

Document: EC 2013/80/W.P.4/Add.1
Agenda: 4
Date: 14 November 2013
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

Revised procedures for selecting and appointing the Director of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD as contained in the IFAD Evaluation Policy:

Comments of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD

Note to Evaluation Committee members

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Fabrizio Felloni
Officer-in-Charge
Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
Tel.: +39 5459 2361
e-mail: f.felloni@ifad.org

Dispatch of documentation:

Deirdre McGrenra
Head, Governing Bodies Office
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2374
e-mail: gb_office@ifad.org

Evaluation Committee — Eightieth Session
Rome, 18 November 2013

For: Review

Revised procedures for selecting and appointing the Director of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD as contained in the IFAD Evaluation Policy:

Comments of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD

1. In commenting on the revised procedures for selecting and appointing the Director, Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE), IOE will focus mainly on the possible implications for IOE's independence. While several of the proposed changes improve the clarity and comprehensiveness of the procedures set out in the IFAD Evaluation Policy, IOE has some concerns related to selected changes.
2. **Areas of general agreement.** IOE supports the proposed paragraph 58(b) on legal and administrative support to the search panel. It notes the proposal in paragraphs 58(c) and 58(d) on the engagement of a headhunting firm, which would be approved by the search panel.
3. IOE strongly recommends that the revised Evaluation Policy explicitly require approval by the Executive Board of a special budget allocation to enable IOE to pay for all costs connected with the recruitment of the Director, IOE, including, but not limited to, the fees of the headhunting firm (if the search panel decides to engage such firm). It is important to note that the recruitment costs for the position are very high and cannot be accommodated through the IOE budget envelope.
4. IOE supports the checking of academic and professional credentials provided in the vacancy application form prior to the search panel's consideration of the candidates. This represents good practice and will help to ensure that the search panel, Evaluation Committee and Executive Board have all the relevant information for a decision to be reached.
5. In addition, IOE supports all ameliorations suggested in paragraph 58(g) regarding added clarity on reporting, what to do if a consensus is not reached and rule 2.3 and 2.5 of the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Evaluation Committee. IOE finds that subparagraphs 58(h) and 58(i) add clarity to the process. Similarly, IOE agrees with the additions covering possible conflicts of interest for members of the search panel and the details provided in annex III of the Evaluation Policy.
6. As per paragraph 58(k), under normal circumstances, the Deputy Director is designated as interim officer-in-charge, IOE. However, having procedures in place to cover unusual circumstances in which the Deputy Director would not be in a position to act as officer-in-charge is desirable. Given IOE's independence from Management, it would be appropriate for the Executive Board to make a decision as to the course of action. The Evaluation Committee could be tasked with preparing a report setting out its reasoning as to why the Deputy Director should not be appointed as officer-in-charge.
7. **Disciplinary actions.** The proposal submitted to the Evaluation Committee contains added text to paragraph 64 ("Grounds and Procedures for Dismissing the Director, IOE") and paragraph 82 ("Investigation"). It is to be noted that this overall change is outside the mandate of the current revision, as requested by the Executive Board in September 2013, which is expected to focus solely on the procedures for recruiting and appointing the Director, IOE. Therefore, as a first option, it would be preferable not to include such a change in the revision of the policy at this stage. IOE suggests that this matter be reconsidered after sufficient time has been taken to review good practices in comparable organizations which

could inform how best to proceed at IFAD (whether, for example, investigations should involve a third party).

8. However, given that this matter was the subject of debate in a closed Executive Board session in September 2013, IOE recognizes that the subject is of high importance. Should the Evaluation Committee, as an alternative option, wish to recommend greater clarity in the text provided in paragraphs 64 and 82 of the Evaluation Policy, then it is fundamental that the text adopted respect the principles of independence of IOE, notably the fact that IOE reports to the Executive Board, not to IFAD Management, with all the implications that such a reporting line implies.
9. Consistent with this fact, the Executive Board should make the ultimate decision on any integrity-related sanctions and be responsible for the approval of any integrity-related corrective or disciplinary measures, if any. In addition, transparency of the process should be ensured, with the full investigation report and proposed sanction made available to the Evaluation Committee and the Executive Board prior to their taking a decision. The Director, IOE or concerned IOE staff member should also be given the opportunity to provide written comments on the final report directly to the Evaluation Committee and the Executive Board for their consideration and provide clarification as required.
10. In the case of an investigation concerning the Director, IOE, justification for the investigation request should be presented to the Executive Board before the investigation is initiated. If the Board approves the undertaking of an investigation, at the conclusion of the investigation the report on the disciplinary investigation, together with the proposed sanction, should be submitted to the Executive Board for its approval, rejection or modification.
11. In the case of IOE staff, a report on the disciplinary investigation together with the proposed sanction should be submitted to the Executive Board for its approval, rejection or modification.
12. In sum, paragraph 64 should read as follows: "For any integrity investigations related to the Director, IOE, the justification of the investigation request will be presented to the Executive Board through the Evaluation Committee. If the undertaking of an investigation is approved, at the conclusion of the investigation, the report on the disciplinary investigation, together with the proposed sanction, should be submitted to the Executive Board through the Evaluation Committee for its approval, rejection or modification. The Director, IOE may provide written comments on the final report directly to the Evaluation Committee and the Executive Board for their consideration and may be given an opportunity to provide clarification as required."
13. Paragraph 82 should read as follows: "**Investigation.** The IOE, Director and IOE staff are held to the same integrity standards as all other IFAD staff, and are subject to integrity investigations if the need arises. The President has the authority to initiate investigations, through the Office of Audit and Oversight, of the activities or conduct of the Director of IOE or the staff of IOE. In the case of the Director, the procedure set out in paragraph 64 applies. In the case of IOE staff, a report on the disciplinary investigation together with the proposed sanction should be submitted to the Executive Board, through the Evaluation Committee, for its approval, rejection or modification. The concerned IOE staff member may provide written comments on the final report directly to the Evaluation Committee and the Executive Board for their consideration and may be given an opportunity to provide clarification as required."