

Document: EC 2010/63/W.P.2/Rev.1
Agenda: 3
Date: 24 June 2010
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Peer Review of IFAD's Office of Evaluation and Evaluation Function

Note to Evaluation Committee members

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Luciano Lavizzari
Director, Office of Evaluation
telephone: +39 06 5459 2274
e-mail: l.lavizzari@ifad.org

Kevin Cleaver
Associate Vice-President, Programmes
telephone: +39 06 5459 2419
e-mail: k.cleaver@ifad.org

Dispatch of documentation:

Deirdre McGrenra
Governing Bodies Officer
telephone: +39 06 5459 2374
e-mail: d.mcgrenra@ifad.org

Evaluation Committee — Sixty-third Session
Rome, 15–16 July 2010

For: **Review**

Peer Review of IFAD's Office of Evaluation and Evaluation Function

A. Background/reference

1. As you know, the Executive Board at its 99th session in April 2010 requested the Evaluation Committee to take forward the peer review process. There are three main documents that capture priority elements that need to be addressed in the 63rd Committee session on 15-16 July 2010. These three documents are: (i) the Evaluation Committee Chairperson's report from its 62nd session on 1 April; and (ii) the draft decisions and deliberations of the 99th Evaluation Board held in April 2010, currently available to members through the IFAD website (see document EB 2010/99/INF.9). In addition, (iii) the final Peer Review report and its Action Plan are also critical reference documents for the Committee.
2. It is useful to recall that the document on the "Draft decisions and deliberations of the Board" (available on line to members) notes that "diverse views were expressed on some of the more detailed recommendations and on processes and procedures" included in the final Peer Review report (see also EB 2010/99/R.6/Add.3), which the Committee is invited to review. The Evaluation Committee Chairperson's report, (see document EB 2010/99/R.5) recorded the three areas where disagreement still exists between Management and the recommendations contained in the final Peer Review report. Furthermore, the Evaluation Committee Chairperson's report captured the Committee's unanimous support to the recommendations in the Peer Review report as well as the Committee's position with regard to the membership-driven critical role it has to play in taking forward the Peer Review process.

B. What is the Evaluation Committee expected to do?

3. In summary, the following would be the main activities the Evaluation Committee would need to address in order to move the peer review process forward:
 - (a) review and decide on the three remaining areas of disagreement expressed by the IFAD management on the recommendations in the final peer review report; and
 - (b) Decide more broadly on how to proceed in implementing the recommendations of the Peer Review, which are also summarised in the draft Action Plan document that was circulated among Committee members in March.
4. As a result, there are main tasks for the Evaluation Committee. These include:
 - (a) Review the areas of disagreement in its July session and take a timely decision on the concerned matters;
 - (b) Decide on how to proceed with the preparation of the revised Evaluation Policy as well as the Evaluation Committee's terms of reference and rules of procedure, which are the two main deliverables expected by the implementation of the Peer Review's recommendations;
 - (c) Decide how to mobilise the professional support (a consultant that we might require for performing these tasks);
 - (d) Supervising: (i) the implementation by IEO and the management of the recommendations of the Peer Review that fall within their respective areas and (ii) determine a realistic time plan for the entire approval process; and
 - (e) Determine how to keep the Board informed/consulted during the process.