a

IFAD
INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
Evaluation Committee – Thirty-Sixth Session

Rome, 1 July 2004

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE
OF THE
EVALUATION COMMITTEE OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ACP	Agreement at Completion Point
ARRI	Annual Report on the Results and Impact of IFAD Operations
CODE	Committee on Development Effectiveness of the World Bank
DEC	Development Effectiveness Committee of the ADB
EB	IFAD's Executive Board
EC	Evaluation Committee of the Executive Board
EO	Policy Division
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFI	International Financial Institution
OE	Office of Evaluation
PEC	Policy and Evaluation Committee of the IADB
PMD	Programme Management Department
POWB	Programme of Work and Budget of IFAD
RIMS	Results and Impact Management System
ROP	Rules of Procedure of the EC
TOR	Terms of Reference of the EC
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WB	The World Bank
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.   **Introduction.** In April 2003, the Executive Board (EB) approved the IFAD Evaluation Policy[1]. The Evaluation Policy was prepared in response to a decision made by the Consultation on the Sixth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources for IFAD to establish the Office of Evaluation (OE) as an independent evaluation office, reporting directly to the EB.

2.   The adoption and implementation of the Evaluation Policy created the need for a review of the role and functioning of the Evaluation Committee (EC), including its interactions with the EB and the OE. In fact, at its April 2003 session, the EB "agreed on the need to revise the rules of procedure and terms of reference of the Evaluation Committee and entrusted the committee with this responsibility, requesting that it submit its proposal to a future session of the Board"[2]. Consequently, at its special session in October 2003 session, the EC charted out the road map and timeframes (see paragraph 4) for revising its terms of reference (TOR) and rules of procedure (ROP), which would culminate in the presentation of the proposed TOR and ROP of the Evaluation Committee for the approval by the Board during the latter's session in December 2004[3].

3.   The Committee held a special session on 20 February 2004 to brainstorm on the main issues related to the EC's TOR and ROP. At the meeting in February, the EC decided that additional research was required to prepare the draft proposal for the EC's revised TOR and ROP. The broad TOR for the additional research was outlined during the meeting, which included a comparative analysis of the objectives and *modus operandi* of committees similar to the EC in the Asian Development Bank (ADB), Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) and the World Bank, as well as further interviews with all EC members and other EB members who attend the EC regularly as observers (including the three List convenors)[4].

4.   Building on the above-mentioned process, the EC requested OE to prepare on its behalf a document with the proposed TOR and ROP for discussion during the Committee's 36th session on 1 July 2004. Thereafter, the proposal will be refined including the guidance and comments of the Committee and presented again for discussion to the 37th session of the EC on 3 September 2004. Following any additional enhancements based on comments provided during the 37th EC session, the document will be submitted by the EC for approval to the EB session in December 2004. Finally, in the framework of his reports on the 36th and 37th sessions, the EC chairman will provide the EB in September a gist of the key emerging issues in relation to the EC's revised TOR and ROP.

5.   **Background on the evolution of the EC.** Based on a proposal made in 1987 by the United States, the EB at its Thirty-First Session established a committee to deal with evaluation matters. The EC was to assist the EB by undertaking in-depth reviews of a selected number of evaluations and studies, relieving the Board of these duties. Until 1999 the work of the EC was governed by *organizational principles* adopted by the First Session of the EC in 1988. TOR of the EC were not spelled out. However, the *organizational principles* stated that the ROP of the EB should be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the work of the EC.

6.   By 1999, when the EC had been operating for more than eleven years, several EB Directors expressed the wish that the Committee be revitalized and take a more proactive role. In response to this desire, the EC proposed and the EB approved the Committee's TOR and ROP in December 1999 (see Annex 3). The deliberations in 1999 established that the overall objectives of the Committee, as contained in the *organizational principles*, were still broadly valid. The EC was asked to continue

---

[1] IFAD Evaluation Policy (EB 2003/78/R.17/Rev. 1).
[2] See paragraph 31 of the minutes dated 1 July 20003 of the April 2003 Executive Board session (EB/78).
[3] The road map was approved by the EB: see paragraph 6 in the Report of the Third Special Session of the EC (EB 2003/80/R.7) to the Board in December 2003.
[4] As agreed with the EC, the additional research was conducted by a consultant recruited by OE.

enhancing the ability of the EB to assess the overall quality of IFAD-supported activities, based on the evaluations conducted by OE, and provide as and when necessary its advice and recommendations to the EB. However, at the time, some changes were introduced into the overall *modus-operandi* of the Committee's work. For example, a common understanding was developed on a number of issues, such as the frequency of EC meetings, the composition of the Committee, the role of observers, the reporting requirements to the Board.

7.   As decided by the EC during its session on 20 February 2004, the issues identified in this paper is the result of the following process: (i) interviews based on a short questionnaire with all EC members and other five Executive Directors who frequently attend Committee sessions as observers[5]. The questionnaire was based on the key issues raised during the February 2004 EC session. It allowed to deepen the understanding on important matters, such as the objectives and scope of work of the EC; (ii) interviews held in, and information obtained from, two International Financial Institutions (IFIs), the IADB and the World Bank, as well as information collected from the Asian Development Bank (ADB). The rationale for considering the experience of these organisations was their similarity regarding the evaluation offices which are independent from management and report directly to the Board as is now the case in IFAD[6]. Information was also collected from the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and World Food Programme (WFP). It is worth noting that both at UNDP and the WFP, there is no sub-committee of their Executive Boards to address evaluation issues. These are treated directly at the Executive Board level. At FAO, major evaluation reports are discussed in the Programme Committee. In this respect, and in terms of the reporting lines and independence of the evaluation function, IFAD resembles more closely the IFI community rather then the UN; and (iii) discussions with IFAD management, which might like to elaborate their perspectives on some of the topics contained in this document during the EC meeting on 1 July.

8.   This paper contains five sections. Section I includes the introduction of the paper and gives an account of the background of the Evaluation Committee. Section II outlines the key elements of the future TOR and ROP of the Evaluation Committee, and covers items related to the Committee's mandate, its objectives and scope of work, frequency and duration of meetings, reporting to the EB, and membership and governance issues. Section III contains a discussion on the resource implications for the future operations of the Evaluation Committee. Section IV includes a draft proposal on the revised TOR and ROP. Finally, section V summarises the key decisions sought from the Evaluation Committee on 1 July to facilitate the preparation of the final proposal on the topic.

II. ELEMENTS OF THE FUTURE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

9.   In this section, an outline is provided of important issues and options for the future TOR and ROP of the EC, on which the Committee's guidance and decisions are required.

(a) Mandate

10.   The Evaluation Policy spells out: (i) the oversight role of the EB with regard to IFAD's independent evaluation function; and (ii) the basic elements of the role to be played by the EC. To fulfil the former, the Executive Board, as specified in the Evaluation Policy (paragraphs 9 and 65), is to:

(i)   oversee IFAD's independent evaluation and OE's work, and assess the overall quality and impact of IFAD programmes and projects as documented in evaluation reports;

---

[5] See Annex 2 for list of persons interviewed.
[6] Summary information on the arrangements in the IADB and World Bank (in comparison with IFAD) is in Annex 1.

(ii)   approve policies aimed at enhancing the independence and effectiveness of the evaluation function;

(iii)   receive directly from OE all evaluation reports, including the annual report on the results and impact of IFAD operations (ARRI);

(iv)   approve the TOR and ROP of the EC, which it has established to enhance and fortify its role in evaluation;

(v)   endorse the appointment, removal and renewal of service of the OE Director; and

(vi)   approve the OE's annual work programme, and recommend to the Governing Council the approval of OE's budget.

11.   As to the Evaluation Committee, the Evaluation Policy provides first of all for the Committee's continuation. It makes the following observations regarding the EC's mandate:

(i)   the EB "has established its own EC to assist it in consideration of IFAD's evaluation issues" (paragraph 9), and refers to the EC "which it has established to enhance and fortify its role in evaluation" (paragraph 65);

(ii)   for establishing effective learning loops, "as in the past, the EC will provide feedback to OE and report to the EB on specific evaluation issues, and the latter will provide feedback to IFAD management" (paragraph 24), and

(iii)   the EC will report to the EB on its deliberations following each and every EC session (paragraph 53).

12.   The discussion in the EC of 20 February 2004 and the subsequent interviews[7] brought up the below points regarding EC's mandate:

13.   **The Evaluation Committee as an advisor to the Executive Board on evaluation issues.** EC members view the Committee's role as advisory to the EB. Given the consensus on this point, the scope of the Committee's mandate would stay within the oversight function of the EB, as defined in the Evaluation Policy. Members of the Committee interpreted the EC's advisory function to mean that the EC would advise the Board by:

(i)   bringing to the Board for consideration important findings and lessons learned, and make recommendations related to evaluation activities and significant aspects of IFAD's evaluation policy in order to strengthen the feedback loop and the Board's capacity to carry out its oversight responsibilities in relation to the IFAD management and OE.

14.   Some EC members conveyed that the Committee might like to consider expanding the current areas of its work and have responsibilities beyond the feedback on specific evaluation issues to OE and the advice/reporting to the Board. They felt that, as part of the EC's contribution to strengthening the institution's learning loop, it ought to be able to give feedback directly to management on important issues that require immediate attention to improve the results and impact of IFAD activities. The objectives of such feedback would be to draw the management's attention to key issues and recommendations in a more timely manner, thereby allowing them to take early remedial actions as and where required. However, it must be noted that such an expansion in the EC's mandate would be

---

[7] Here and in the following, references to views attributed to members of the EC also cover views of observers, including from the former chair.

beyond the provisions of the Evaluation Policy, which saw the role of the EC (as in the past) as an advisory organ of the Executive Board. The latter would be responsible for exercising oversight on the IFAD management and OE, as well as providing feedback to the IFAD management (see paragraph 11 (ii)) in order to enhance the learning loop.

15.   **The expanded role of the relevant Board Committees on evaluation in International Financial Institutions.** The experiences of the ADB, IADB and the World Bank indicate two other areas of significance that the Committee members may like to discuss during their session on 1 July 2004. A comparison between IFAD and the other IFIs regarding their Board Committee on evaluation activities has to consider two basic differences: (a) IFIs have a Board with full time resident Executive Directors, and (b) their volume of operations activities is a multiple of that of IFAD. This being said, the information collected in preparing this document revealed that the relevant Committee's of the Executive Board at both the IADB and World Bank dealing with evaluation matters are mandated not only to consider independent evaluation issues, but also major self-evaluation reports and policies before they go to the EB for approval (see Annex 1). The equivalent Board sub-Committee at the ADB deals with both independent evaluation and self-evaluation matters but not with policy issues. The Evaluation Policy does not explicitly consider nor preclude such an extension of the EC's mandate, provided that the EB finds the advice by the EC in the abovementioned areas of great value — and the EC considers it compatible with its own capacity.

16.   **The possible role of the EC with regard to self evaluation[8].** This is an aspect EC members have already considered in the February 2004 session. In this respect, EC members may wish to look at the mandate of its counterpart Committees in the ADB, IADB and World Bank and advise the EB accordingly. In fact, the Boards of these IFIs have asked their respective committees, namely the Development Effectiveness Committee (DEC) at the ADB, the Policy and Evaluation Committee (PEC) at the IADB and the Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE) at the World Bank, to review both independent and key self-evaluation reports. Indeed, some of their Board members have expressed the need for even more intensive examination of self-evaluations than they perform at present. There are a number of reasons why other IFIs Committees dealing with evaluation would review self evaluation reports. Firstly, it is widely recognised that self evaluation and independent evaluation are closely linked and mutually reinforcing. In fact, the quality and synergies of the methodologies used for both self evaluation on the one hand and independent evaluation on the other are essential to gain a coherent and complete picture of the respective institution's results and impact. This is particularly the case as it is widely recognised that independent evaluations should, as a priority, focus on major and systemic operation issues and policies, and can therefore only cover a restricted spectrum of any institution's operations. Moreover, the availability of quality and timely self evaluation products are fundamental to facilitate independent evaluations and impact assessments, which depends to an important degree on the outputs, overall quality, the information base and analysis generated by self evaluation processes. Finally, strong self evaluation is of paramount importance to ensure systematic learning and feedback and therefore improvement in the performance of all operational activities, and not only those covered by independent evaluations. Hence, the importance of ensuring and monitoring the adequacy and quality of the self evaluation system.

17.   As distinguished from the independent evaluations undertaken by OE, self evaluation activities at IFAD are the range of activities conducted under the overall responsibility of staff involved in operations, for example, the Programme Management Department (PMD), IFAD-supported projects and co-operating institutions. Some core outputs from IFAD self-evaluation processes include supervision reports, mid-term review reports, project completion reports, project/country status reports and so on. Clearly, the EC would not have adequate resources to examine all such self-evaluation

---

[8] "Self evaluation is an evaluation by those who are entrusted with the design and delivery of a development intervention" – as defined in the *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management of the* OECD Development Assistance Committee, 2002. However, at IFAD, the concept of self evaluation is more widely referred to as "self assessment", the methodology of which is currently being strengthened.

products, nor would it be advisable as this would lead to an excessive involvement of member states in IFAD operational issues and their management.

18.   Therefore, as discussed during the EC session on 20 February 2004 and based on the interviews with EC members, the eventual role of the Committee in IFAD self evaluation activities would be limited to the review of self evaluation reports prepared by the Management before their presentation to the EB. These would include the Progress Report on Project Portfolio (which is presently discussed annually at the Board in its April sessions) and any possible revision of the Results and Impact Management System[9]. The EC's role is this new area should remain consistent with its overall advisory role to the EB. It should also be limited to the review of few major self evaluation documents brought up by the Management to the Board and advise the EB on the adequacy and quality of the self-evaluation capabilities and the findings contained in these documents. It must be recognised in advance that an extension of the EC's role would have resource consequences that would deserve further analysis. This is discussed in Section III.

19.   **The possible role of the Committee with regard to operations policies.** The IADB and World Bank have over time expanded the responsibility of their Board Committees dealing with evaluation. The committees are expected to ensure that the feed back loop between lesson learning and adoption takes place not only in the design of new and implementation of ongoing operations, but also in terms of a systematic feedback into the development of operation policies. In fact, new operation policies may originate on a variety of grounds, but in all cases, they should be consistent with the lessons learned from the institution's own evaluations. As a result, by now both at the IADB and the World Bank, the respective committees (PEC and CODE) cover under their mandate the discussion/review of operation policies in addition to operations evaluation.

20.   In the IFAD context, it is conceivable that the EC could also play a useful advisory role to the Board, given that OE is increasingly involved in evaluations of IFAD policy and strategy[10] and the EC is gaining deeper insights into IFAD experiences on issues of strategic and policy nature. This role could entail reviewing policy proposals before these come up for approval in the EB, so as to bring reassurance to the Board that these policies takes due consideration of the key lessons learned and recommendations from relevant evaluations. However, in view of the IFAD Management, whose comments were solicited in this process, they believe it may be unnecessary to expand the role of the Committee in this area as EC members can also take up this role by participating in informal Board seminars that are usually organised ahead of the EB session in which policy documents are presented for discussion.

21.   Should the EC want to consider to widen its mandate in this direction, it ought to be with the understanding that the Committee's functions would remain consistent with its overall role as advisor to the Board. This would mean, firstly, that the EC would consider only those policies and strategies that Management intends to present to the Board. And secondly, the role of the EC would be limited to review the relevant documents and to provide their overall comments and corresponding recommendations for the Board's consideration. Concretely, this could include, for example, a discussion in the Committee of key sectoral or institutional operations policies as well as regional strategies. As with a possible extension of the role of the Committee to cover self-evaluation activities, the EC's involvement in operations policy review would have resource implications that would need to be studied in more detail.

---

[9] Framework for a Results Management System for IFAD-supported Country Programmes (EB 2003/80/R.6/Rev.1) presented to the December 2003 session of the Executive Board. The document includes a framework for measuring and reporting on the results and impact of IFAD-supported country programmes, with common indicators, baselines and categories for consolidation, with timelines and milestones for implementation.

[10] For example, the corporate level evaluations on supervision, IFAD capabilities to promote replicable innovations, the NGO/ECP, the Technical Assistance Grant Programme for Agriculture Research.

(b) Objective

22.   The discussions at the EC during its meeting on 20 February and the subsequent comments made by Committee members suggest two major concerns that should find primary attention in the articulation of the EC's objectives:

(i)   Many Committee members indicated that they saw evidence of important progress made in recent years in the OE activities, including on evaluation methodology and in the development of IFAD's practical guide on project monitoring and evaluation. Notwithstanding recent positive examples, they also felt that the feed back loop of integrating the lessons from OE evaluations into operational activities and IFAD policies and strategies remained rather weak; and

(ii)   Most Committee members felt that the EC's reporting to the EB needs to be strengthened if the Committee's advice is to have a greater impact on the EB.

23.   In the light of the February 20 discussion and the observations made by EC members during the interviews, the main objective of the EC, in order to effectively assist the EB in discharging its oversight responsibilities, would be at the broadest level, to satisfy itself that IFAD's operations evaluation [and self-evaluation] activities are effective and efficient. As to the OE evaluation activities, this would consist foremost of ensuring full implementation of and compliance with the Evaluation Policy. Within this Policy, the EC will specifically review the formulation and implementation of OE's annual work programme and budget[11], and provide its overall advice to the Board in order to assist the EB in discharging its oversight functions on OE. As to self evaluation activities, the EC would advise the EB on the adequacy of the self evaluation capabilities and processes that are in place to perform this crucial function. Should the EC wish to recommend to the EB the expansion of its mandate to include the review of operations policies as in the IADB and World Bank, an appropriate formulation will have to be eventually included in the EC's statement of objectives and scope of work.

(c) Scope of Work

24.   In order to achieve the stated objective, EC members believed that the Committee needs to focus its work on selected areas. In the first place, in general members felt that the EC has to satisfy itself at two levels:

(i)   that the independent [and self] evaluation work is of high quality; and

(ii)   that management take up systematically the recommendations agreed in the ACP.

25.   **Specific evaluation work required by the Evaluation Policy for presentation to the EB and EC.** EC members see the need for the Committee to prioritize its activities so as to assure the EB that on major OE reports the Board knows that it can consistently rely on the prior work done by the EC. The Committee mentioned they should, on a standing basis, review all the main OE-related documents that are submitted during the year for Board consideration. There are three such documents referred to in the Evaluation Policy: the OE annual work programme and budget (which also includes a review of the achievements in the previous year), the ARRI, and the *President's Report on the Status of the Adoption and Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations* together with OE's independent report

---

[11] A function which was performed by IFAD Management before the approval of the Evaluation Policy in April 2003 by the Executive Board.

on this (President's) report[12]. Such an approach *de facto* has already been established for the ARRI and the OE work programme and budget in 2003. The review of these items are included in the work of the EC for 2004. In fact, this year it is envisaged that during its September 2004 session, the Committee will for the first time discuss the *President's Report on the Status of the Adoption and Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations[13]* as well as the OE report to the Board on the topic, before the same is considered by the EB in September 2004. The discussion on this latter document would provide the EC with a more coherent review of the feed back loop and assess the extent to which evaluation recommendations are internalised by the IFAD Management in design and operation activities. [As for self evaluation reports, the EC would review and propose recommendations to the EB on the Progress Report on the Project Portfolio and any revision of the Results and Impact Management System].

26.   **Review of selected OE evaluation reports.** The past shift in emphasis towards corporate level evaluations, country programme and thematic evaluations is seen as helpful in the light of IFAD' s evolution and members welcome a continuation in this shift. Nevertheless, most EC members would not like to lose project/program specific evaluations from their purview. They recognize that these operations are the backbone of IFAD activities and main signatures of IFAD successes or lack thereof. In conclusion, it is proposed for the EC to review all corporate level evaluations carried out by OE, and selected country programme, thematic and project evaluation reports together with their respective ACPs.

27.   Some members expressed concern that the compulsory requirement for preparation of an interim evaluation in each case when IFAD embarks on a second phase of a project introduces a rigidity which in effect limited OE's flexibility to undertake the best mix of evaluations. In this regard, in due time the EC might like to consider whether to recommend to the EB to review the specific provision in the Evaluation Policy (with regard to the mandatory undertaking of interim evaluations) to introduce the required degree of flexibility in the OE annual work programme.

28.   **OE's annual work programme and budget.** According to the Evaluation Policy, the OE annual work programme and budget will be presented together, but as a separate submission, with IFAD's annual work programme and budget (POWB)[14] to the Executive Board for approval, and to the following Governing Council meeting[15]. In 2003, the EC discussed the preview of the OE work programme and budget in the Committee's session September and made its recommendations to the Board when it discussed the preview document in the September EB session. The EC also had a detailed discussion on the same topic, based on a more comprehensive work programme and budget document that OE prepared for the special session in October, and made its recommendations to the Board when the latter discussed the final proposal on the OE work programme and budget in its December session. By reviewing the document on a systematic basis twice (in September and October sessions), the EC can reassure the EB that it reviews in detail the preparation and content of the OE annual work programme and budget. In fact, while adopting the EC's chairman's report in its December 2003 session, the Board decided that the EC would discuss the OE work programme and budget on two occasions. Firstly, the EC would discuss the preview of the OE work programme and budget during the Committee session in September, and secondly, the Committee would discuss a more comprehensive document on the OE work programme and budget in its session in October.

29.   A new development has been introduced by the EB's decision in April 2004 to request the Audit Committee to discuss the POWB – which also includes the annual work programme and budget

---

[12] OE is required to prepare and submit its comments in the form of a report simultaneously to the Board on the President's Report on the Adoption and Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations (see Evaluation Policy paragraph 49).
[13] This is already a practice at other IFIs, where the Board Committee's dealing with independent evaluation are required to review the actions taken by management on evaluation reports and their recommendations.
[14] IFAD's Programme of Work and Budget
[15] See IFAD Evaluation Policy, paragraph 28.

of OE[16] - for 2005 and onwards in November, before the same document is presented for approval to the EB in its December sessions. In spite of this development, it would seem important for the EC to continue thoroughly reviewing both the annual OE work programme and the OE budget, as the EC is in a unique position to assess not only the adequacy of the proposed priorities and activities but also the resources required for their implementation. Consequently, in order to facilitate the work of the Audit Committee, the EC might wish to recommend to the Board that, in reviewing the IFAD POWB, the Audit Committee would consider the recommendations of the EC on the OE work programme and budget[17] in preparing its recommendations to the EB on the overall POWB.

(d) Meetings and Reporting

30.   EC members believe that the present review ought to be used to lay the basis for strengthening reporting to the EB and thereby reinforcing the impact of the EC. From the many comments made during the preparation process of this paper, it appears that the following structural elements must be considered:

(i)   The EB is seen as overburdened and thus finding it difficult to address evaluation related issues which may appear of a less urgent nature than other EB business;

(ii)   Individual EB and thus also EC members frequently face different workloads. Some have multiple responsibilities (e.g., vis-à-vis FAO or WFP in addition to those with IFAD) and maybe also have less of alternate staff, and thus are not in a position to devote as much time to IFAD EB and EC matters than others who can focus more exclusively on IFAD itself;

(iii)   Few members can draw on the relevant knowledge for evaluation matters from "back home";

(iv)   Timing of the EC chair's report is seen as a major issue for improving the EC's reporting to the EB. The current closeness of the EC with the EB meetings does not allow, in the view of all EC members, for timely presentation of EC's findings and recommendations; and

(v)   In addition to the critical timing issue for the EC Chair report to the EB, EC members also felt there was need for an issues-oriented and focused reporting to the Executive Board for making the EC advisory function fully effective.

31.   While the EC may not be able to do much about the first two points, the others are largely under its purview. However, before addressing the question of the EC's reporting to the Board and timing of EC sessions vis-à-vis EB meetings, the EC might wish to review and agree on the frequency and length of its individual meetings, i.e., the volume of the Committee's work that it considers essential to carry out its function.

32.   **Frequency and Length of Meetings.** The EC meeting of 20 February suggested a broad consensus that to do justice to the issues which the EC faces, it has to devote more time to its Committee activities. In this context, EC members emphasized that incremental work by the

---

[16] As per the President's Bulletin of 8 December 2003 on the Evaluation Policy (see paragraphs 15, 16 and 18), the OE budget will closely follow the overall structure and layout of the IFAD budget. For example, the OE budget will be constructed using an activity-based budget and FC will continue to provide the required reports and information to the Executive Board on the OE budget…together with the standard reporting on IFAD financial matters."

[17] In fact, a similar arrangement is already in place at the IADB, where the Audit Committee does not formally discuss the annual work programme and budget of the IADB's Office for Evaluation and Oversight, which is reviewed by the Policy and Evaluation Committee.

Committee should result in more in-depth deliberations rather than in adding more subjects to its agenda. The consensus appeared to be that the work would require not less than five meetings a year, a level obtained in 2003 and 2004 due to exceptional circumstances (e.g., the preparation and implementation of the Evaluation Policy and the Independent External Evaluation). The organisation of five or more sessions in 2003 and 2004 have had a significant human resource and cost implications for OE and IFAD's Secretary's office[18]. There also was consensus that the EC Chair should be allowed to call for other ad hoc meetings as and when required, in addition to the five regular meetings. There was also an indication that, if needed, the EC meeting could be extended to a full day. The costs implications of the frequency and length of meetings will have to be carefully determined.

33.   **Timing of meetings and reporting to the Board.** The concern that the EC Chair's report is provided in adequate time for greater impact on the corresponding EB meeting is seen by EC members as especially pertinent, particularly in the context of the OE work programme and budget, which is a critical document that should be reviewed systematically by the EC (see paragraph 28-29). Now that the OE work programme and budget is treated separately from that of management, in accordance with the Evaluation Policy, EC members feel that the Committee's advice to the EB on the quality of OE's work programme and budget has to be highly informed and timely, so that the respective EB efforts may be minimized.

34.   In the past, IFAD determined the present timing of the EC vis-à-vis the EB meetings on practical grounds of coordination across meetings and costs related to two factors, i.e., bringing non-resident EC members and interpreters to Rome, both having significant cost implications:

(i)   To ensure the participation of non-Rome based EC members, the Committee might like to consider the use of alternative technology, such as videoconferencing. This could introduce flexibility in the timing/scheduling of EC meetings and reduce costs (no such device would of course be needed when all EC members are Rome based); and

(ii)   The second factor, interpretation and translation services, may introduce a significant cost element, keeping in mind that interpreters in one language (Arabic) are brought to Rome from the respective region. For the other languages, interpreters and translators are being recruited on a short-term basis from Rome. However, it might be worth noting that the costs of recruiting such services in conjunction with the EB is lower, than if they are recruited only for EC meetings[19].

35.   Many members believe that greater Board attention to the EC work would be obtained by having the EC Chair's report consistently circulated earlier than now before the Board session. This would have an important bearing on the timing of EC meetings given the primacy of the timing of EB meetings. Therefore, in order to gain in effectiveness, the EC may wish to de-link its meetings from those of the EB, so that its Chair's report can be dispatched to EB members at least five days before the respective EB meeting where the same will be considered. A critical advantage of providing EB members with the suggested timely EC Chair report will be that EC issues will be on the mind of EB members at an early stage, sometime even before they focus on other Board issues. It should be noted however that, according to the By-Laws for the Conduct of the Business of IFAD, the Fund is authorised to cover the travel expenses of Board members attending a meeting of the Board. It would therefore not be possible under the present By-Laws to reimburse Executive Directors who come to Rome for "self-standing" EC meetings that are not linked to EB meetings. The EC may also like to

---

[18] Normally, the EC has been holding 3 sessions per year.

[19] It may be of interest to the EC members to note that at the CODE meetings of the WB, where no translation is used, some members who feel less fluent in English have at times circulated comments prior to the meeting to ensure full understanding of their concern — a procedure which has also been used, from time to time, by members with perfect fluency.

note that the Governing Council by a two-thirds majority has the authority to change the By-Laws of IFAD.

36.   The EC members agreed that the EC chair's report to the Board is a fundamental document in terms of providing the EB with a summary of the key issues discussed and recommendations for the Board's approval. However, EC members mentioned the need for the EB to receive focused and "actionable" report. In addition, EC members conveyed that it is important for the Secretary's Office to continue with the production of the verbatim records and to make them accessible upon request to the EC. The experience in other IFIs is that succinct, issues-oriented reports containing clear recommendations from the Chair are critical for achieving maximum results in the Board and in strengthening the learning loop.

37.   **Documentation for the EC.** This was an area where there seemed to be broad satisfaction, except possibly with respect to the timing of when the ACPs were provided to the EC. The main interest expressed by the EC regarding OE documentation was that the evaluation summaries be sufficiently comprehensive (say from 5-10 pages) and be provided together with the corresponding ACPs. EC members requested that these two documents be made available systematically whenever an OE evaluation is considered by the Committee. The EC would particularly like to see ACPs when they receive an OE report to understand the rationale underlying agreements and differences in the views contained in the OE evaluation reports and those of IFAD's management and other key partners. This is a subject to which the two other IFIs have given extensive attention. At the World Bank, for instance, all evaluation reports from the operations evaluation department (OED) that come up for CODE deliberation are paralleled by a written management response. Vice-versa, self-evaluation reports and operations policy documents from management are considered together with the respective OED comments. This, over time has been seen as a highly valued and effective approach for CODE to arrive at realistically based conclusions.

38.   In the future, OE proposes to provide the Committee with the entire evaluation report, which would include the executive summary, ACP and main report. The executive summary and ACP will be provided both in English and in the original language (should the report be written in Arabic, French or Spanish). The main report will be available in the original language only, as translation of the main evaluation report into English or other IFAD official languages would have a very major cost implication for the operations of the Committee.

(e) Membership and Governance

39.   Some EC members felt that Executive Board and thus EC members normally do not have specialized knowledge in evaluation — their selection criteria are different. Moreover not all EC, or EB members can turn to their home county authorities for quick assistance in evaluation matters. Thus, efforts should be made to strengthen the professional knowledge within the EC to become a stronger advisory body to the EB in all evaluation matters. It was also noted that the Audit Committee has instituted a briefing package for new members to facilitate familiarization with the subject matters under the purview of that Committee. Against this background, the EC may wish to consider introducing the following steps:

(i)   as per current practice, OE will continue in a systematic manner to provide a small package of documentation and oral briefings to new EC members to assist them in familiarising with the work and methods of the EC and OE; and

(ii)   The OE should organize a workshop or seminar for all EC members, of course open also to other EB members, to help them become familiar with evaluation methodologies and policies, including through getting different points of view from recognized authorities. This would be done soon after the Board elects a new EC. Since field visits, discussed in the following paragraph, also provide opportunities for learning on the ground, there may be an advantage in linking the two learning events.

40.   **Field Visits.** Members feel field visits undertaken collectively by the EC on a periodic basis are extremely useful instruments to allow them to exchange views on the ground and to enhance their ability to effectively contribute to EC deliberations. The EC members were highly laudatory about this activity (not least because of the recent insightful field visit to Indonesia). Moreover, members interviewed were favourable to the participation in such field visits of other EB directors who are not members of the EC, with the understanding that the participation of both EC members and other EB directors would be in an observer capacity in order to safeguard the independence of the OE evaluation activity, which is the subject of the field visit.

41.   **Composition and Chair.** Currently, the EC consists of 9 members, 4 from List A, 2 from List B and 3 from List C. The chairperson is selected from the List B or C members of the EC[20]. In its February 2004 session, the Committee has decided to leave it to the Board to decide whether to maintain the current arrangements or propose other options with regard to the composition and/or chair of the EC. However, it would be useful if the EC would take up its advisory role and recommend to the Board either to maintain the status-quo with regard to these issues or to propose an alternative arrangement. In this regard, should the EC recommend to the EB to change the status quo, the Board might like to review any such proposal within the framework of the overall governance of the EB's two sub-committees, taking also into consideration the decision regarding the composition[21] and chair[22] of the Audit Committee.

42.   **Role of Observers.** A number of EC members raised questions related to the role of the observers. Currently, other Executive Board members not members of the Evaluation Committee may also attend the meetings as observers. A number of observations on this point emerged from the interviews following the meeting on 20 February 2004:

(i)   The fact that there are member states that are not in the EC, but who are still very interested in evaluation issues reflects the status and importance of the EC. This in turn was likely to lead to greater recognition of the EC within the EB, both in terms of the Committee as such and in support of specific points which the EC brings to the EB as recommendations or major comments;

(ii)   The added value of the observers is that there will be a broader base of evaluation expertise available for the EC; and

(iii)   While there was a general sense that observers are an asset to the EC, a number of EC members felt that it was also important to recognize the different status within the Committee of EC members who are elected, and that of observers. As some put it, the views from the members ought to be sought before the ones from the observers. The experience in the two IFIs on which information was sought in the present context gives little to guide: at both the IADB and the World Bank observers are welcome; and they speak, mostly but not always awaiting the end of the members' interventions. Much depends on the circumstances of the topic, the persons concerned and the Chair's guidance.

III. RESOURCE ISSUES

43.   A number of points raised in the above sections have resource implications. This would apply to the following;

---

[20] As decided by the EB at its 61st session.
[21] As for the Evaluation Committee, the Audit Committee has 4 members from List A, 2 from List B and 3 from List C.
[22] The Chair of the Audit Committee is selected from Committee members from List A.

(i) *Increasing the number and length of EC meetings*: beyond costs that fall directly on EC members for their additional time spent on EC activities, there would be a significant cost element for OE and to a lesser extent on the Secretary's staff preparing for and attending such meetings. Some additional IFAD management time would also be spent to the extent that more ACPs would be discussed; other management attention may also be necessary (e.g., for discussion of the Report on the Status of Adoption and Implementation of evaluation Recommendations);

(ii) *"De-linking" from the EB sessions*: such a "de-link" would involve a change in the date of EC meetings by some two weeks or so (ahead of the EB sessions). This change would have some measurable cost implications for travel of non-Rome based members and somewhat higher costs for interpretation (see paragraph 34); and

(iii) *Preparation of Committee members* (see paragraph 39) would add mainly to the cost of the OE for preparing and conducting the respective instructional workshops, say every two years, and less frequently for the preparation of an introduction briefing kit which, as in the current case, would be largely a compendium from existing documentation.

44.   Should the EC decide to consider extending its mandate to cover self-evaluation issues and operations policies, the following should be kept in mind:

(i) *Concerning self evaluation*. Everything else remaining equal, this would result in more work for the EC members as they would have to consider at least one major self evaluation report per year. This would also result in additional work by the OE and for IFAD operations and management for preparing and attending these discussions; and

(ii) *Concerning policy development*. This would bring an additional workload onto the EC members, probably more over the longer term than in the immediate future. This extension of the EC's mandate in this aspect would imply some degree of additional work for IFAD's Policy Division (EO) in preparing for and attending the relevant EC meeting.

45.   It is assumed that, as per rules of the Executive Board, the EC will operate in all IFAD official languages. Consequently, resources for the translation of documents and simultaneous interpretation facilities will need to be earmarked. These costs will increase with any increase of the number of meetings and topics to be discussed. However, significant cost savings will be achieved should the EC decide on an ad-hoc basis to operate only in English. While most of the additional costs, as outlined in the previous sections, by the EC members (and observers) would not fall on IFAD's budget, there would be costs to Secretary's Office for organising EC sessions and providing the related services to the OE and the IFAD Management. In the light of the current zero-growth directive of the Board on IFAD's administrative budget, any significant (incremental) increase in the costs including those caused by an eventual extension of the EC's mandate would have to be absorbed by the OE budget. Based on the decision by the EC in regard of the various options and proposals contained in this document, it will be necessary to make a proper estimate of the cost and work load before the final proposal is submitted to the EB.

IV. PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

46.   This section has been divided into 2 parts. In the first part, the draft proposed TOR of the EC have been outlined, whereas in the second part key elements of the ROP are proposed.

(a) Terms of Reference

47.   Here below, the draft proposed TOR is provided building on the information collected and analysis undertaken during the preparation of this paper:

Mandate[23]

48.   The EB has established the EC to enhance and fortify its role in operations evaluation. It relies on the EC to provide it with advice in matters related to IFAD's independent [and self-] evaluation activities. Recognizing that the EC is an advisory body, the EC will make recommendations on major evaluation matters as part of its reporting to the EB.

Objectives

49.   In order to assist the EB in discharging its oversight, the Committee has two main objectives:

- to satisfy itself that IFAD's independent [and self-] evaluation activities are relevant and carried out effectively and efficiently. As to the OE evaluation activities, this would consist foremost of ensuring full implementation of and compliance with the Evaluation Policy, and that the formulation and implementation of OE's annual work programme and budget is done in line with the Policy. [As to self evaluation activities, this would entail reassuring the EB that an adequate self evaluation capability and processes are in place to perform this crucial function] ; and

- to contribute to IFAD's learning loop by reporting and making recommendations to the Board on major independent evaluation and the two Management reports mentioned in paragraph 18 and the third bullet of paragraph 50.

Scope of Work

50.   The Committee will undertake the following activities:

- Review on a standing basis the OE Annual Work Programme and Budget, the Annual Report on the Results and Impact of IFAD Operations and the President's Report on the Status of the Adoption and Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations together with the OE report on the same subject, and convey the findings and recommendations of its review in the form of a report to the EB;

- Discuss all OE corporate level evaluations and selected country programme, thematic and project evaluation reports together with their respective ACPs;

- Discuss the following reports including OE comments on the same prior to their consideration by the EB: (i) the Progress Report on the Project Portfolio; and (ii) any possible future revision prepared by the Management to the Results and Impact Management System; and

- Undertake collectively field visits, as and when appropriate, to observe key OE evaluation activities, which will assist the Evaluation Committee in conducting its duties more efficiently and effectively; in this regard, due attention will be given in ensuring the full independence of the concerned OE activity.

(b) Rules of Procedure

51.   The Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the proceedings of the EC, except as specific below:

---

[23] In the event the EC decides to expand its mandate to include the review of operation policies, corresponding text will need to be included under mandate, objectives and scope of work in this section. Such a decision would also require a revision of Rule 1 in the rules of procedure of the EC.

Rule 1: Convening, Timing and Length of Meeting. The EC shall hold up to five sessions in each calendar year. One meeting each will be held before the respective (three) sessions of the Executive Board. Another meeting will be held in October with the specific objective of discussing the annual OE work programme and budget. The final (fifth planned) meeting will be held in the first semester of the year. The exact dates and length of each meeting in the subsequent year will be fixed based on a proposal made by OE during the EC's annual December session. Additional special sessions in the same calendar year may also be called on an ad hoc basis by the EC Chairperson at any time in the year.

Rule 2: Notification of Sessions and Agenda. The IFAD Secretariat[24] shall inform each committee member of the date and place of a session at least thirty days in advance. During its December session, the Evaluation Committee shall draw up a tentative agenda for all five sessions in the subsequent year, taking into consideration the various standing items the EC must discuss. For this purpose, the Office of Evaluation shall provide the committee with a proposal for the agenda of its five annual sessions. The committee retains the prerogative to revise by adding, deleting, defining or amending items on the agenda during the course of the year. The agenda shall be communicated by the Secretariat to all Evaluation Committee members along with the notification of sessions. A notification of each EC session together with the agenda will be sent by the Secretary's Office for information to all other Executive Board directors not members of the EC.

Rule 3: Membership and Terms of Office. The composition of the Evaluation Committee shall consist of nine Executive Board members or alternate members: four members from List A, two from List B and three from List C. The term of office of the Evaluation Committee shall be three years and coincide with the term of office of the Executive Board. [The EC must decide whether to recommend to the EB to confirm or reconsider the number of members and composition of the EC.]

Rule 4: Quorum. The quorum for any meeting of the Evaluation Committee shall be constituted by five members.

Rule 5: Chairperson. The committee must decided whether to recommend to the EB to continue with the current practice of electing its chairperson from List B and C Committee members or to allow any member to seek appointment as EC chairperson.] In the absence of the chairperson during a scheduled meeting or field visit of the committee, the chair shall be temporarily assumed by another member selected by the committee.

Rule 6: Decisions. The committee shall make every effort to arrive at decisions by consensus. Where such efforts have been exhausted, the chairperson's rulings shall stand when supported by four other members.

Rule 7: Attendance at Meetings and Field Visits. In addition to Evaluation Committee members and the Director of the Office of Evaluation, the said Director may designate members of his staff to participate in the deliberations of the committee. The Director shall also invite other IFAD staff members to provide, pursuant to the committee's request, such information as maybe required in carrying out the committee's responsibilities. The EC members will participate as observers in any field visit organised by OE. Other Executive Board members not members of the Evaluation Committee may also attend EC meetings as observers and participate in field visits.

Rule 8: Documentation and Reports. In line with IFAD's disclosure policy, all reports and documents presented to the Evaluation Committee will be disclosed to the public at large. The key

---

[24] The role and responsibility of the IFAD's Secretary's Office (See Annex 4) in relation to the EC has been articulated in the Section VII of Annex I in the President's Bulletin of 8 December 2003 on the IFAD Evaluation Policy. At the request of the EC, the said President's Bulletin was provided as an information paper to all Executive Board members in December 2003.

issues and recommendations of the EC shall be recorded in report of the EC, which the Chairperson shall prepare after each session and submit for approval to the EB (see Rule 9). This document too will be disclosed to the public through the IFAD internet website.

Rule 9: Reporting to the Executive Board. The Committee chairperson shall provide a written report of its deliberations to the Executive Board after each EC session. The reports will be focused and issues-oriented, and identify the most relevant issues and recommendations for the EB's information and approval, as required. This report should be translated in IFAD official languages and dispatched to EB members at least five days ahead of the respective EB session. The chairperson of the committee may, in addition, provide an oral report during each EB session, as and when s/he considers necessary.

V. DECISIONS SOUGHT FROM THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

52. In its session on 1 July, the EC is requested to provide its comments and observations on the Committee's proposed TOR and Rules of Procedure, as contained in this paper. In this regard, the EC is requested to provide their comments and decisions, including in particular on the text in the square brackets in paragraphs 24, 25, 48, 49 and 51 (items c & e), which has not yet been approved by the EC. A refined version of the proposal will be presented, as per agreement, to the EC for its further comments in the Committee's session in September 2004. Thereafter, taking into consideration any additional suggestions by the EC, the proposal will be submitted to the Executive Board in December 2004 for decision.

Comparison with Board Committees Addressing Evaluation in two IFIs, the Inter Development Bank (IADB) and the World Bank (WB), whose Independent Evaluation Offices Report Direct to the Board (rather than to Management)

	IFAD	IADB	WB
Independent Evaluation Office (functions)			
Name of Office	Office of Evaluation (OE)	Office of evaluation and Oversight (OVE)	Operations Evaluation Department (OED)[25]
Independent Evaluations	Yes	Yes	Yes
Methodology for evaluation across institution	partial	Yes	No
Oversight for evaluation throughout institution	No	Yes	Yes
Validation / attestation of self evaluation	no (except for projects evaluated by OE)	Yes	Yes
2. "Evaluation Committee" Equivalents			
Name of Committee of the Executive Board	Evaluation Committee (EC)	Policy & Evaluation Committee (PEC)	Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE)
Function / coverage	Independent evaluation	Independent and self evaluation, and operational policies	Independent and self evaluation, and operational policies
Members (number)	9	7	8
Frequency of meetings	3-5 per annum	Average ca. 3 per month	Average ca. 2 per month
Open to non-members	Yes	Yes	Yes
Formal TOR for Committee	Yes	No (role discussed in Board meetings - would be found in	Yes (for sector strategy papers, Country Assistance reviews,

---

[25] OED covers IBRD and IDA operations. Different evaluation units provide similar services for other pats of the WB group: IFC has its Operations Evaluation Group (OEG) and MIGA its Operations Evaluation Unit (OEU).

		minutes)	evaluation policies, methods and processes)
Evaluation sub-committee(s)	No	No	Yes
Relationship with Board	advisory	advisory	advisory
3. Executive Board			
Members (Number)	18 & 18 alternate members, who all participate in Board sessions	14	24
Frequency of meetings	3 per annum	1-2 weekly	1-2 weekly
4. Reports from Independent Evaluation Office			
a. For board agenda	Work programme & budget ARRI, President's Report on the Adoption and Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations together with OE's report on the same topic (with EC advice)	all (with PEC advice)	Work programme & budget AROE and ARDE (with CODE advice)
b. For Board information only	All OE evaluation reports. EC may recommend any report for Board discussion or the Board itself may request to discuss a given evaluation report	n.a	All other OED reports, CODE may recommend any such other OED reports for Board discussion
c. For committee agenda	Work programme & budget, ARRI, President's Report on the Adoption and Implementation of evaluation Recommendations together OE's report on the same topic, sample of other OE reports	Annual report and work programme & budget for following year. All other OVE reports	All reports except (i) project evaluations; and (ii) country assistance evaluation – latter are considered by the sub-committee

5. Tracking recommendations from evaluations	To start in 2004 with OE response to the Board (see 4 above).	Not systemic	Management Action Report (MAR) follows all recommendations except for those in country assistance evaluations (handled separately in the context of the next CAS).
6. Reporting from the committee to the board	Report of chair on all items discussed in EC	Report of chair on all OVE reports (2-3 pages)	Report of Chair on OED reports discussed in CODE. The chair also provides an annual report on CODE's activities (and a monthly report goes to the board steering committee).

Summary Comment:

Any comments on comparing IFAD and the two other IFIs regarding their Board Committee functions on evaluation activities has to start out with two related basic difference: these two IFIs have a Board with full time resident Executive Directors, and their volume of operations is a multiple of that of IFAD. Moreover, differences in the function of their independent evaluation offices need recognition. Time and moneys spent on the various oversight functions including for evaluation in these two IFIs are manifold the level of what IFAD can do. However, when it comes to certain qualitative aspects, the comparisons may throw light on relevant functions and scope of the independent evaluation offices and the respective Boards and Board Committees. Two are of special interest:

(i) *The coverage of the evaluation function across the three institutions*: in the two other IFIs the independent evaluation offices and the Board Committees concerned with evaluation address both independent and self evaluation across the institution. In the case of IADB, when the evaluation system was redesigned in 1999-2000, the oversight function of the independent evaluation office was even given special recognition in the new name of the Office of Evaluation and Oversight. This has not been the case in IFAD where the OE and the EC at present have no oversight function on the self-evaluation undertaken by management. That oversight function has so far remained a dire Board responsibility;

(ii) *The role of the Board Committee that addresses evaluations*: at the IADB and the WB there has been an evolution over time toward the respective Board Committees' enlarged functions, now covering both evaluation and operations policies. At the WB, for instance, for many years the Board had a Joint Audit Committee (JAC) with two arms, one dealing with the traditional audit function the other evolving operation evaluation function — a situation that, in most ways, now prevails at IFAD with its two Board Committees , i.e. the Audit Committee and the Evaluation Committee. The WB Board recognized increasingly that for an effective evaluation feedback loop, one major important link was to build these lessons into new operations policies. CODE now has to ensure that such a link is established under its mandate.

In addition, it is worth to draw attention to the special efforts made by the respective Board committees to engage the independent evaluation units and management in a closer exchange and learning process for obtaining maximum benefits from the lessons learned in the (independent) evaluation activities. This has resulted, especially in the WB, in CODE's ability to draw consistently on OED evaluations together with management responses for its own deliberations.

ANNEX II

LIST OF IFAD EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS INTERVIEWED

Evaluation Committee Members	Date
Mr. Bernard De Schrevel, Belgium	March 23
Mr. Lothar Caviezel, Switzerland	March 23
Prof Gabriel Lombin, Nigeria	March 24
Mr. Govindan Nair, India (EC Chairperson)	March 24
Mr. Sunggul Sinaga, Indonesia	March 25
Mr. Bernd Dunnzlaff, Germany	March25
Mr. Charles Parker, Canada	March 26
Mr. Medi Moungui, Cameroon	March 26
Ms. Regina Gurgel de Saboya, Brazil	April 20

Other IFAD Board members/EC Observers	
Mr. Victor Hugo Morales Mexico (former EC Chair)	March 26
Ms. Djerir Habiba, Algeria	March 26
Mr. Peter Reid, United Kingdom (email)	April 14
Ms. Margaret Slettevold, Norway	April 19
Mr. Mark Jaskowiak, USA	April 28

ANNEX III

TERMS OP REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD IN DECEMBER 1999

(1)   To enhance the ability of the Executive Board to assess the overall quality and impact of IFAD's programmes and projects through a discussion of selected evaluations and reviews conducted by the Office of Evaluation as well as to fortify the Board's knowledge of lessons learned in IFAD's programmes and projects and to enable Member States to better assess the fund's role in the pursuit of a global development strategy;

(2)   to discuss with the Office of Evaluation the scope and contents of its annual work programme and strategic directions;

(3)   to satisfy itself that the Fund has an effective and efficient evaluation function;

(4)   to report to the Executive Board on the committee's work and, as appropriate, make recommendations and seek guidance on evaluation issues of policy and strategic importance; and

(5)   to undertake field visits, as and when required, and participate in evaluation missions, workshops, round-table meetings and related activities in order to assist the Evaluation Committee in conducting its duties.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD IN DECEMBER 1999

The Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the proceedings of the Evaluation Committee, except as specified below:

Rule 1
Convening of Meetings

The Evaluation Committee shall hold three sessions in each calendar year The first meeting shall be held the day before or after IFAD's annual Governing Council session whichever is more convenient for committee members. The remaining two sessions shall be held on the thy preceding the September and December Executive Board sessions, respectively. Additional informal m in the same calendar year may also be called on an *ad hoc* basis by the chairperson.

Rule 2
Notification of Sessions and Agenda

The IFAD Secretariat shall inform each committee member of the date and place of a session at least thirty days in advance. During its December session, the Evaluation Committee shall draw up a tentative agenda for all three sessions in the subsequent year. To facilitate this work, the Office of Evaluation shall provide the committee with its proposed work programme for the year. The committee retains the prerogative to revise by adding, deleting, defining or amending items on the agenda dining the course of the year. The agenda shall be communicated by the Secretariat to all Evaluation Committee members along with the notification of sessions.

Rule 3
Membership and Terms of Office

The composition of the Evaluation Committee shall consist of nine Executive Board members or alternate members: four members from List A, two from List B and three from List C, The term of office of the Evaluation Committee. shall be three years and coincide with the term of office of the Executive Board.

Rule 4
Quorum

The quorum for any meeting of the Evaluation Committee shall be constituted by five members.

Rule 5

Chairperson

The committee shall elect its chairperson from List B and C Committee members, in the absence of the chairperson during a scheduled meeting of the committee, the chair shall be temporarily assumed by another member from List B or C selected by the committee.

Rule 6

Decisions

The committee shall make every effort to arrive at decisions by consensus. Where such efforts have been exhausted, the chairperson's rulings shall stand when supported by four other members.

Rule 7

Attendance at Meetings

In addition to Evaluation Committee members and the Director of the Office of Evaluation and Studies, the said Director may designate members of his staff to participate in the deliberations of the committee, The Director shall also invite other WAD staff members to provide, pursuant to the committee's request, such information as maybe required in carrying out the committee's responsibilities. Other Executive Board members not members of the Evaluation Committee may also attend the meetings as observers.

Rule 8

Documentation, Records and Reports

The proceedings of the committee, documents provided to the committee and the records of the committee's deliberations shall be restricted and available only to members of the committee and members of the Executive Board. The proceedings of the committee shall be reflected in the Minutes of the Evaluation Committee, unless the committee decides otherwise.

Rule 9

Reporting to the Executive Board

The Evaluation Committee shall provide a written report of its deliberations to the Executive Board during the latter's April session. The report, which shall be included in the Office of Evaluation Annual Progress Report on Evaluation, shall be dispatched to Board members according to established Board procedures. The chairperson of the committee may, in addition, provide an oral report during the April Executive Board session. The Evaluation Committee may also provide ad hoc written or oral reports to the Board during its September and/or December sessions.

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY'S OFFICE IN RELATION TO THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Continuity of Functions of the Secretary's Office

The Secretary's Office (ES) will continue to perform the functions it currently undertakes related to evaluation in support of the governing bodies.

Specific Functions of ES

The functions that ES will continue to perform include the following:

a)   Editing and translation of documents going to the Evaluation Committee, Executive Board and Governing Council;

b)   Organisation of the Evaluation Committee's sessions, including provision of interpretation in all languages;

c)   Invitation and documentation to participation in Evaluation Committee sessions;

d)   Provision to OE of the verbatim of each Evaluation Committee session in a timely manner;

e)   Keeping updated contact details of Evaluation Committee members in the CIAO system; and

f)   Provision of the necessary archival services to OE.

Clearance of OE Documents for Consideration by Governing Bodies

In accordance with the approved IFAD Evaluation Policy, the Director of OE will have the authority to issue final evaluation reports and related documents directly and simultaneously to the Executive Board, the President and other stakeholders, and to disclose them to the general public without prior clearance from anyone outside OE.