

a

IFAD

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation Committee – Thirty-Seventh Session

Rome, 3 September 2004

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	iii
I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
A. Introduction	1
B. Background	1
II. ELEMENTS OF THE FUTURE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE	2
A. Mandate	3
B. Objective	6
C. Scope of Work	6
D. Meetings and Reporting	8
E. Membership and Governance	10
III. RESOURCE ISSUES	11
IV. PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE	12
A. Terms of Reference	12
B. Rules of Procedure	13
V. DECISIONS SOUGHT FROM THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE	14
 ANNEXES	
I. COMPARISON WITH THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK AND THE WORLD BANK	15
II. LIST OF IFAD EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND EXECUTIVE BOARD MEMBERS INTERVIEWED	19
III. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD IN DECEMBER 1999	20
IV. THE FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY IN RELATION TO THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE	23
V. LIST OF OPERATION POLICIES PRESENTED TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD SINCE 2000	24

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AsDB	Asian Development Bank
ACP	Agreement at Completion Point
ARRI	Annual Report on the Results and Impact of IFAD Operations
CODE	Committee on Development Effectiveness
DEC	Development Effectiveness Committee
ES	Office of the Secretary
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFI	International Financial Institution
OE	Office of Evaluation
PEC	Policy and Evaluation Committee
POWB	Programme of Work and Budget
RIMS	Results and Impact Measurement System
ROP	Rules of Procedure
TOR	Terms of Reference

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

A. Introduction

1. In April 2003, the Seventy-Eighth Session of the Executive Board approved the IFAD Evaluation Policy.¹ The Evaluation Policy was prepared in response to a decision 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 Executive Board.

2. The adoption and implementation of the evaluation policy created the need for a review of the role and functioning of the Evaluation Committee, including its interactions with the Executive Board and OE. In fact, at its Eighty-First Session in April 2003, the Executive Board "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 Third Special Session in October 2003, the Evaluation Committee charted 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 approval by the Eighty-Third Session of the Executive Board in December 2004.³

3. The Evaluation Committee held a Fourth Special Session on 20 February 2004 to brainstorm on the main issues related to the Committee's TOR and ROP. At this session, the Committee decided that additional research was required to prepare the draft proposal for the Committee's revised TOR and ROP. The broad TOR for the additional research was outlined during the meeting. This included a comparative analysis of the objectives and *modus operandi* of committees similar to the evaluation committee in the Asian Development Bank (AsDB), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and World Bank, as well as further interviews with all Evaluation Committee members and Executive Board members who attend the Evaluation Committee regularly as observers (including the three List convenors).

4. Building on the above-mentioned process, the Evaluation Committee requested OE to prepare on its behalf a document with the proposed TOR and ROP, which was discussed by the Committee at its Thirty-Sixth Session on 1 July 2004. Thereafter, the document was refined to include the guidance and comments provided by the Committee. The revised document is presented today for discussion during the Thirty-Seventh Session of the Evaluation Committee. Following any enhancements based on comments provided today, the document will be submitted by the Committee for approval to the Eighty-Third Session of the Executive Board in December 2004. Finally, within the framework of his reports on the Thirty-Sixth and Thirty-Seventh Sessions, the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee will provide the Executive Board next week with a summary of the key emerging issues in relation to the Committee's revised TOR and ROP.

B. Background on the Evolution of the Evaluation Committee.

5. Based on a proposal made in 1987 by the United States, the Executive Board at its Thirty-First Session established a committee to deal with evaluation matters. The Evaluation Committee was to assist the Board 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 Committee was governed by *organizational principles* adopted by the First Session of the Evaluation Committee in 1988. The TOR

¹ IFAD Evaluation Policy (EB 2003/78/R.17/Rev. 1).

² See paragraph 31, Minutes of the Seventy-Eighth Session of the Executive Board (EB/78).

³ The road map was approved by the Executive Board (see paragraph 6, Report of the Third Special Session of the Evaluation Committee (EB 2003/80/R.7)).

of the Committee were not spelled out. However, the *organizational principles* stated that the ROP of the Executive Board should be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the work of the Evaluation Committee.

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

7. The issues contained in this paper are the result of the following process: (a) interviews based on a short questionnaire with all Evaluation Committee members and other five Executive Directors who frequently attend Committee sessions as observers.⁴ The questionnaire was based on the key issues raised during the Fourth Special Session of the Evaluation Committee. It allowed a deepening of understanding on important matters, such as the objectives and scope of work of the Committee; (b) interviews held in, and information obtained from, two international financial institutions (IFIs), the IDB and the World Bank, as well as information collected from the AsDB⁵; (c) discussions with IFAD management; and (d) deliberations of the Committee during its Thirty-Sixth Session on 1 July 2004.

8. This paper contains five sections. Section I contains an introduction 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 Executive Board, 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 summarizes the key decisions sought from this current session of the Evaluation Committee 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. This section includes issues related to the TOR and ROP on which a consensus has been reached by the Thirty-Sixth Session of the Evaluation Committee, and other matters requiring additional discussion and a decision by the current session of the Committee.

⁴ See Annex II for list of persons interviewed.

⁵ The rationale for considering the experience of these organizations was their similarity regarding their evaluation offices, which are independent of management and report directly to a board, as is the case in IFAD. Information was also collected from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and World Food Programme (WFP). It is worth noting that both at UNDP and WFP, there is no subcommittee of their executive boards to address evaluation issues. Such issues are dealt with 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 the IFI community rather than the United Nations.

A. Mandate

10. The evaluation policy spells out: (a) the oversight role of the Executive Board with regard to IFAD's independent evaluation function; and (b) the basic elements of the role to be played by the Evaluation Committee. 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;
- (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 Evaluation Committee, 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 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 Committee's mandate:

- (i) the Executive Board "has established its own Evaluation Committee to assist it in considering evaluation issues" (paragraph 9), and refers to the Committee "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 Evaluation Committee will provide feedback to OE and report to the Executive Board on specific evaluation issues, and the latter will provide feedback to IFAD management" (paragraph 24); and
- (iii) the Evaluation Committee "will report to the Board on its deliberations following each and every Evaluation Committee session" (paragraph 53).

12. The Evaluation Committee is an advisor to the Executive Board on evaluation issues. As per its original mandate, the Committee will continue to have an advisory role in relation to the Board. Therefore, the scope of the Committee's mandate would stay within the oversight function of the Board, as defined in the evaluation policy. More specifically, this implies that the Committee would advise the Board by bringing to the Board for consideration important findings and lessons learned. Furthermore, the Committee would 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 IFAD management and OE.

13. In light of the aforementioned, the Evaluation Committee would provide feedback on its deliberations and any corresponding recommendations intended for IFAD management and/or OE to the Executive Board, for the latter's consideration. The Board would be responsible for exercising oversight of IFAD management and OE, and also for providing feedback to IFAD management (see paragraph 11 (ii)) in order to enhance the learning loop. Nevertheless, in order to shorten the learning loop, it is noted that a member of IFAD management will participate regularly in Evaluation Committee sessions.

14. **The expanded role of the relevant board committees on evaluation in IFIs.** A comparison between IFAD and the other IFIs regarding their board committees 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 operation activities is far greater than that of IFAD. This being said, the information collected revealed that the corresponding committees of the executive board at both the IDB and the World Bank are mandated not only to consider independent evaluation issues, but also major self-evaluation reports and policies prepared by the management of the two institutions before they go to the board for approval (see Annex I). The equivalent board subcommittee at the AsDB deals with both independent evaluation and self-evaluation matters but not currently with policy issues.

15. **The role of the Evaluation Committee with regard to self-evaluation.**⁶ The boards of the AsDB, IDB and World Bank have asked their respective committees, namely the Development Effectiveness Committee (DEC) at the AsDB, the Policy and Evaluation Committee (PEC) at the IDB and the Committee on Development Effectiveness (CODE) at the World Bank, to review both independent and key self-evaluation reports. There are a number of reasons why other IFI committees dealing with evaluation would review self-evaluation reports. Firstly, it is widely recognized 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 recognized that independent evaluations should, as a priority, focus on major and systemic operation issues and policies, and can only cover a restricted spectrum of any institution's operations. Moreover, the availability of quality and timely self-evaluation products is fundamental to facilitating independent evaluations and impact assessments, which in turn depend to a large degree on the outputs, overall quality, information base and analysis generated by self-evaluation processes. Finally, strong self-evaluation is of paramount importance in ensuring systematic learning and feedback and therefore improvement in the performance of all operational activities, not only those covered by independent evaluations — hence the importance of ensuring and monitoring the adequacy and quality of the self-evaluation system.

16. As distinct 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, IFAD-supported projects and cooperating institutions. Some 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 Evaluation Committee would not have adequate resources to examine all such self-evaluation products, nor would it be advisable to do so, as this would lead to excessive involvement by Member States in IFAD's operational issues and their management.

17. Therefore, it was agreed at the Thirty-Sixth Session of the Evaluation Committee that the role of the Committee in IFAD self-evaluation activities would be limited to the review of the two below-mentioned self-evaluation reports prepared by IFAD management before their presentation to the Executive Board. These are the Progress Report on the Project Portfolio (which is presently discussed annually at the Board at its April sessions) and any possible revision of the Results and Impact Management System.⁷ The Evaluation Committee's role in this new area shall remain consistent with

⁶ "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.

⁷ Framework for a Results Management System for IFAD-Supported Country Programmes (EB 2003/80/R.6/Rev.1) presented to the Eightieth 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, and with timelines and milestones for implementation.

its overall advisory role to the Executive Board. That is, it will be limited to the review of the aforementioned major self-evaluation documents presented by IFAD management to the Board and advise the Board on the adequacy and quality of the self-evaluation capabilities and the findings contained in these documents. The possible consequences for resources of this role are discussed in Section III.

18. **The possible role of the Committee with regard to operation policies.** The IDB and World Bank have over time expanded the responsibility of their board committees dealing with evaluation. The committees are expected to ensure that the feedback loop between lesson learning and adoption operates not only in the design of new operations and the implementation of ongoing ones, but also in terms of a systematic feedback into the development of operation policies. In fact, new operation policies may draw on a variety of sources, but in all cases, they should be consistent with the lessons learned from the institution's own evaluations. As a result, the corresponding committees at the IDB and the World Bank, (PEC and CODE respectively) both cover under their mandate the discussion/review of operation policies in addition to operations evaluation. The DEC of the AsDB is considering expanding its role to include a review of operation policies.

19. In the context of IFAD, it is conceivable that the Evaluation Committee could also play a useful advisory role to the Board, given that OE is increasingly involved in evaluations of IFAD policy and strategy⁸ and the Evaluation Committee is gaining deeper insights into IFAD experience in issues of a strategic and policy nature. This role could entail reviewing policy proposals before they come up for approval in the Executive Board, so as to reassure the Board that these policies take due consideration of key lessons learned and of recommendations from relevant evaluations. Upon the request of the Evaluation Committee, Annex V contains a list of all operation policies discussed by the Board since 2000. This provides the Evaluation Committee with an overview of the amount of work entailed in the review of policies presented by IFAD management to the Board. However, it must be noted that there is an emerging practice for policy documents to be discussed in informal seminars held before the Executive Board.

20. There was no consensus on this issue at the Thirty-Sixth Session of the Evaluation Committee. The Committee discussed two scenarios with regard to its potential involvement in reviewing operation policies.

- Option one would be for the Committee to confine itself to discussing only the revisions of those corporate-level policies that have been evaluated by OE or new policies that have emerged as a follow-up to an OE corporate-level evaluation.
- Option two would be for the Evaluation Committee not to extend its mandate to cover operation policies presented by IFAD management to the Board.

21. Under the first option, the Committee would discuss the documents before their presentation to the Board with the understanding that the Committee's functions would remain consistent with its overall role as advisor to the Board. However, this option might require a review of the Evaluation Policy. That is, the role of the Evaluation Committee would be limited to reviewing the relevant documents and to providing their overall comments and corresponding recommendations for the Board's consideration. As with a possible extension of the role of the Committee to cover self-evaluation activities, the Evaluation Committee's involvement in operations policy review would have resource implications that would need to be studied in more detail.

⁸ For example, the corporate-level evaluations on supervision, IFAD capabilities to promote replicable innovations, the IFAD/NGO Extended Cooperation Programme and the Technical Assistance Grant Programme for Agriculture Research.

B. Objective

22. As a result of discussions with the Evaluation Committee at its Thirty-Sixth Session, two major concerns have been taken into account in articulating the Committee's objectives:

- Many Committee members indicated that they saw evidence of important progress made in recent years in OE activities, for instance 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 feedback loop of integrating the lessons from OE evaluations into operational activities and IFAD policies and strategies remained rather weak; and
- Most Committee members felt that the Committee's reporting to the Executive Board needed strengthening if the Committee's advice is to have a greater impact on the Board.

23. There is consensus that the main objective of the Committee, in order to assist effectively the Board 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 primarily of ensuring full implementation of and compliance with the Evaluation Policy. Within this Policy, the Evaluation Committee will specifically review the formulation and implementation of OE's annual work programme and budget,⁹ and provide the Board with overall advice to assist it in discharging its oversight functions on OE. With regard to self-evaluation activities, the Committee would advise the Executive Board on the adequacy of the self-evaluation capabilities and processes in place to perform this crucial function.

C. Scope of Work

24. In order to achieve the stated objective, the Committee needs to focus its work on selected areas. First, the Committee has to satisfy itself at two levels, namely that:

- the independent and self-evaluation work is of high quality; and
- management takes up systematically the recommendations agreed in the Agreement at Completion Point (ACP) of each evaluation.

25. **Specific evaluation work required by the evaluation policy for presentation to the Executive Board and Evaluation Committee.** There is need for the Committee to prioritize its activities so as to assure the Executive Board that for major OE reports it can consistently rely on the prior work of the Committee. The Committee will, on a standing basis, review all the main OE-related documents submitted during the year for Board consideration. Three such documents are referred to in the evaluation policy, namely the: (a) OE annual work programme and budget (**which also includes a review of the previous year's achievements**); (b) ARRI; and (c) Report of the President on the Status of Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations together with OE's independent report on this report.¹⁰ Such an approach *de facto* has already been established for the ARRI and the OE work programme and budget in 2003. A review of these items is included in the work of the Evaluation Committee for 2004. In fact, this year it is envisaged that during its September session, the Committee will for the first time discuss the Report of the President on the Status of Implementation of Evaluation

⁹ A function that was performed by IFAD management before the approval of the evaluation policy in April 2003 by the Executive Board.

¹⁰ Simultaneously, OE is required to prepare and submit its comments on this, in the form of a report to the Board (see evaluation policy paragraph 49).

Recommendations¹¹ as well as the OE report to the Board on this topic, before the same is considered by the Executive Board in September 2004. Discussions on this latter document would provide the Committee with a more coherent review of the feedback loop and assess the extent to which evaluation recommendations are internalized by IFAD management in design and operation activities. With respect to self-evaluation reports, the Evaluation Committee will review and propose recommendations to the Board on the Progress Report on the Project Portfolio and any revision of the Results and Impact Measurement System (RIMS).

26. **Review of selected OE evaluation reports.** The past shift in emphasis by the Evaluation Committee towards corporate-level evaluations, country programme and thematic evaluations is helpful, as these provide an assessment of results and impact beyond the project level. However, given that projects are still the backbone of IFAD activities, the Committee will continue to review project evaluations in addition to all corporate-level evaluations carried out by OE, and selected country programme and thematic evaluations together with their respective ACPs.

27. The compulsory requirement of the evaluation policy to conduct an interim project evaluation in each case of IFAD embarking on a second phase of a project introduces a rigidity that in effect limits OE's flexibility to undertake the best mix of evaluations. In this regard, in due course the Committee should consider whether to recommend that the Executive Board review the specific provision in the evaluation policy (with regard to the mandatory undertaking of interim evaluations) with a view to introducing the required degree of flexibility in the OE annual work programme.

28. **OE's annual work programme and budget.** According to the evaluation policy, OE's annual work programme and budget will be presented together, but as a separate submission, with IFAD's annual programme of work and budget (POWB) to the Executive Board.¹² In 2003, for example, the Evaluation Committee discussed the preview of the OE work programme and budget at the Committee's September session and made its recommendations to the Board when it discussed the preview document in the September session of the Executive Board. The Evaluation Committee also had a detailed discussion on the same topic, based on a more comprehensive programme of work and budget document that OE prepared for the Third 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 at its December session. By twice reviewing the document on a systematic basis (at both the September and October sessions), the Committee can reassure the Board that it reviews the preparation and content of the OE annual programme of work and budget in detail. In fact, while adopting the Report of the Chairperson at the Thirty-Fifth Session of the Evaluation Committee in December 2003, the Board decided that the Committee would discuss the OE programme of work and budget on two occasions. First, the Committee would discuss the preview of the OE programme of work and budget during the Evaluation Committee session in September, and second, the Committee would discuss a more comprehensive document on the same topic at its session in October.

29. At its Eighty-First Session in April 2004, the Executive Board decided to request the Audit Committee to discuss the POWB (which includes OE's annual work programme and budget)¹³ for 2005 and onwards in November, before the same document is presented for approval to the Executive Board at its December sessions. In spite of this development, Evaluation Committee members were of the opinion during the July session that it was important for the Committee to continue thoroughly

¹¹ This is already a practice at other IFIs, where the board committees dealing with independent evaluation are required to review the actions taken by management on evaluation reports and their recommendations.

¹² See paragraph 28, IFAD Evaluation Policy (EB 2003/78/R.17/Rev. 1).

¹³ 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 the Office of the Controller (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.

reviewing the annual OE work programme and the OE budget as a package, as the two components are closely interlinked. This would ensure an adequate examination of the document and the formulation of coherent recommendations to facilitate the task of the Board in considering the topic. In fact, there was a consensus at this session that the Evaluation Committee 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, for which a well functioning process is in place (as described in the previous paragraph).

30. Consequently, in order to facilitate the work of the Audit Committee in reviewing the POWB, the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee will share the draft report of the October session to the December Executive Board with the Chairperson of the Audit Committee for informal circulation within the Audit Committee.¹⁴ Should the need arise, the chairpersons of the Audit Committee and Evaluation Committee would meet with a view to harmonizing their respective reports to the December Board.

D. Meetings and Reporting

31. The present review has been used to lay the basis for strengthening reporting to the Executive Board and thereby reinforce the impact of the Evaluation Committee. However, in articulating its proposal, the Committee took note of the fact that the Executive Board is seen as overburdened and thus not always able to address evaluation-related issues in a systematic and timely manner. Furthermore, the Evaluation Committee took note that the timing of the report of the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee is a major consideration in improving the Committee's reporting to the Board. The current closeness of the Evaluation Committee meetings to those of the Executive Board does not allow for the timely presentation of the Committee's findings and recommendations. The Committee saw a need for issues-oriented and focused reporting to the Executive Board in order to make the Evaluation Committee's advisory function fully effective.

32. However, before addressing the question of the Committee's reporting to the Board and the timing of Committee sessions vis-à-vis Executive Board meetings, it is worth noting the agreement reached at the Thirty-Sixth Session of the Evaluation Committee on 1 July 2004 on the frequency and length of its individual meetings, i.e. the volume of work considered essential by the Committee to carry out its function.

33. **Frequency and length of meetings.** During the July meeting, the Evaluation Committee felt that more time needed to be devoted to Committee activities. In this context, any incremental work by the Committee should result in more in-depth deliberations rather than in adding more subjects to the agenda. There was a consensus that the Committee's work required up to five meetings a year, a level already obtained in 2003 and 2004. It was noted that the organization of five or more sessions in 2003 and 2004 has had significant human resource and cost implications for OE and the Office of the Secretary (ES),¹⁵ which cannot be taken for granted.

34. There was a consensus that the Committee should be able to determine the duration of each session in light of the nature and number of agenda items it decides to consider in a given session. Therefore, it would be up to the Committee to decide when to have a half-day or full-day session. Moreover, the Chairperson may call for other *ad hoc* meetings as and when required, in addition to its regular meetings.

35. **Timing of meetings and reporting to the Executive Board.** The concern that the report of the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee be provided in adequate time for greater impact on the

¹⁴ In fact, a similar arrangement is already in place at the IDB, where the Audit Committee does not formally discuss the annual work programme and budget of the IDB's Office for Evaluation and Oversight, which is reviewed by the policy and evaluation committee.

¹⁵ Previously, the Evaluation Committee had been holding three sessions per year.

corresponding Board meeting is especially pertinent. The ARRI for example is a critical document that should be reviewed systematically by the Committee during its September session before being considered by the Executive Board in the same month. The Committee's advice to the Board on the results and impact of IFAD operations, as well as on the key insights and recommendations in the ARRI has to be highly informed and timely, so that the Executive Board's efforts may be minimized.

36. The solution to the above is to 'de-link', as and when required, the holding of the Evaluation Committee meetings from those of the Board (see next paragraph). However, there are some cost implications of such de-linking, which must be taken into consideration. One is related to the need to bring non-Rome-based Committee members to Rome. Another issue relates to interpreters. In this regard, it should be noted that Arabic interpreters are usually not recruited locally and therefore have to travel to Rome. For the other official languages, interpreters and translators are generally recruited locally on a short-term basis. However, it might be worth noting that the costs of recruiting such services in conjunction with the Board are lower than if they were recruited only for Evaluation Committee meetings.¹⁶

37. Building on the rationale in paragraph 35, there was agreement within the Committee that greater Board attention to the Committee's work would be obtained by having the report of the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee to the Executive Board circulated earlier than is the present practice. This would have an important bearing on the scheduling of Committee meetings, given the timing of Board meetings. Therefore, in order to gain in effectiveness, there was a consensus at the Committee meeting in July to de-link selected Committee meetings from Board sessions in those cases where a topic under consideration in a given Evaluation Committee session is also to be discussed at the subsequent Board meeting. This will allow for the report of the Chairperson to be dispatched to Board members at least five days before the Board session. A critical advantage of the timely provision of this report to Board members is that members will be aware of Evaluation Committee issues at an early stage.

38. With regard to the travel of non-Rome-based Committee members, it should be noted that, according to the *By-Laws for the Conduct of the Business of IFAD*, the Fund is authorized to cover the travel expenses of Executive Board members attending Board sessions. It would therefore not be possible for IFAD under the present by-laws to reimburse Executive Directors who come to Rome for Evaluation Committee meetings that are not linked to Executive Board meetings. The Evaluation Committee may also wish to note that the Governing Council, by a two-thirds majority, has the authority to change the by-laws of IFAD. Moreover, the cost issue related to Arabic interpretation (raised in paragraph 36) will also have to be addressed, as and when necessary. In the immediate future, it is therefore proposed that an appropriate allocation be included in the OE budget to cover such expenses as well as the extra cost of interpretation into Arabic (and other languages when required).

39. The Evaluation Committee's report to the Executive Board is a fundamental document in terms of providing a summary of the key issues discussed and recommendations for the Board's approval. 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. Hence, it is important for the Executive Board to receive focused and 'actionable' reports. In addition to these reports, as per Evaluation Policy requirements, OE in consultation with ES will summarize the key deliberations and recommendations of Committee sessions in the form of minutes, which will be circulated in draft to all participants for their clearance. ES will continue with

¹⁶ It may be of interest to Committee members to note that at the CODE meetings of the World Bank, where no translation is used, members less fluent in English have at times circulated comments prior to the meeting to ensure full understanding of their concern — a procedure that has also been used, from time to time, by members with perfect fluency.

the production of verbatim records and make them accessible to the Committee upon request. With regard to ES, it is important to note that the overall organizational and administrative relationship between ES and OE with regard to the Evaluation Committee is governed by the President's Bulletin issued in December 2003 (see Annex IV for details).

40. **Documentation for the Evaluation Committee.** Whenever an OE evaluation is considered by the Committee, OE will systematically provide the Committee with sufficiently comprehensive evaluation summaries (of about five to ten pages) together with the corresponding ACP. The ACPs would allow the Evaluation Committee to understand the rationale underlying agreements and differences in the views between 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.

41. OE will also 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 major cost implication for the operations of the Committee.

E. Membership and Governance

42. In the July 2004 session, there was a broad consensus that efforts should be made to strengthen evaluation knowledge within the Committee to make it a stronger advisory body to the Executive Board in all evaluation matters. This is important as not all Committee and Board members can turn to the authorities in their home country for quick assistance in evaluation matters. It was 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 following steps will be introduced:

- as per current practice, OE will continue systematically to provide a small package of documentation and intensive oral briefings to new Committee members to assist them in familiarizing themselves with the work and methods of the Evaluation Committee and OE; and
- OE will organize a workshop or seminar for all Committee members, also open to other Board members, to help them become familiar with evaluation methodologies and policies, including obtaining different points of view from recognized authorities. This would be done soon after the Board elects a new Evaluation Committee.

43. **Field visits.** As in the past, OE will organize field visits to be undertaken by the Evaluation Committee on a periodic basis. These are very useful instruments to allow the Committee to exchange views on the ground and enhance their ability to contribute effectively to Committee deliberations. Board Directors who are not members of the Evaluation Committee may also take part in such visits, with the understanding that the participation of both Committee members and other Board 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.

44. **Composition, Chairperson and the role of observers.** Currently, the Evaluation Committee consists of nine members, four from List A, two from List B and three from List C.¹⁷ The Chairperson is selected from List B or List C members of the Committee.^{18 19} The Committee recommends to the Board that the current arrangement with regard to the composition and Chairperson of the Committee be maintained. Moreover, there was broad agreement that Board Directors who are not Evaluation Committee members may participate in Committee meetings as observers.

III. RESOURCE ISSUES

45. A number of points raised above have resource implications, as follows:

- **Increasing the number and length of Evaluation Committee meetings to up to five per year.** Beyond costs that fall directly on Committee members for their additional time spent on Committee activities, there would be significant costs for OE and to a lesser extent for ES staff preparing for and attending such meetings. Some additional IFAD management time would also be spent attending the meetings and to the extent that more evaluation reports would be discussed, additional management attention may also be necessary (for example to discuss the Report of the President on the Status of Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations);
- **De-linking from Executive Board sessions.** Such a de-link would involve moving the date of Evaluation Committee meetings by some two weeks or so (ahead of Executive Board sessions) in the case of at least two meetings. This is because the Committee in its respective sessions in September and December will discuss several topics for consideration at the Board sessions that follow in the same month. This change would have measurable cost implications for travel of non-Rome-based members and somewhat higher costs for interpretation (see paragraph 36-38); and
- **Preparation of Committee members** (see paragraph 40). This would add mainly to OE costs for preparing and conducting instructional workshops, say every two years, and less frequently for the preparation of an introduction briefing kit which, as is currently the case, would be largely a compendium from existing documentation.

46. It is assumed that, as per the *Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board*, the Evaluation Committee 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 grow with any increase in the number of meetings and topics to be discussed,²⁰ and would be borne by ES. In light of the current zero-growth directive of the Board on IFAD's administrative budget, any significant (incremental) increase in costs including those caused by an eventual extension of the Committee's mandate might have to be absorbed by the OE budget, except for roughly the first ten per cent increase, which would be absorbed by ES. For this purpose, OE will include a contingency allocation in its 2005 budget proposal, pending a Board decision on the revised TOR and rules of procedure of the Evaluation Committee.

¹⁷ As for the Evaluation Committee, the Audit Committee has four members from List A, two from List B and three from List C.

¹⁸ As decided by the Executive Board at its Sixty-First Session.

¹⁹ The Chairperson of the Audit Committee is selected from Audit Committee members from List A.

²⁰ However, significant cost savings will be achieved should the Evaluation Committee decide on an *ad hoc* basis to operate only in English.

IV. PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE

47. This section has been divided into two parts. In the first part, the draft proposed TOR of the Evaluation Committee have been outlined, whereas in the second part key elements of the ROP are proposed.

A. Terms of Reference

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

Mandate²¹

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

Objectives

50. In order to assist the Executive Board in discharging its oversight, the Committee has two main objectives:

- to satisfy itself that IFAD's independent and self-evaluation activities embodied in two management reports (the Progress Report on the Project Portfolio and any further revisions to the RIMS) are relevant and carried out effectively and efficiently. As to 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 are undertaken in line with the policy; 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 17.

Scope of Work

51. 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 Report of the President on the Status of 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 Executive Board;
- Discuss all OE corporate-level evaluations and selected country programme, thematic and project evaluation reports together with their respective ACPs;

²¹ In the event that the Evaluation Committee 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 Evaluation Committee.

- Discuss the following reports, including OE comments on the same, prior to their consideration by the Executive Board: (a) the Progress Report on the Project Portfolio; and (b) any possible future revision prepared by management to the RIMS; 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 to ensuring the full independence of the concerned OE activity.

B. Rules of Procedure

52. 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, Timing and Length of Meeting. The Evaluation Committee shall hold up to five sessions in each calendar year. One meeting will be held before each of the (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. If required the Committee shall hold a fifth meeting in the first semester of the year. The exact dates and length of each meeting in the subsequent year will be fixed during the Committee's annual December session. Additional special sessions in the same calendar year may also be called on an *ad hoc* basis by the Evaluation Committee Chairperson at any time in the year.

Rule 2: Notification of Sessions and Agenda. ES shall inform each Committee member of the date and venue of a session at least thirty days in advance. During its December session, the Evaluation Committee shall draw up a tentative agenda for all sessions in the subsequent year, taking into consideration the various standing items that the Committee must discuss. For this purpose, OE shall provide the Committee with a proposal for the agenda of its 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 ES to all Evaluation Committee members along with the notification of sessions. A notification of each Evaluation Committee session together with the agenda will be sent by ES for information to all other Executive Board Directors who are not members of the Evaluation Committee.

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: Chair. The Committee will elect its Chairperson from its List B and C Committee members. In the absence of the Chairperson during a scheduled meeting or field visit of the Committee, the role of Chairperson 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. Other IFAD staff members might be required to attend the Committee meetings and to provide, pursuant to the Committee's request, such information and clarifications as may be required in carrying out the Committee's responsibilities. Evaluation Committee members will participate as observers in any field visit organized by OE. Other Executive Board members not members of the Evaluation Committee may also attend Committee 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. Key issues and recommendations shall be recorded in a report of the Evaluation Committee, which the Chairperson shall prepare after each session and submit for approval to the Executive Board (see Rule 9). This document too will be disclosed to the public through the IFAD website. In consultation with ES, OE shall prepare minutes after each Committee session and send them in draft to all the participants for their clearance before finalization.

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

V. DECISIONS SOUGHT FROM THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

53. The Thirty-Seventh Session of the Evaluation Committee is requested to provide its overall comments and observations on the Committee's proposed TOR and ROP. In particular, it is requested to take a decision on the issues raised in paragraph 20. Following this session, OE will revise the document taking into consideration any additional suggestions by the Committee. The document will then be submitted on behalf of the Committee to the Executive Board in December 2004 for decision.

COMPARISON WITH THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK AND THE WORLD BANK

	IFAD	IDB	World Bank
1. Independent Evaluation Office (functions)			
Name of Office	Office of Evaluation (OE)	Office of Evaluation and Oversight (OVE)	Operations Evaluation Department (OED) ¹
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	Evaluation Committee (EC)	Policy and 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)	Nine	Seven	Eight
Frequency of meetings	Three to five per year	Average three per month	Average two per month
Open to non-members	Yes	Yes	Yes
Formal TOR for committee	Yes	No (role discussed in board meetings – would be found in minutes)	Yes (for sector strategy papers, country assistance reviews, evaluation policies, methods and processes)
Evaluation subcommittee(s)	No	No	Yes
Relationship with Executive Board	Advisory	Advisory	Advisory

3. Executive Board			
Members (Number)	18, plus 18 alternate members, who all participate in Executive Board sessions	14	24
Frequency of meetings	Three per year	One to two weekly	One to two weekly
4. Reports from Independent Evaluation Office			
(a) For Executive Board agenda	Work programme and budget, ARRI, Report of the President on the Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations together with OE's report on the same topic (with Evaluation Committee advice)	All (with PEC advice)	Work programme and budget, the Annual Report on Operations Evaluation and the Annual Review of Development Effectiveness (with CODE advice)
(b) For Executive Board Information only	All OE evaluation reports. The Committee 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 other such OED reports for Board discussion
(c) For committee agenda	Work programme and budget, ARRI, Report of the President on the Implementation of Evaluation Recommendations together with OE's report on the same topic, sample of other OE reports	Annual report and work programme and budget for following year. All other OVE reports	All reports except (i) project evaluations; and (ii) country assistance evaluation – latter are considered by the subcommittee

<p>5. Tracking recommendations from evaluations</p>	<p>To start in 2004 with OE response to the Board (see 4 above)</p>	<p>Not systemic</p>	<p>Management Action Report follows all recommendations except for those in country assistance evaluations (handled separately in the context of the next Country Assistance Strategy)</p>
<p>6. Reporting from the Committee to the Executive Board</p>	<p>Report of Chairperson on all items discussed in Evaluation Committee</p>	<p>Report of chair on all Office of Evaluation and Oversight reports (two to three pages)</p>	<p>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)</p>

SUMMARY COMMENT

1. Any comments on comparing IFAD with the two other IFIs regarding their board committee functions on evaluation activities have to start out with two related basic differences: these two IFIs have a board with full-time resident Executive Directors, and their volume of operations is larger than 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 evaluation, in these two IFIs are much above 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 independent evaluation offices and their respective boards and board committees. Two are of special interest:

- **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 the IDB, 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 OE and the Evaluation Committee at present have no oversight function on self-evaluation undertaken by management. That oversight function has so far remained a direct Board responsibility;
- **The role of the board committee that addresses evaluations.** At the IDB and World Bank there has been an evolution over time towards the respective committee's enlarged functions, now covering both evaluation and operations policies. For many years at the World Bank, for instance, the board had a Joint Audit Committee with two arms, one dealing with the traditional audit function the other with the 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 World Bank board recognized increasingly that for an effective evaluation feedback loop, one major link was to build these lessons into new operations policies. CODE now has to ensure that such a link is established under its mandate.

2. In addition, it is worth drawing 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 World Bank, in CODE's ability to draw consistently on OED evaluations together with management responses for its own deliberations.

**LIST OF IFAD EVALUATION COMMITTEE AND EXECUTIVE BOARD
MEMBERS INTERVIEWED**

Evaluation Committee Members

Date

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

Other IFAD Executive Board Members/Evaluation Committee Observers

Mr Victor Hugo Morales Mexico (former Committee Chairperson)	26 March
Ms Djerir Habiba, Algeria	26 March
M Peter Reid, United Kingdom (e-mail)	14 April
Ms Margaret Slettevold, Norway	19 April
Mr Mark Jaskowiak, USA	28 April

**TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE
APPROVED BY THE EXECUTIVE BOARD IN DECEMBER 1999**

Terms of Reference of the Evaluation Committee

- (1) To enhance the ability of the Executive Board to assess the overall quality and impact of IFAD programmes and projects through a discussion of selected evaluations and reviews conducted by the Office of Evaluation and Studies 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 and Studies 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

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 day preceding the September and December Executive Board sessions, respectively. Additional informal sessions 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 and Studies 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 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.

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 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.

ANNEX III

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 IFAD 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 and Studies 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 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY IN RELATION TO THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE¹

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.

¹ As included in the President's Bulletin dated 8 December 2003 on the IFAD Evaluation Policy.

LIST OF OPERATION POLICIES PRESENTED TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD SINCE 2000

EB69	May 2000	IFAD Rural Finance Policy
EB74	Dec 2001	Strategic Framework for IFAD 2002-2005
EB78	Apr 2003	IFAD's Evaluation Policy
EB78	Apr 2003	IFAD's Rural Enterprise Policy
EB79	Sept 2003	The Structure and Operation of a Performance-Based Allocation System for IFAD
EB80	Dec 2003	IFAD Policy for Grant Financing
EB82	Sept 2004	IFAD's Private-Sector Development and Partnership Strategy

