion, it was agreed that further discussions were needed. The Secretariat was tasked with organizing the reconvening of the meeting on a date to be decided and providing full documentation so that an informed decision could be made.

Reconvened session

52. The reconvened session was held on 2 July. The session was attended by Committee members from Egypt, Finland, Germany, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Nigeria (Chairperson) and Switzerland. Observers were present from China and the United States. Members thanked IOE and the Office of the Secretary (SEC) for the documentation provided ahead of the meeting.

53. Deliberations focused on the process, timeline and next steps for the appointment of the next IOE Director, noting the written proposal by IOE of two modifications to the annexes of the IFAD Evaluation Policy in light of the EPR (modification to annex I of the Evaluation Policy).[1] Members broadly agreed on the urgency of launching the recruitment process, while differing on the timing and procedure for addressing possible policy and annex revisions linked to the independence of the selection process.

54. There was broad consensus on the wish to move forward efficiently with the IOE Director recruitment process, particularly the constitution of the search panel and issuance of the vacancy announcement, in order to abide by the timeline of submitting a report the Executive Board in December. While some members emphasized that the EPR report should first be reviewed by the Executive Board before policy amendments were advanced, as they viewed the recruitment process as being distinct from consideration of the EPR recommendations, others did not wish to decide at this point to defer consideration of the recommended revisions.

55. Clarity was provided as regards the identification of the two independent experts that would participate in the search panel. Members shared criteria for due consideration in identifying such experts in order to ensure gender balance and merit-based selection and address conflicts of interest. Full information would be required to ensure a thorough process.

56. It was agreed that IOE would provide SEC with a list of eligible experts, accompanied by background information and years of relevant experience, for circulation to Evaluation Committee members by close of business on 3 July. Members were to provide rankings or input by 8 July, with the aim of identifying the external experts by 10 July. SEC would contact candidates to confirm availability, willingness to serve and the absence of conflicts of interest. The search panel, once constituted, would meet soon thereafter to review the vacancy announcement in order to allow the position to be advertised in July.

57. Some members expressed the need to discuss the proposed revisions so that they could be considered in time for implementation within the current process. The Committee also agreed that discussion of the EPR recommendations, including review of possible policy revisions, would continue. The Chair indicated that the Evaluation Committee would consider the matter at its session on 4 September, ahead of the Executive Board session on 15 September. The outcome could be either a recommendation of certain policy revisions to the Board or a presentation of the Committee’s views and discussions to date, depending on members’ deliberations. The Chair emphasized that the Board was the final decision-making body on any changes to the policy or annexes, while the Committee would continue to work proactively and transparently.

[1] Annex II of IOE’s session document outlines proposed roles and responsibilities for clarification under the revised Evaluation Policy for the selection of the IOE Director and is not intended to serve as a new annex to the Evaluation Policy.