



IFAD
INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
Evaluation Committee - Twenty-Sixth Session
Rome, 4 December 2000

PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR 2001
OF THE
OFFICE OF EVALUATION AND STUDIES



ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ACP	Agreement at Completion Point
CLP	Core Learning Partnership
CPE	Country Programme Evaluation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAE	New Approach to Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OE	Office of Evaluation and Studies
PD	Programme Management Department
PRP	Process Reengineering Programme
TA	Technical Assistance



I. REVIEW OF 2000 ACHIEVEMENTS

1. The first year of implementation of the New Approach to Evaluation (NAE), developed in 1999, took place in 2000. In addition, a number of major corporate initiatives that were launched in 2000 have significantly affected the work of the Office of Evaluation and Studies (OE): IFAD V: Plan of Action (2000-2002) (hereafter Plan of Action); the revised score cards; the Rural Poverty Report; and, above all, the Process Re-Engineering Programme (PRP).
2. In the following sections, a brief description is provided of how each of *OE's four main priorities for 2000 have been implemented.

A. The New Approach to Evaluation

3. The staff of OE is firmly committed to working with the new strategy, which is an innovative approach to enhancing the impact of IFAD's operations and achieving its objective of becoming a knowledge centre on rural poverty alleviation. In the last year, OE's partners within the evaluation process have firmly supported the NAE, particularly with regard to the three main features of the 1999 re-engineered evaluation process: the Approach Paper, the Core Learning Partnership (CLP), and the Agreement at Completion Point (ACP)¹. With the introduction of the NAE, OE now conducts evaluations in a very different manner compared with the past:

- NAE's first strategic direction has been the shifting of OE's past focus on project evaluations to policy/strategy, country programme and thematic evaluations, in line with the trend experienced by the evaluation departments of Development Assistance Committee agencies. That trend reflects the significant change over the past decade in the way development assistance is delivered and measured: the undertaking of more country-level programmes and thematic initiatives and sector-wide approaches complements the traditional project-based approach. The shift is also based on the recognition that lessons learned from project evaluations tend to be very specific, making it hard to draw generalizations. Furthermore, since evaluations are normally carried out at the end of the project cycle, lessons may be learned too late to be of use for the projects concerned. Examples of higher-level evaluations conducted in 2000 include: the IFAD/Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) Extended Cooperation Programme, which paved the way for formulating a coherent strategy for IFAD's cooperation with NGOs and highlighted the need for greater emphasis on innovative approaches to selecting activities for financing; IFAD's capacity to promote replicable innovation (initiated in 2000 as stipulated in the Plan of Action), which is expected to contribute to the development of the Fund's capacity and strategy in this critical area; and, finally, three Country Programme Evaluations (CPEs) in Papua New Guinea, Syria and

¹ **Approach Paper:** Prepared by the concerned Evaluation Officer in close connection with his/her evaluation partners, the AP provides concise background information on, and the rationale for, the evaluation activity to be undertaken. The process and phases of evaluation and the methodology to be used are described. The finalized paper provides the guiding framework for the undertaking of the evaluation/study.

The Core Learning Partnership: This is composed of representatives of the main evaluation partners such as IFAD's Programme Management Department (PD), government, OE, project-level staff, etc. The involvement of other partners, including community-based organizations, non-governmental organizations, beneficiaries and cooperating institutions, is pursued wherever feasible. The CLP collaborates in the design and approval of the AP, discusses the draft evaluation report and develops recommendations, lessons learned and related follow-up. The CLP also plans the process leading to the ACP.

Agreement at Completion Point: The learning and knowledge generated by the evaluation is officially acknowledged and internalized within IFAD's knowledge systems and by the partnership. The ACP is a written understanding that illustrates the stakeholders' consensus and commitment to adopt and implement evaluation recommendations expected to improve the performance of IFAD-supported operations and policies.



Viet Nam, which have provided clear building blocks for formulating Country Strategic Opportunities Papers for these countries².

- The NAE's second strategic direction is the transformation of each evaluation into a systematic process of learning with OE's various evaluation partners. While the NAE calls for evaluation analysis to be undertaken in a rigorous and timely manner, it also recognizes that the production of thick evaluation reports and the consequent overflow of information and lessons is less useful. Therefore, OE's staff time and resources have been redirected towards both the learning processes that take place among partners during evaluations, i.e., through workshops with the Division's partners in all evaluations, and proper feedback and communication of results and lessons learned. The first year has proved that the concept of the CLP is a key to this learning process. Although there are variations in the way the CLP can be implemented in different countries and situations, the concept itself is a viable proposition. A notable example of a good CLP was the CPE for Viet Nam: interaction among the CLP at the end of the mission included a videoconference, which proved to be a very cost-effective tool for the purpose.
- The third key feature of the new OE strategy is the significant contribution that each and every evaluation is expected to make towards improving IFAD's policies and operations. For this reason, the final outcome of each evaluation now consists of an ACP among the main evaluation partners on lessons learned and recommended follow-up action, the adoption of which can be monitored in future years. Furthermore, the ACP has proved to be a useful advocacy tool for the promotion of civil society within the evaluation process. The ACP of the interim evaluation of the Food Security Project in the Northern Guéra Region in Chad, for example, was reached among IFAD, the Government, and a number of NGOs and farmers' organizations. This strengthened the position of civil society in a context that does not usually encourage the participation of NGOs and community-based organizations. In 2000, OE concluded seven ACPs.

B. Development of a New Dissemination and Communication Approach

4. As a first stage in the development of the new dissemination and communication approach to evaluation, OE embarked upon an analysis of the communication requirements of various stakeholders, which yielded a number of important insights. OE has now begun to formulate a more client-oriented approach towards communication during the entire evaluation cycle.

5. Although work on the new approach will be completed in early 2001, OE has already started producing more concise evaluation reports for rapid finalization. For example, the evaluation of the Rural Enterprises Project in Ghana took four months from the drafting of the Approach Paper, discussion of the ACP and distribution of the final report. Evaluation reports are now also more reader-friendly in that they have a more attractive cover and contain colour photographs and maps, as well as personal history profiles. In addition, new formats are being tested for publishing excerpts and summaries from evaluation reports, as in the case of the small booklet produced in collaboration with the Publications Unit for distribution at a donor roundtable meeting in Accra on the evaluation of the Rural Enterprises Project. Yet another example of action to ensure wider dissemination and internalization of evaluation results was the translation into the Tamil language of the ACP on the completion evaluation of the Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project.

6. Similarly, OE worked closely with the Management Information Systems Division in 2000 on the development of a new section on "Evaluation and Learning" in the corporate web site. In a further effort to promote the sharing of knowledge derived from evaluation, the Sixty-Ninth Session of the Executive Board approved an extension of IFAD's policy on the disclosure of documents and recommended that all evaluation-related documents be disclosed to the public.

² A list of all evaluations conducted in 2000, including four main thematic evaluations, is contained in Annex I.



C. Methodological Work for Impact and Performance Assessment

7. From IFAD's perspective, 'impact' can be defined as the "change brought by the Fund to the lives of the rural poor and their communities as well the change that affects the environment within which they operate to enhance sustainability". Such an impact is produced by activities undertaken by IFAD (together with its partners). These activities involve two broad categories: projects and programmes financed by loans and grants; and advocacy, policy dialogue and knowledge sharing, and dissemination. There is a pressing need for the Fund to develop a sound methodology for impact assessment at the corporate and project levels, as set out in the Plan of Action recommendation that the Fund improve its impact assessment, and to devise and implement a strategy for sharing lessons learned.

8. In order to rise to the challenges involved in developing such a methodology, OE conducted three methodological studies in 2000, each with the specific objective of formulating a coherent approach to impact assessment. **The first study**, on impact and performance assessment, was initiated in response to the increasing recognition of the need to develop within IFAD the capacity to assess performance and impact at the corporate level.

9. Based on the foregoing considerations, OE concluded a stocktaking exercise in the first half of 2000. A paper entitled "Methodological Approaches to Performance Assessment of IFAD Projects" reviewed the methodologies used by IFAD and other donors and proposed a tentative framework of impact and performance assessment. More recently, in the context of the PRP exercise, OE proposed, *inter alia*, the development (at the corporate level) of a set of common categories of impact indicators (to be used across all types of evaluations), reflecting IFAD's mandate, corporate strategy and stakeholder expectations, as well as a harmonized impact assessment methodology.

10. **The second study**, on support to monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems at the project level, is based on the realization that project-level impact monitoring and assessment is fundamental for learning and improvement of performance and hence for impact achievement. However, improved M&E systems at the project level are also important because they feed the whole process of corporate-level impact assessment, consolidation, learning and improvement. In many ways, the effectiveness of corporate-level impact and performance assessment will depend upon the quality of project-level M&E. The Division's M&E support aims at the identification of good practices and development of tools and guidelines for effective project M&E systems. In 2000, OE reviewed IFAD's experience in M&E over the last ten years. The outcome of this review, which was discussed at an in-house seminar in May 2000, was the need to emphasize discussion of M&E processes rather than technical M&E tools; the importance of involving field-level partners in discussions; and the need to coordinate with the PRP exercise. As a consequence, OE joined the Programme Management Department (PD) Working Group on Impact Achievement Through the Project Cycle. The synthesizing report of the review was presented as work-in-progress to the Evaluation Committee of the Seventieth Session of the Executive Board in September 2000. In addition, at the request of IFAD's regional divisions, OE undertook a number of direct M&E support missions to specific projects (e.g., to the Sahelian Areas Development Fund Programme in Mali), which involved highly participatory workshops.

11. **The third study**, on participatory evaluation methodologies, was initiated in October 1999. The study examined the range of approaches, methods and tools used by IFAD and other institutions to inject a stronger participatory dimension into project evaluation. It also assessed the adequacy of such approaches and methods in different contexts and identified good practices to be used in all IFAD evaluations.

12. During 2000, OE also participated in the PRP Impact Management Working Group. Impact management aims to ensure that the impact of IFAD-supported activities in combating rural poverty is constantly monitored, assessed, improved and effectively communicated. The goal is to increase the



effectiveness of IFAD and its partners in reducing rural poverty and, in so doing, enhance financial and political support for the Fund's mandate. The impact assessment initiatives undertaken by OE and its involvement in impact management as part of the re-engineering exercise have been mutually reinforcing. The orientation of the three aforementioned studies and their thrusts take full account of the emerging results of the PRP and the ultimate goal of improving impact achievement and performance at the corporate level.

D. Reorganization of the Office of Evaluation and Studies

13. As a first step in aligning OE's organizational set-up with the new evaluation strategy developed in 1999, the Division has been reorganized into five regional teams. The main objective of the teams is to build up, within OE, expertise and knowledge on the work priorities and directions of each IFAD regional division, the ultimate aim being to support the development of the organization's regional strategies through appropriate evaluation work. Before it can develop its full potential, however, the concept of OE regional teams needs time and nurturing. Although peer reviews within the teams are not yet held on a regular basis, good results have been obtained with a number of pilot initiatives in 2000.

14. The Division has also established two functional desks: Evaluation Committee relations and communication affairs; and programme of work and budget issues. All General Service staff positions have been reclassified.

E. Other Activities Performed by the Office of Evaluation and Studies in 2000

OE Programme of Work for 2000³

15. In 1999, OE developed a new instrument for formulating its annual work programme. As such, the preparation of the 2000 work programme required a comprehensive round of initial discussions with PD divisions. The programme of work for 2000 was finally approved by senior management in November 1999, and discussed in the Evaluation Committee in December 1999.

16. The implementation of the programme of work for 2000 was reviewed in June 2000 during a mid-year review (MYR) with the participation of the entire OE team. Note was taken of the unprecedented demands on OE staff time in relation to PRP, the Rural Poverty Report and the Plan of Action. For this reason, the completion of some of OE's objectives for 2000 will slip into the first quarter of 2001. It also emerged from the MYR that the next OE programme of work should contain a pipeline of evaluation work covering a two-year period in order to allow for necessary lead-time and flexibility.

Partnership

17. OE organized seven partnership meetings with the heads and representatives of evaluation divisions of various bilateral and multilateral agencies, namely, the Danish International Development Assistance, the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom, the German Agency for Technical Cooperation, the Government of The Netherlands, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency and the World Bank. The overall objectives of these meetings were to understand the role of evaluation in other organizations, exchange experiences with related methodologies and pave the way for future partnerships in areas of mutual interest.

18. The Division acted as focal point in organizing the Fund's participation in the Second Global Knowledge Conference, held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, in March 2000. On that occasion, OE

³ See Annex I.



organized a number of events with other partners, including an international contest to scout for knowledge and innovation among rural people and the production of a documentary film entitled "Forests, Local Knowledge and Livelihoods", which emphasized the importance of local knowledge for development.

19. The Division was represented at the Workshop on Evaluation Feedback for Effective Learning and Accountability, organized by the Government of Japan in cooperation with the Development Assistance Committee Working Party on Aid Evaluation. OE has officially requested that IFAD should be admitted to the working party in an observer capacity.

Evaluation Committee

20. The Evaluation Committee held its three sessions in February, September and December 2000, respectively. A new Evaluation Committee was elected during the Sixty-Ninth Session of the Executive Board in May 2000, and met for the first time in September 2000. On the latter occasion, the Committee elected a new chairperson (Mexico).

Process Re-Engineering Project and Plan of Action

21. Nine OE staff members have been involved in six of the nine PRP working groups: (i) Impact Management (sponsor and co-sponsor); (ii) Knowledge Management; (iii) Project Cycle; (iv) Partnership Management; (v) Support Services; and (vi) Information Technology. Given the size of the Division, this was a significant contribution. Involvement in the PRP was not, however, cost-free for the Division. Although compensation was provided by way of funds for the recruitment of consultants, only a limited amount of the duties usually performed by the OE staff members could be delegated. Furthermore, OE seconded one of its General Service staff to work with the PRP team.

22. As mentioned earlier, work has started on all three of the action lines for which OE is answerable under Objective B(iii) and B(iv) of the Plan of Action (see table in Section 3). This initial work has been financed entirely from OE's administrative budget, with the exception of the evaluation of IFAD's innovation capability, for which supplementary funds were mobilized from Switzerland and Finland.

II. PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES FOR 2001

23. In the formulation of its priorities for 2001-2002, OE has been influenced by three major considerations: (i) priorities set in the Plan of Action and the 2001 score cards; (ii) expected OE participation in the implementation phase of the PRP in the areas where OE can make the most tangible contribution, i.e. impact management and knowledge management; and (iii) current OE activities that need to be carried over into 2001 for completion.

24. Based on these considerations, OE has identified its three priority areas for 2001, as follows: (i) impact management; (ii) knowledge management and innovation; and (iii) the new approach to evaluation.



III. MAIN FEATURES OF THE PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR 2001

25. Details of the OE programme of work for 2001 are provided in Annex II. The following sections describe how OE intends to implement the above priorities and objectives.

A. Impact Management

26. Activity in this area corresponds to the Objective B(iii) of the Plan of Action and is divided into two areas:

- **Development of an improved methodological framework for impact assessment (and its consistent use) in evaluating IFAD's projects and programmes⁴.** The ongoing study (initiated in 2000 and to be concluded in 2001) has two main objectives. First, the aim is to develop a framework and methodology for corporate-level impact assessment and evaluation criteria. The latter will be used systematically in all evaluation activities (i.e. of project and country programmes and thematic evaluations), and allow for aggregation and consolidation of results at the corporate level. The methodology will include, *inter alia*, the specification of, and agreement on, a common set of impact indicators. The second objective is to develop a methodological framework for the issuance by IFAD of an "Annual Report on Impact Assessment and Development Effectiveness", which will compile and analyse the results of a critical mass of completion and interim evaluations undertaken during the course of a year, as well as thematic evaluations and CPEs. It will also provide a consolidated picture of the performance and effectiveness of a group of similar projects, and synthesize lessons learned from these and other evaluations. The evaluations will be selected in collaboration with PD and the beneficiary countries concerned and undertaken in accordance with the strategic guidelines of the NAE and the unified methodology for impact assessment. When addressing these objectives, the studies will supplement the ongoing self-evaluation effort performed by PD on a yearly basis and recognize both the Fund's generalized use of the project logframe system and its efforts to strengthen M&E systems at the project level. IFAD senior management will approve the final list of project/programme evaluations in order to ensure that they reflect the organization's corporate priorities and the recommendations of the new processes for impact management and knowledge management.
- **Identification of best practices and the development of tools and guidelines for an effective M&E system at the project level.** In 2000, OE developed a definition of basic requirements for project M&E (processes and tools) that were discussed at the International Workshop on Impact Achievement organized by IFAD in November 2000. Based on the outcome of these discussions, in 2001, OE will provide assistance to IFAD's regional divisions and their projects in an effort to operationalize and introduce effective M&E systems at the project level. The Division will also provide support by (i) setting up and supporting, on a pilot basis, the M&E functions of a limited number of new IFAD projects; and (ii) developing regional M&E support networks in regions specified by PD. The extent of such direct OE support will depend on the level of resources made available to OE in coming years.

⁴ A summary of how OE's priorities relate to the PRP and the Plan of Action is contained in the table on Page 9.



B. Knowledge Management and Innovation

27. Activities in this area in 2001 will entail:

- **Completion of the evaluation initiated in 2000 of IFAD's capacity as a promoter of replicable innovations in rural poverty reduction.** The Report of the Consultation to Review the Adequacy of the Resources Available to IFAD recommended that the Fund should test and promote more effective, innovative approaches to rural poverty eradication. The above-mentioned evaluation, which was contained in the Plan of Action, aims at providing IFAD with a better understanding of how it may strengthen its capacity and performance in innovation and knowledge management, in line with its comparative advantages and stakeholder expectations. The evaluation will also provide building blocks and a framework for developing an IFAD strategy for the promotion of innovations and the sharing of innovative learning and knowledge on rural poverty alleviation.
- **Evaluation of the technical assistance (TA) grant programme for agricultural research.** IFAD's intention to conduct this major evaluation was outlined in the paper entitled "Grant Financing: A New Approach" (document EB 2000/69/R.11) submitted to the Sixty-Ninth Session of the Executive Board in May 2000. Although the Board requested further information in the form of an additional document, the conducting of such an evaluation was not disputed. Coupled with the results of the 2000 evaluation of the IFAD/NGO Extended Cooperation Programme (see para. 3), the evaluation under reference is expected to have an important bearing on the formulation of IFAD's policy on the TA grant programme. As IFAD management intends to present a document on the latter policy to the Board during the course of 2001, the evaluation is both timely and expected to produce insights that complement the ongoing evaluation of IFAD's capability to promote innovations. Furthermore, the concept of TA grants for agricultural research is clearly innovative.
- **Contribution to the development of the strategy on corporate knowledge management.** This activity will take place within the framework of the PRP implementation phase. OE has released two of its staff to participate in the PRP Working Group on Knowledge Management and, as such, will take an active part in formulating the knowledge management strategy and defining building blocks and organizational infrastructure.
- **Thematic evaluations⁵.** These particular evaluations have been selected in cooperation with other IFAD divisions and departments and approved by senior management, in line with the organization's requirement for knowledge management.

C. New Approach to Evaluation and Communication

28. In the first quarter of 2001, OE will complete work on the development of a more effective approach to evaluation and communication, for implementation during the course of the year. The expected outcomes are the restructuring and revamping of the Evaluation Knowledge System; increased reader-friendliness and standardization of evaluation reports; improved communication components in the new evaluation processes developed in 2000; and an assessment of the feasibility of new communication tools and approaches, such as the development of an outreach capability within OE.

29. All evaluation missions undertaken by OE in 2000 were required to produce brief summaries of their experience with the NAE and new evaluation processes; and, when appropriate, to outline the

⁵ See Annex II.



remedial and/or follow-up measures required. Based on these summaries, in early 2001, OE intends to conduct a stocktaking exercise of the first year's experience in implementing the NAE and the new evaluation processes and products. This exercise is intended fine-tune and, where necessary, adjust the Fund's evaluation strategy so as to render it more effective in terms of supporting new processes for impact and knowledge management.

30. In the light of the above-mentioned stocktaking exercise, in early 2000 the Division intends to determine the most suitable organizational set-up to support both implementation of the NAE and Plan of Action activities for which it is responsible. Specifically, this will entail reviewing the objectives of the OE regional teams established in 2000, which were to: (i) collaborate with PD regional divisions in preparing and implementing their annual evaluation work programmes; (ii) promote policy dialogue with regional divisions through evaluation work; (iii) within OE, build up specific knowledge of individual regional issues, work priorities and strategic directions; and (iv) further develop OE's internal cross-fertilization work through peer reviews of all evaluations undertaken.

D. Evaluation Committee

31. The Evaluation Committee will hold three sessions in 2001 in conjunction with the Twenty-Fourth Session of the Governing Council in February and the Seventy-Third and Seventy-Fourth Sessions of the Executive Board in September and December, respectively. During the course of the year, the Committee will discuss a number of evaluations undertaken as part of OE' 2001 work programme. As per the rules of procedure, a field visit for members of the Committee will be organized in 2001. Finally, a summary of the Committee's activities during 2000 will be contained in the annual progress report on evaluation, which will be prepared by OE and presented to the Seventy-Second Session of the Executive Board in April 2001.



TABLE 1
HOW OE PRIORITIES RELATE TO THE PRP AND PLAN OF ACTION

OE PRIORITIES	PRP	PLAN OF ACTION
Impact Management		
1.a. Develop methodological framework for impact assessment at the corporate level	Impact Management Working Group recommendations No. 1 and 4	Objective B(iii), Action 1
1.b. Develop effective participatory M&E systems at the project level.	Impact Management Working Group recommendations No. 6 and 7 and Project Cycle Working Group recommendations	Objective B(iii), Action 2
1.c. Conduct project evaluations and CPEs	Impact Management Working Group recommendations No. 1 and 4	Objective B(ii), Action 2
Knowledge Management		
2.a. Evaluation of IFAD's capacity to promote replicable innovation in rural poverty		Objective B(iv), Action 1
2.b. Evaluation of the agricultural research component of the TA grant programme		Objective B(vi), Action 1b
2.c. Contribute to the development of a corporate strategy on knowledge management and related organizational infrastructure and building blocks	Knowledge management Working Group recommendations No. 1, 2 & 3	Objective B(iv)
2.d. Conduct thematic evaluations	Relevant for knowledge management	Objective B(i) Action 1, Objective B(ii) Action 2
New Approach to Evaluation		
3.a. Review experience with NAE and make necessary adjustments	Relevant for impact management and knowledge management	
3.b. Recast OE's approach to communication	ditto	Objective B (iv)
3.c. Complete reorganization of OE	ditto	

REVIEW OF THE OE PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR 2000

Evaluation Work in 2000

	TYPE	REGION	NUMBER
1.	Policy/strategy evaluations	-Evaluation of IFAD's capability as a promoter of replicable innovations - IFAD/NGO Extended Cooperation Programme	1 1
2.	Country Programme Evaluations ¹	- Asia and the Pacific (PI) - Near East/ North Africa (PN)	2 1
3.	Thematic Evaluations ²		5
4.	Project Evaluations:		
4.1	Interim evaluations ³	- Eastern and Southern Africa (PF) - Western and Central Africa (PA) - Latin America and the Caribbean (PL) - Near East and North Africa (PN)	3 1 3 1
4.2	Completion evaluations ⁴	- Western and Central Africa (PA) - Asia and the Pacific (PI)	1 1
4.3	Mid-term evaluations ⁵	- Near East and North Africa (PN)	1
	Total evaluations		21
5.	Methodological and strategic work ⁶		4
6.	M&E support ⁷		6
	Total evaluation work		31

¹ CPEs were conducted in Syria; Viet Nam, in conjunction with a Country Programme Review; and Papua New Guinea as part of a Regional Programme Evaluation of IFAD operations in the Pacific Islands.

² Thematic evaluations were carried out on: water users' associations; participatory irrigation (phase II); agricultural extension interventions in West and Central Africa; rural agricultural marketing in the United Republic of Tanzania; community ownership of food/nutrition security intervention tools (ongoing); and rural financial services in China.

³ The following interim evaluations were carried out: Ghana, Rural Enterprises Project; Mauritania, Maghama Improved Flood Recession Farming Project; Uganda, Masindi District Integrated Community Development Project; Mozambique, Nampula Artisanal Fisheries Project; Madagascar, Upper Mandrare Basin Development Project; El Salvador, Rehabilitation and Development Project for War-Torn Areas in the Department of Chalatenango; Honduras, Agricultural Development Programme for the Western Region; and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Smallholder Crop Improvement and Marketing Project.

⁴ Niger, Aguié Rural Development Project; India, Andhra Pradesh Tribal Development Project.

⁵ Jordan, Agricultural Resource Management Project in the Governorates of Karak and Tafila.

⁶ The following methodological and strategic work was carried out: impact/performance assessment of IFAD's operations; participatory evaluation study; M&E systems support work, phase I; stocktaking reviews, phase II; synthesis of main issues and proposed solutions, and three basic requirements for project-level M&E; development of a dissemination and communication approach to evaluation (phase I completed).

⁷ M&E support as follows: PL/PREVAL 2, PI/Bangladesh, PI/Sri Lanka, PF/United Republic of Tanzania-Mauritius, PA/Guinea, PA/Mali (two missions).



OE PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR 2001-2002

* Responsible person within OE not yet determined

<i>Area of work</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Start Date</i>	<i>Expected Finish</i>	<i>Responsible Persons</i>
1. Policy/ strategy evaluations	Evaluation of IFAD's capability to promote replicable innovation	2000	2 nd Quarter 2001	Bishay/ CLP with PD staff
	Evaluation of the agricultural research component of the TA grant programme	2001	3 rd / 4 th Quarter 2001	*/ Mathur
	Evaluation of natural resources management in IFAD projects	2002	2002	*/ Mwanundu
	Evaluation of women's grass-roots organizations in IFAD projects	2002	2002	*/ Crowley
2. CPEs	Papua New Guinea/ Pacific Islands	2000	2 nd Quarter .2001	Eklund/ Prayer Galletti
	Syria	2000	1 st Quarter 2001	Bishay/ Abdouli
	Sri Lanka	1 st Quarter 2001	2 nd Quarter 2001	*/Ramesh
	Tanzania, United Republic of	3 rd Quarter 2001	4 th Quarter 2001	*/Faisal
	Turkey (CPR/ CPE)	2001	2001	*/Hassani
	Tunisia	2002	2002	*/El Harizi
3. Thematic evaluations	Agricultural extension interventions in West and Central Africa	2000	1 st Quarter 2001	Audinet/ Kingsbury/ Jatta
	Rural financial services in China	2000	1 st Quarter 2001	Eklund/ Martens
	Marketing and prices in the United Republic of Tanzania	2000	1 st Quarter 2001	Muthoo/ Faisal
	Soil and water conservation and agro-forestry: impact study in Burkina Faso	End 2000	2001	*/ Trupke
	Study on organic agriculture in Latin America	2001	2002	*/ Hopkins
	Evaluation of livestock and pastoral development operations in three ongoing projects in Morocco	2001	2001	*/ Nourallah
	Impact of microfinance schemes in West and Central Africa	4 th Quarter 2001	2002	*/ Tounessi
	Country thematic evaluation on decentralization in Indonesia	2 nd Quarter 2002	2002	*/ Prayer Galletti
	Evaluation of IFAD operations in land reclamation and impact on natural resources management in the Near East and North Africa region.	2002	2002	*/ Abdouli
	ENRAP TA grant	4 th Quarter 2001	2002	*/ Thapa
	FIDAMERICA TA grant	3 rd Quarter 2001	1 st Quarter 2002	*/ Murguia

<i>Area of work</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Start Date</i>	<i>Expected Finish</i>	<i>Responsible persons</i>
4.1 Interim evaluations	Mauritania: Maghama Improved Flood Recession Farming Project	2000	2 nd Quarter 2001	Palmeri/ Ben Senia
	Niger: Aguié Rural Development Project	2000	1 st Quarter 2001	Audinet/ Manssouri
	Guinea: Smallholder Development in the Forest Region	2001	2001	Audinet/ Nsimpasi
	Pakistan: Neelum and Jhelum Valleys Community Development Project	1 st Quarter 2001	3 rd Quarter 2001	*/ Attig
	Laos: Bokeo Food Security Project	1 st Quarter 2001	3 rd Quarter 2001	*/ Wang
	Panama: Rural Development Project for Ngobe Communities	1 st Quarter 2001	3 rd Quarter 2001	*/ Murguia
	Togo: Support to Village Groups in the Eastern Savannah Region Project	2 nd Quarter 2001	2001	*/ Marzin
	Tanzania, United Republic of: Mara Region Farmers' Initiative Project	2 nd Quarter 2001	4 th Quarter 2001	*/ Faisal
	Yemen: Tihama Environment Protection Project	2 nd Quarter 2001	3 rd Quarter 2001	*/ Rahman
	Chad: Ouadis of Kanem Agricultural Development Project	3 rd Quarter 2001	2002	*/ Nsimpasi
	Swaziland: Smallholder Agricultural Development Project	3 rd Quarter 2001	2001	*/ Yayock
	Mauritania: Oasis Development Project, Phase II	2002	2002	*/ Ben Senia
	Zambia: Smallholder Irrigation and Water Use Programme	2002	2002	*/ David e Silva
4.2 Completion evaluations	India: Andhra Pradesh Tribal Development Project	2000	1 st Quarter 2001	Muthoo/ Khadka
	Armenia: North-West Agricultural Services Project	3 rd Quarter 2001	4 th Quarter 2001	*/ Turilli
	Ethiopia: Informal Seed Component of the Seed Systems Development Project	2002	2002	*/ Gicharu
	D.P.R. Korea: Sericulture Development Project	2002	2002	*/ Musharraf
	India: Maharashtra Rural Credit Project	2002	2002	*/ Khadka
5. Methodological and strategic work	Impact assessment at the corporate Level	2000	2001	Bishay
	M&E systems at the project level	2000	2 nd Quarter 2001	Silveri/ Audinet
	Communication strategy for OE	2000	2 nd Quarter 2001	Palmeri/ Muthoo/ Keating
6. M&E support	Mali: Sahelian Areas Development Fund Programme	2000	2001	Audinet/ Jatta
	Angola: Assistance in setting up M&E system in the Northern Region Foodcrops Development Project	1 st Quarter 2001	2001	*/ David e Silva
	India: Bihar-Madhya Pradesh Tribal Development Programme	2 nd Quarter 2001	2001	*/ Khadka
	Viet Nam: Country-level M&E support	2 nd Quarter 2001	2001	*/ Prayer Galletti
	Uruguay: National Smallholder Support Project, Phase II	2 nd Quarter 2001	2001	*/ Glikman
	Cape Verde: Rural Poverty Alleviation Programme	2001	2001	*/ Manssouri
	Madagascar: Evaluation of M&E system vis-à-vis impact achievement in Madagascar projects	2001	2001	*/ David e Silva
	Sao Tome and Principe: Participatory Smallholders and Artisanal Fisheries Development Programme	2002	2002	*/ Sparacino



PRODUCT DESCRIPTIONS

Project Evaluations

1. Project-level evaluations are undertaken throughout the implementation cycle. The different types of evaluations all share the purpose of improving project performance – both currently and for the future.

- **Mid-term evaluations** are undertaken at around the mid-life of project implementation, when approximately 50% of the funds have been disbursed.
- **Interim evaluations** are compulsory steps before embarking on a second phase of a project or launching a similar project in the same region. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of such evaluations are used as the basis for improving the design of subsequent interventions.
- **Completion evaluations** are conducted after the finalization of the project completion report prepared by the borrower or the Cooperating institution, generally 3–18 months after the project closing date.

Thematic Evaluations

2. Thematic evaluations and studies are undertaken to provide *building blocks* for revisiting existing, or formulating new, operational strategies and policies. They are also designed to assess the effectiveness of IFAD's processes and approaches and to contribute to increasing the Fund's knowledge on specific issues and subjects. Such evaluations not only build on the findings of project evaluations but also draw on a variety of external sources, and will thus be supplemented by further investigation. They will be conducted in close consultation with, and with the agreement of, OE's core partners, particularly PD.

Country Programme Evaluations

3. CPEs provide direct inputs for establishing effective Country Strategic Opportunities Papers, which are progressively assuming greater importance at IFAD. In particular, CPEs are expected to assist in providing comparative information on the most essential aspects of project performance and to contribute to developing strategic and operational orientation for IFAD's future project pipelines in individual countries. CPEs will be focused and results-oriented, and conducted in a highly participatory manner. A further objective of CPEs is to contribute elements to IFAD's policy dialogue on poverty alleviation, improve the implementation of ongoing projects and contribute to the generation of knowledge on the countries involved through the distilling of a series of lessons learned.