

Document: EC 2013/80/W.P.4
Agenda: 4
Date: 13 November 2013
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

Revision of the procedures for selecting and appointing the Director of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD contained in the IFAD Evaluation Policy

Note to Evaluation Committee members

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Michael Gehringer

Director
Human Resources Division
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2820
e-mail: m.gehringer@ifad.org

Fabrizio Felloni

Officer in Charge
Independent Office of Evaluation of
IFAD
Tel.: +39 06 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

Revision of the procedures for selecting and appointing the Director of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD contained in the IFAD Evaluation Policy

Contents

I	Introduction	2
Annexes		
I	Report of the Consultant	3
II	Notes from the informal meeting of the Evaluation Committee (held on 8 November 2013)	9
III	Proposed Amendments to the Revised Evaluation Policy	10
IV	Amendment to Sections 64 and 82 of the Revised Evaluation Policy	20
V	Curriculum Vitae of External Consultant	22

I. Introduction

1. Acting at the direction of the Evaluation Committee, pursuant to the decision taken by the Executive Board in July 2013, IFAD management and the Interim Officer-in-Charge of the IOE engaged an independent external consultant¹ to review the procedures for the selection and appointment of the Director, IOE, contained in the 2011 Revised IFAD Evaluation Policy.
2. The consultant took into account the recommendations of the 2013 Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Appointment of the Director, IOE, for revisions to these procedures, as well as comments provided by IFAD management and IOE on an initial draft. The consultant had provided a brief report summarizing his findings, attached as Annex I, and has proposed changes to the Revised IFAD Evaluation Policy. Annex II is an excerpt of the Revised IFAD Evaluation Policy Executive Board document 2011/102/R.7 Rev.1, dated 10 May 2011, in which the suggested changes to the Policy are indicated in tracked changes. The proposed changes begin in Part II, Chapter V of the Policy – Human Resources Management. Therefore, this document includes only those chapters containing proposed changes (Part II, Chapter V and Chapter VI).
3. The Evaluation Committee is asked to review the proposed changes and provide direction and comments. These changes will be incorporated and the revised document will be presented at the formal meeting of the Evaluation Committee on 18 November. Final recommendations will be proposed to the Executive Board for its approval at its 110th Session in December 2013.

¹ The curriculum vita of the consultant, who has extensive experience in recruitment in international organizations and familiarity with the work of independent offices of evaluation, is attached as Annex III.

Review of Procedures for Selecting and Appointing Director of the Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE)

Report of the External Consultant

1. At the request of IFAD management and the Interim Officer-in-Charge of the IOE, acting at the direction of the Evaluation Committee, I have reviewed the revised procedures for the selection and appointment of the Director, IOE contained in the Revised IFAD Evaluation Policy document. In doing so, I have taken into account the recommendations of the 2013 Ad-Hoc Working Group on the Appointment of the Director, IOE for additional revisions to these procedures, as well as comments provided by IFAD management and IOE on an initial draft. I have also obtained background information from IOE and the Human Resources Division (HRD) on recruitment procedures, including experience with recent efforts to select a new IOE Director.
2. In undertaking the review, I was guided by the premise that the IOE must be independent of IFAD management and operate at arm's- length from the Executive Board. Its operational independence must be both actual and perceived and, for this reason, it is located organizationally outside the line and staff management function of IFAD. Thus it follows that the selection and appointment of the Director IOE should reflect this independent status.
3. On the whole, the procedures for selecting and appointing the Director, as described in Section V of the Revised IFAD Evaluation Policy and the Working Group's revisions, largely meet the objectives of ensuring the independence of IOE from IFAD management while providing an effective means of locating and bringing a Director on board. However, in my view, there are several areas where the procedures could be further developed or more clearly articulated to further

increase their effectiveness and align them with best practices. These are summarized below and reflected in text revisions to Section V of the Revised IFAD Evaluation Policy (attached).

- a. **The Working Group's recommendation 1** proposed that the search panel comprise three Executive Board members who are not members of the Evaluation Committee. I agree with this recommendation, which would ensure that all members of the Evaluation Committee are on an equal footing when presented with the search panel's recommendations. The Convenors of each of the three Lists could nominate the three Executive Board members to serve on the panel. These three Board members would then select a chairperson from among themselves. As a means of further underscoring the importance of independence in the selection process, I would also suggest that, while there should be a management representative on the search panel, the representative should participate as a non-voting member. At this stage, and before the search panel commences its work, the Chair of the Search Panel should consult with the Chair of the Evaluation Committee to address any questions regarding the qualifications to be sought in candidates or other issues relevant to the selection process.
- b. **As per the Working Group's recommendation 2**, a sentence should be added to paragraph 58(b) indicating that administrative support should be consistent with established IFAD policies, rules, and procedures.
- c. Although not a recommendation of the Working Group, in addition to advertising for the Director position, best practice in similar organizations would suggest that the search panel be strongly encouraged to engage the services of a professional headhunting firm. Use of such a firm helps to ensure the actual and perceived neutrality and independence of the

selection process, broadens the pool of prospective applicants, and ensures that candidates fully meet the qualification requirements. The firm can narrow down the field and present the search panel with a slate of the best-qualified candidates.

- d. **In line with the Working Group's recommendation 3**, once the search panel has drawn up a short list of candidates, it should ask the HRD to verify that the academic and professional credentials of the candidates are valid. Reference checks could also be carried out at this stage, either by HRD or the headhunting firm, subject to the agreement of the individuals concerned. In some instances, individuals would not wish their current employers to be contacted unless/until they receive a conditional offer of employment. As is customary practice in such cases, reference checks can be conducted at a later date.
- e. **Recommendation 4 of the Working Group** calls for both the chairs of the search panel and the Evaluation Committee to meet jointly with the President following completion of the panel's work. However, if the Chair of the Evaluation Committee is not to be a member of the search panel, it would not be appropriate for him/her to participate in the meeting. In fact, this would further ensure that all members of the Evaluation Committee are on an equal footing when presented with the search panel's recommendations.
- f. **In its recommendation 5**, the Working Group noted that the meaning of the term "common understanding" in paragraph 58(f) needs clarification. Indeed, this has an important bearing on how the process moves forward from the search panel to the Evaluation Committee and thence onto the Executive Board. Ideally, the Evaluation Committee should endeavor to arrive at a consensus on the ranking of the candidates. It would then

forward a report containing its recommendations to the Executive Board, which would determine if it agrees with the Committee's number one choice or if it prefers another of the short-listed candidates. If the Evaluation Committee cannot reach a consensus on the ranking of candidates, it should still send the short list to the Executive Board, together with a report explaining why it has been unable to reach agreement on the ranking or, if it deems none of the candidates qualified, why the search process should be restarted. It is important that this report be approved by all participating members of the Evaluation Committee as the official record of the Committee's deliberations. Upon receipt of the Evaluation Committee's report, the Executive Board will decide if it wishes to appoint one of the candidates or, if it finds none of them suitable, ask the Evaluation Committee to restart the search process. The proposed revision also clarifies that reporting to the Board on this matter shall be governed by Rule 2.3 of the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Evaluation Committee.

- g. **In its recommendation 6**, the Working Group proposed language to be included in the Revised Evaluation Policy with respect to the identification and handling of actual or perceived conflicts of interest involving search panel members. I would suggest that the importance of avoiding conflicts of interest be mentioned in the Evaluation Policy itself and that , given the absence of a Code of Conduct for the Executive Board where such matters would normally be addressed, possible measures for the identification and handling of conflicts of interest be attached to the Policy as an annex (see suggested Annex III).
- h. In addition, to provide guidance to the Evaluation Committee, I have suggested in paragraph 58 that the recruitment process for the Director,

IOE should start at least six months before the expiration of the incumbent Director's contract (in line with standard IFAD practice) or upon receipt of the incumbent's resignation, whichever is earlier.

4. I understand that during the course of the most recent effort to select a new IOE Director, it came to light that the procedures for identifying and approving an Officer-in-Charge if the Director has resigned are not specified in the Revised Evaluation Policy. In order to address this gap I would suggest adding a provision to the policy that, if the position of IOE Director falls vacant, the Deputy Director will automatically serve as Interim Officer-in-Charge, pending the appointment of a Director, unless otherwise decided by the Executive Board. In the event the Deputy Director is not available to serve for any reason, the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee, in consultation with the President, will appoint one of the Senior Evaluation Officers as Temporary Officer-in-Charge. If a longer-term Interim Officer-in-Charge is required, the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee, with the support of IFAD management and the Temporary Officer-in-Charge and in consultation with the President, will identify and appoint such an individual.

5. Finally, although strictly speaking, it falls outside the specific terms of reference for this review, another procedural gap that surfaced in the recent recruitment effort for IOE Director concerns the procedures for handling corrective or disciplinary measures flowing from an integrity investigation of the IOE Director or IOE staff. These procedures are also not specified in the Revised Evaluation Policy. Given that the issue arose in the context of recruiting for the Director position, I understand that management would wish to see it addressed. Accordingly, I am including a proposal, which, hopefully, will help to clarify the situation.

- a. Paragraphs 64 and 82 of the Revised Evaluation Policy stipulate that the IOE Director and staff are held to the same integrity standards as all other IFAD staff and subject to integrity investigations should the need arise. The results of such investigations, carried out by the President, are then “considered by the Board.” While such situations should be rare, it would be useful if the Policy were clearer with respect to the authority to impose corrective or disciplinary measures, if any, arising from such investigations after consideration by the Executive Board.

- b. Therefore, I have proposed language that I have been informed reflects decisions taken by the Executive Board in a recent closed session, indicating that, unless otherwise decided by the Executive Board, the President will determine the appropriate corrective or disciplinary measures, if any, in line with the practices and precedents followed in integrity investigations of all other IFAD staff. The only exception would be if dismissal of the IOE Director is the proposed disciplinary action: this would have to be determined by the Executive Board.

Notes from Informal meeting of the Evaluation Committee, held on Friday, 8 November 2013, on the revisions to the IFAD Evaluation Policy relative to the procedures for selecting and appointing the Director of IOE

- Clarification was provided as to the **budgetary implications** of the procedure for the selection and appointment of the Director, IOE. Costs related to the hiring of a professional headhunting firm tend to be in the region of US\$90,000 – 110,000. The costs are borne by the hiring division.
- There was discussion regarding the **revisions to paragraphs 64 and 82** (relative to integrity investigations) of the Revised Evaluation Policy. Some members felt that this went beyond the mandate of the Evaluation Committee, which should focus only on the selection and appointment procedures for the Director, IOE. Other members were of the opinion that making recommendations on revisions to any part of the Evaluation Policy were within the purview of the Evaluation Committee, that the recent recruitment exercise had highlighted lessons to be learned with respect to the integrity investigations and sanctions and that the opportunity should be seized to ensure clarity. **Discussion in this regard was deferred to the meeting of 18 November.**
- **Amendments** to the section of the Revised Evaluation Policy on the Procedure for selecting and appointing Director of IOE, agreed to by all members, are shown in the attachment.
- The following issues were not supported by the Committee:
 - **Restricting the voting power of the independent external experts.**
 - **Ensuring the Evaluation Committee chair's participation in the Search panel chair's meeting with the President.**
- The following clarification was provided:
 - the **process for ensuring academic and professional credential checks** would normally be carried out in advance by the HR division, as the arbiters of what is considered acceptable under IFAD's rules and procedures.
 - the **final report to the Executive Board** on the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee would be a Committee report and not a report of the Chairperson.
 - the Evaluation Committee would consider the report of the Search Panel and then make its own recommendations to the Board. **The Executive Board would consider only the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee**, not those of the Search panel, and would base its decision thereon.
- **IOE comments** on the revisions will be submitted in writing to the Evaluation Committee meeting on 18 November.

Proposed amendments to the Revised Evaluation Policy

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms

V. Human resource management

- A. Procedure for selecting and appointing Director of IOE
- B. Grounds and procedures for dismissing the Director IOE
- C. Principles for the annual performance review of Director IOE
- D. IOE staff and consultants

VI. Audit and investigation

Annexes:

I Types of evaluations conducted by IOE

II Key elements of the terms of reference of the Director of IOE

III Considerations for Identifying and handling conflicts of interest in the selection of the Director of IOE

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACP	Agreement at Completion Point
ARRI	Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations
CLE	Corporate Level Evaluation
CLP	Core Learning Partnership
CPE	Country Programme Evaluation
ECG	Evaluation Cooperation Group
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
IOE	IFAD's Office of Evaluation
PCR	Project Completion Report
PCRV	Project Completion Report Validation
PMD	Programme Management Department
PPA	Project Performance Assessment
	President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation
PRISMA	Recommendations and Management Actions
RIDE	Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness
TOR	Terms of Reference

V. Human resource management

A. Procedure for selecting and appointing Director of IOE

58. The Director IOE shall be ~~selected~~^{appointed} by the Board for a single, non-renewable period of six years². The Fund shall enter into a contract with the Director IOE in accordance with the terms determined by the Executive Board, which shall be equivalent to D-2 rank positions at IFAD. The recruitment process for the Director should start at least six months before the expiration of the incumbent Director's contract or upon receipt of the incumbent's resignation, whichever is earlier. The following procedures will be applied for the selection and appointment of the Director IOE:

- a) ~~The selection process will be led by a search panel consisting of three representatives of Executive Board members who, for the duration of the search panel process are not neither -members of the Evaluation Committee nor serving as Convenors of their respective Lists and/or sub-Lists including the Chairperson (one each from Lists A, B and C and nominated by the Convenors of the respective lists), and two independent experts identified by the Evaluation Committee with recognized evaluation experience (at least one of whom would have experience managing an independent evaluation department). and a representative of IFAD's senior management~~^{A representative of IFAD's senior management will participate in the panel as a non-voting member. The Executive Board search panel members will choose a chairperson who shall not be one of the independent experts nor the management representative.}
- b) IFAD Management shall provide administrative and legal support and advice to the search panel. Such support and the recruitment process and procedures should be consistent with established IFAD policies, rules, and procedures to the extent that they are not superseded by the provisions of the Evaluation Policy.
- c) The search panel shall develop the position description and, ensure that the position is advertised. A professional headhunting firm may be engaged to help ensure that a slate of well-qualified candidates is provided to the panel. The search panel will decide whether to engage a professional headhunting firm and approve the selection of the firm., prepare the short list of applicants, interview and assess the applicants and rank the candidates in order of merit.
- d) From the applicants obtained either through advertising and or a professional headhunting firm or both, the search panel will draw up a short list of candidates, interview and assess them, and rank them in order of merit.
- d)e) The search panel will request the Human Resources Division to verify that the academic and professional credentials of those candidates short-listed for further consideration are valid before proceeding with its assessment of the shortlisted candidates. Subject to their agreement, personal and professional references of shortlisted candidates will also be checked at this stage by the Human Resources Division or the professional headhunting firm at the search panel's direction. Otherwise, the search panel will request the Human Resources Division or the professional headhunting firm to carry out reference checks after the search panel has identified its preferred candidate, with the results made available to the search panel before it completes its work. To help ensure good quality candidates, if required, a professional head-hunting firm may be engaged to help the search panel.

² Key elements of the terms of reference of the Director of IOE is attached in Annex II.

- e)f) After the search panel completes its work, the Chairperson of the panel/Evaluation Committee will consult with the IFAD President to obtain her/his views with respect to the recommendations of the Search Panel.
- f)g) The search panel Chair will/ould then prepare a report on its work, which the Chairperson of the Search Panel will present to a special/dedicated session of the Evaluation Committee. present the report of the search panel to the Evaluation Committee. This report will clearly mention the views of the President with respect to the suitability of the recommended candidates, the order in which they are ranked and, and any other concern the President may have about the recommended candidates. Thereafter, the Committee will endeavour to arrive at a consensus on the ranking of candidates in order to present in the Committee's report to the Executive Board, as far as possible, the unanimous views of Committee members. In the event the Committee cannot reach a consensus, it should provide along with the list of candidates a report setting out the different views expressed in the Committee and an explanation of why it has been unable to reach agreement or, if it deems none of the candidates qualified, why the search process should be restarted. This report, which shall be approved by all participating Evaluation Committee members, will constitute the official record of the Evaluation Committee's meeting. Reporting to the Board on this matter shall be governed by Rule 2.3 of the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Evaluation Committee. For the purposes of the Evaluation Committee meeting(s) dedicated to consideration of the search panel's report, Rule 2.5 of the Terms of Reference and Rules of procedure of the Evaluation Committee shall be suspended. generate a common understanding on which candidate to recommend to the Executive Board for its decision or to re-start the search process again, in case it found the outcome of the search process unsatisfactory.
- g)h) The Executive Board will deliberate on the suitability of the candidates submitted/recommended by the Evaluation Committee taking into due account the President's views. The Board may decide to endorse the recommendation of the Committee/Committee, select a different candidate from among those proposed by the Evaluation Committee, or request the Evaluation Committee to re-start the search process in case it does not concludes that none of the candidates are suitably qualified. agree with the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee.
- i) After the Executive Board has taken a decision on the candidate to select/appoint as Director IOE, the President or his/her representative will make an employment offer to the candidate and the President will make the formal appointment.
- j) In the process of recruiting and selecting the IOE Director, search panel members must avoid any situation that poses an actual conflict or the potential for or the appearance of a conflict between their individual interests and the performance of their official duties. Considerations for identifying and handling conflicts of interest are set out in Annex III.
- h)k) If the position of Director falls vacant, the Deputy Director will be appointed as Interim Officer-in-Charge, pending the appointment/assumption of duties of a Director, unless otherwise decided by the Executive Board. Should the Deputy Director not be available to serve for any reason, the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee, in consultation with the President, will appoint one of the senior Evaluation Officers to serve as Temporary Officer-in-Charge. If a longer-term Interim Officer-in-Charge is required, the Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee, after consultation with the members of the Evaluation Committee, with the support of IFAD management and the Temporary Officer-

in-Charge, and in consultation with the President, will identify and appoint such an individual.

- i) The Director IOE shall not be eligible for other staff positions in IFAD upon the completion of his or her term.

B. Grounds and procedures for dismissing the Director IOE

59. The Executive Board may terminate the appointment of Director IOE on one of the following grounds, which, in the case of a staff member of IFAD would warrant the staff member's dismissal:
- a. In case of serious unsatisfactory conduct;
 - b. If the Director IOE is considered to have abandoned his\her position or has not taken up the position to which s/he is assigned;
 - c. In case of continuous unsatisfactory performance;
 - d. if the Director IOE is unable to perform his/her duties for health reasons; and
 - e. If the Director IOE is no longer a national of a Member of the Fund.
60. In any event, dismissal would entail written documentation containing due notice about the reasons for dismissal with an opportunity for staff to contest the reasons.
61. Unless specifically decided otherwise, IFAD will use procedures developed in accordance with the agreed termination provision in rules, regulations and procedures applicable to the staff of IFAD.
62. The recommendation for dismissal shall be made to the Executive Board by the Evaluation Committee, after hearing the person concerned and seeking the advice of the President on the legal, administrative and other relevant aspects of the matter.
63. The decision taken by the Board will be duly communicated by the President to the Director ~~of~~ IOE.
64. Normal IFAD procedures would be followed for any integrity investigations related to Director OE with the results considered by the Executive Board. Following this consideration, and unless otherwise decided by the Executive Board, the President will determine the appropriate corrective or disciplinary action, if any, in line with the practices and precedents followed in integrity investigations of all other IFAD staff, with the exception of dismissal which must be decided by the Executive Board.

C. Principles for the annual performance review of Director IOE

65. The following principles will apply with respect to the annual performance review of the IOE Director.
- a) The performance of Director IOE shall be reviewed once a year by the Chair of the Evaluation Committee.
 - b) The procedures used for the annual performance assessment and for determining the related salary increase of Director IOE should be the same as those used for other division heads.
 - c) The chair of the Evaluation Committee must consult with and seek feedback from the other members of the Evaluation Committee.
 - d) The chair of the Evaluation Committee must also consult with the President of IFAD, who will provide his/her feedback to the Committee Chair in the form of written comments.

- e) The Committee Chair may also consult with other members of the IFAD's Management, as required, and whoever else s/he deems necessary as input into the performance assessment.

D. IOE staff and consultants

- 66. Subject to the budgetary appropriations approved by the Governing Council and the work programme approved by the Executive Board, the Director shall determine the size, organize, and direct the workforce of IOE.
- 67. For that purpose, the President will delegate authority to make all personnel and operational decisions concerning IOE staff and consultants to IOE Director, in accordance with the provisions contained in this policy as well as other applicable IFAD rules covering human resources. Within these rules, the Director will have authority for managing IOE personnel, their work plans and the demands on their time.

Staff

- 68. IOE staff will be considered IFAD staff. As such IFAD staff rules and procedures will be applicable to IOE staff.
- 69. IOE staff will be entitled to seek employment in other units of IFAD. IFAD management will treat IOE staff who may apply for positions outside IOE as other IFAD staff, and treat requests for rotation in accordance with IFAD staff rules and procedures.
- 70. The Director IOE and the IFAD Management will encourage staff rotation to strengthen cross-fertilisation of evaluation and operational knowledge.
- 71. For the appointment of IOE staff (except the Deputy Director):
 - i. The Director of IOE, will constitute an interview panel chaired by the IOE Deputy Director. The panel will include the following members: Associate Vice President, Programme or his/her designee, Director, IFAD Human Resources Division or his/her designee, representative of the staff association (as a non-voting member), and an external evaluation expert.
 - ii. Before the report of the interview panel is forwarded to the Director IOE, the President will establish an appointment board tasked to undertake the due diligence to ensure that the appointment process led by the IOE Director has adequately followed the procedures laid down in this Evaluation Policy as well as applicable IFAD rules and procedures. The due diligence process will be restricted to ensuring that the required rules have been followed in issuance of the corresponding vacancy announcement, screening of application to generate the long and shortlist of candidates, and the interview panel composition and overall process including review of references and annual performance evaluations.
 - iii. Except in such cases where the outcome of the due diligence process requires corrective measures, the IOE Director will take a decision on the recommendation of the interview panel and convey the same to the President who will accordingly instruct the Director of Human Resources to make the formal appointment.
- 72. For the appointment of IOE's Deputy Director, the same provisions will apply as for all IOE staff outlined in paragraph 71 above, with the following adjustments to the process:
 - i. In consultation with the Director of IFAD's Human Resources Division, the Director IOE will select a recognised external evaluation expert to chair the IOE interview panel.

- ii. Before taking his/her decision, the Director IOE should consult with the President and, at his discretion, with any member of Management, to seek their views on the shortlisted candidates.
73. The Director of IOE will be responsible for managing the performance of IOE staff and will follow standard IFAD performance evaluation procedures in assessing the performance of IOE staff. The Director will be responsible for the final annual assessment of IOE staff and will inform the Director of the Human Resources Division the outcomes of such assessment.
74. The Director of IOE will have the authority to recommend promotions of IOE staff in accordance with IFAD rules and procedures for staff promotion. IFAD's Promotion Board will carry out due diligence to ensure that IFAD rules and procedures are followed. Thereafter, the Director of Human Resources will implement the recommendations of the Director of IOE.
75. Dismissal of IOE will follow IFAD rules and procedures applicable for the dismissal of IFAD staff.

Consultants

76. IOE will have the autonomy to formulate the terms of reference for consultants, identify the most suitable consultants, and to supervise their work. To that effect, in the same way as the heads of departments in IFAD, and following the applicable procedures, the Director IOE shall be authorized to engage the services of consultants and other vendors deemed necessary for the performance of the functions of the IOE.
77. Contracts for IOE consultants will follow the applicable IFAD rules and procedures for the recruitment of consultants. The selection of IOE consultants will be governed by written guidelines within the Office of Evaluation, which aim to prevent any conflict of interest.
78. The Director of Human Resources Division will approve IOE's requests for recruiting and contracting consultants, after a due diligence process with the goal of ensuring that the contracts of consultants proposed by IOE have followed the procedures laid down in this Evaluation Policy and applicable IFAD rules and procedures.
79. Except in such cases where the outcome of the due diligence process requires corrective measures by Director of Human Resources Division, IFAD's Human Resources Director will proceed with the issuance of the proposed consultancy contract.

VI. Audit and investigation

80. **Audit.** IOE's budget and expenditure shall be included in the regular annual external audit of IFAD's accounts. The Evaluation Committee may commission external budget reviews of IOE as well as ad hoc audits of IOE's compliance with various IFAD policies.
81. For any special audit of IOE proposed by the Management, the Management shall consult with the Evaluation Committee, which, in consultation with the Chair of the Audit Committee, may agree to the proposed audit, veto the proposed audit or prescribe an external audit in lieu of an audit undertaken by the Office of Audit and Oversight. The President has the right to appeal to the Executive Board if the Management's proposal is rejected.
82. **Investigation.** IOE Director and staff are held to the same integrity standards as all other IFAD staff, and 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, with the results considered by the Executive Board. Following this consideration, and unless otherwise decided by the Executive Board, the President will determine the

appropriate corrective or disciplinary measures, if any, in line with the practices and precedents followed in integrity investigations of all other IFAD staff.

Types of evaluations conducted by IOE

Project Evaluations

1. IOE's approach to project evaluations consists of undertaking project completion report validations (PCRVS) and project performance assessments (PPAs) based on the project completion reports prepared by the respective government and IFAD management. The purpose of PCRVS and PPAs is to assess the results and impact of IFAD-funded projects and to generate findings and recommendations that can inform the other projects funded by IFAD. PCRVS and PPAs are undertaken after the completion of the operation being evaluated.
2. IOE will validate a selected number of project completion reports prepared in a given year. PCRVS will not entail any field work and be mainly based on a desk review of documents. They could include interactions with the IFAD country programme manager and concerned project staff by electronic means, as appropriate.
3. A number of projects for which a PCRVS has been conducted will be selected for a PPA, based on a clearly defined set of criteria³. Consistent with the practice in other international financial institutions, around 20-30 per cent of projects covered by PCRVS will be exposed to PPAs. The latter will entail a limited amount of field work to collect additional data and information from in-country partners.

Country Programme Evaluations

4. Country programme evaluations (CPEs) provide building blocks for the preparation of a new COSOP in the same country. CPEs essentially entail an assessment of three inter-related components including: (i) the project portfolio; (ii) non-lending activities, namely policy dialogue, partnership building, and knowledge management; and (iii) COSOP performance, in terms of relevance and effectiveness. The assessment of these three components allows CPEs to generate an overall appreciation of the partnership between IFAD and the concerned government in reducing rural poverty. All CPEs include field work.

Corporate-Level Evaluations

5. Corporate-level evaluations are conducted to assess the results of IFAD-wide corporate policies, strategies, business processes and organisational aspects. They are expected to generate findings and recommendations that can be used for the formulation of new and more effective corporate policies and strategies, as well as improve business processes and the Fund's organisational architecture, as required.

Evaluation Synthesis

6. Each year, IOE produces few evaluation synthesis on selected topics. The main aim of such synthesis is to facilitate learning and use of evaluation findings by identifying and capturing accumulated knowledge on common themes and findings across a variety of situations. Synthesising existing evaluation material allows evaluation evidence to be packaged and fed into the decision-making process when neither the time nor resources are available to undertake a full-fledged evaluation.

³ These may include: PCRVS where more information and data is required to make an accurate assessment of project results; innovative projects that offer special opportunities for learning; projects that are likely to be covered by a forthcoming corporate level or country programme evaluation, etc.

Key elements of the terms of Reference of the Director of IOE

1. In collaboration with the IFAD management, the IOE Director will be responsible for the implementation of IFAD's evaluation policy as described in this document. The IFAD Management will be specifically responsible for implementing the provisions related to the management's self-evaluation system. They will also provide the necessary environment and support to IOE Director for implementing the policy directives related to IFAD's independent evaluation.
2. Director IOE's TOR will incorporate all the responsibilities for managing IOE as the independent evaluation function of the Fund in accordance with its rules and procedures. These responsibilities will include, inter alia:
 - (i) managing IOE as an effective, efficient and independent evaluation function of the Fund;
 - (ii) developing operational policies, strategies and related instruments to enhance the independence and effectiveness of the independent evaluation function;
 - (iii) ensuring high-quality professional work by instituting the necessary enabling environment for and coaching of IOE staff and setting quality standards for IOE outputs;
 - (iv) overseeing the quality control of IOE evaluation deliverables;
 - (v) formulating and implementing the annual work programme and budget, and reporting directly to the Executive Board on evaluation issues;
 - (vi) communicating evaluation results to partners and the general public;
 - (vii) ensuring that evaluation knowledge and lessons are fed in a timely manner into key IFAD's processes for the formulation of policies, strategies and operations;
 - (viii) promoting dialogue and exchanges with the management, senior IFAD officials and Executive Board members on evaluation issues of critical importance to the Fund;
 - (ix) assisting IFAD's operations and partner countries in their evaluation capacity development; and
 - (x) representing IFAD in the United Nations Evaluation Group and the Evaluation Co-operation Group of the multilateral development banks.

Considerations for Identifying and handling conflicts of interest in the selection of the Director of IOE.

1. An actual conflict of interest involves a conflict between a search panel member's official duties as part of the recruitment and selection process and his/her individual interests that could improperly influence the performance of those official duties. A potential or apparent conflict of interest arises when it could reasonably be perceived that a search panel member's individual interests could improperly influence the performance of his/her official duties, even if this is not, in fact, the case.

2. Specifically, search panel members shall avoid any action which might result in, or create the potential for or the appearance of:

(i) giving unwarranted preferential or prejudicial treatment to any organization or person;

(ii) impeding the efficiency of the recruitment and selection process;

(iii) losing independence or impartiality of action;

(iv) affecting adversely the confidence of member countries or the public in the integrity of IFAD.

3. If an actual, potential, or apparent conflict arises, the search panel member shall promptly withdraw from participation in the recruitment and selection process and communicate in writing to the three List Convenors and the Chair of the Search Panel. In this communication, the search panel member shall set out the actual, potential, or apparent conflict of interest and seek the List Convenors' determination as to whether he/she should recuse himself/herself from the recruitment and selection process.

4. If the Convenors determine that an actual conflict of interest exists, the search panel member shall continue such recusal. If the Convenors determine that a potential or apparent conflict of interest exists, such recusal shall be required where necessary in the interests of IFAD. If necessary, a replacement for the search panel member who has withdrawn shall be nominated by the appropriate List(s) or, if the recused member was an independent external expert, the Evaluation Committee will select a new independent expert as provided for in Section 58 (a) of the Evaluation Policy.

5. Any member of the search panel may also communicate in writing to the Convenors and Chair of the Search Panel if he/she believes that another member of the search panel should recuse himself/herself because of an actual, potential, or apparent conflict of interest. Following consultation with the search panel member concerned, the procedure set out in paragraph 4. Above will be followed.

Amendment to Sections 64 and 82 of the Revised Evaluation Policy

1. Subsequent to the submission of the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Appointment of the Director of IFAD's Independent Office of Evaluation, a procedural gap in the Revised Evaluation Policy surfaced in the recent recruitment effort for the IOE Director. Therefore, the Ad Hoc Working Group was not in a position to review or address this gap.
2. The issue, which arose in the context and as a direct result of the recruitment process, concerns the procedures for handling corrective or disciplinary measures flowing from an integrity investigation of IOE staff.
3. In its decision of 28 July 2013, the Executive Board approved the Ad Hoc Working Group's recommendation that Management undertake an investigation of an academic credential issue identified by the Working Group and to submit its report to the Executive Board for its consideration. Management carried out the investigation, and on 18 September 2013, in a closed Board session, Management presented the results of the investigation to the Board. In doing so, Management indicated that, under IFAD's Human Resources Implementing Procedures Section 2.13 (iii) corrective or disciplinary measures would likely be called for, were any other IFAD staff member involved.
4. The procedural gap relates to the absence of guidance within the Revised Evaluation Policy on how this disciplinary stage of the investigation process should be accomplished. Section 82, which deals with integrity investigations involving IOE staff, states that the "IOE Director and staff are held to the same integrity standards as all other IFAD staff, and 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, *with the results considered by the Executive Board.*"
5. Section 64, dealing with the grounds and procedures for dismissing the IOE Director, has nearly identical language: "Normal IFAD procedures would be followed for any integrity investigations related to Director OE *with the results considered by the Executive Board.*"
6. The phrase "considered by the Executive Board" in both Sections 64 and 82 is insufficiently clear to provide guidance on how disciplinary or corrective measures are to be determined and imposed. Therefore, after having been briefed by the President on the results of the integrity investigation, and after having been satisfied that the imposition of disciplinary or corrective procedures would be appropriate, the Executive Board in its closed session determined the appropriate process for imposing disciplinary or corrective measures.
7. After extensive discussion, the Board decided that a decision on specific disciplinary or corrective measures would be both inappropriate for the Board to determine and beyond the normal competence of the Board to decide. Therefore, the Board asked the President to carry out the disciplinary stage of the investigation process in the same way as he would for any other IFAD staff member, following the same procedures and applying the same standards that would be applied to any other IFAD staff member.
8. The purpose of the proposed revisions to sections 64 and 82 of the Revised Evaluation Policy is to reflect this decision taken by the Executive Board and thereby provide appropriate guidance should such investigations take place in the future. While such situations should be rare, it would be useful if the Policy were

clearer with respect to the authority to impose corrective or disciplinary measures, if any, arising from such investigations after consideration by the Executive Board.

9. Having this information appropriately and clearly reflected in the Revised Evaluation Policy would be important for the smooth functioning of the Executive Board. It would also provide clarity and certainty to current and prospective IOE staff, and would help to ensure that any corrective or disciplinary action that was imposed would withstand scrutiny on review, should a disciplined IOE staff member file an appeal.
10. Therefore, the proposed revisions to paragraphs 64 and 82 stipulate that, after the President has carried out an investigation and presented the results to the Board for its consideration, unless otherwise decided by the Executive Board, the President will determine the appropriate corrective or disciplinary measures, if any, in line with the practices and precedents followed in integrity investigations of all other IFAD staff. This sets out clearly the procedures to be followed while retaining for the Board the authority to take other measures, should it so decide. The only exception would be if dismissal of the IOE Director is the proposed disciplinary action: this would have to be determined by the Executive Board.

4201 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, VA 22207

703-237-4816

I. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

International Monetary Fund, Washington DC May 2010 - Present
Executive Coach

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC April
2010
Consultant, Independent Evaluation Office (IEO)

- Drafted a paper for the Executive Board on recommended changes to IEO staffing policies.

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC March 2008 - August 2008; October 2008 - April
2009

Special Advisor to Human Resources Director, Human Resources Department

- Part-time consulting contracts to advise and assist HR Director across a range of policy and operational issues.
- Provided support in organization-wide staff downsizing exercise, including counseling of senior managers.
- Drafted policy announcements, news articles, and speaking notes. Reviewed and edited policy papers.
- Performed screening interviews and participated in selection panel interviews for professional and managerial economist staff.

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC November 2001 - November 2007 (retired)
Assistant Director and Senior Personnel and Budget Manager, Human Resources Department

- Assisted Director in day-to-day running of the department, including oversight of the department's work program, supervision of various HR projects, advising on HR policy application and organization-wide senior staffing issues, and review of HR policy papers.
- Responsible for all aspects of human resources management of HR staff. Included staffing, performance management, career counseling and planning, coaching and mentoring.
- Responsible for the HR Department's budget management and preparation of its annual business and HR plans.
- Chair of the I.M.F. External Assignments Committee.

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC December 2000 - November 2001
Advisor, Human Resources Department

- Served as Business Advisor to seven I.M.F. departments.
- Provided advice and guidance to the departments' senior management on strategic human resources planning, the compilation and implementation of annual human resources plans, and performance management and organizational development initiatives.
- Coordinated the provision of the central human resources services to departments and provided career counseling to senior staff of the departments.
- Continued as Business Advisor for two departments until July 2004.

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC May 1991 - December 2000
Division Chief, Staff Development Division, Human Resources Department

- Managed division responsible for policy and program development and implementation in the areas of training, career development, and management development.

Annex V

- Provided Fund-wide organizational development assistance and individual career counseling services to staff.
- Among programs and services introduced during tenure: an assessment center for prospective managers, an individual coaching program for managers, a management training curriculum, a 360 degree assessment instrument, a career development guide, a Fund-wide mobility program, and a short-term external assignments program.

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC May 1984 - May 1991

Division Chief, Recruitment Division, Administration Department

- Established new division (resulting from split of former Recruitment and Training Division), including staffing assignments, and operating procedures.
- Managed division responsible for Fund-wide recruitment of staff and contractual employees.
- Broadened recruitment efforts, streamlined application processing, and rationalized contractual hiring policies, codifying them in a contractual employment manual.

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC June 1982 - May 1984

Deputy Division Chief, Administrative Services Division, Administration Department

- Served as deputy to the chief of the division responsible for the entire range of administrative services covering new building construction, facilities management, building maintenance, graphic arts and printing services, and messenger and driver services.
- Primary responsibilities in the areas of HRM (including staffing, performance management and organizational development) and project management.

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC May 1981 - June 1982

Deputy Division Chief for Recruiting, Recruiting and Training Division, Administration Department

- Responsible for the coordination and supervision of all recruitment activities.

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC October 1971 - Sept. 1974; Sept. 1975 - May 1981

Personnel Officer/Senior Personnel Officer, Recruiting and Training Division, Administration Department

- Worked on various training programs, including the design and implementation of the I.M.F.'s first management training course.
- Served as administrator of the Young Professionals Program.
- Undertook recruitment of economist staff.
- Contributed to policy formulation in the recruitment, training and compensation areas.

International Monetary Fund, Washington, DC September 1974 - September 1975

Economist, Caribbean Division, Western Hemisphere Department

- Temporary mobility assignment to acquire knowledge of the Fund's core economic work.
- Assigned as desk officer for Trinidad and Tobago.
- Analyzed and reported on developments in the country's economy.
- Participated in Article IV consultation missions to Trinidad and Tobago and to Jamaica. Primary responsibility for the monetary and real economy sectors, respectively.

Bank of England, London, England September 1968 - September 1970

Economist, Economic Intelligence Department

- Successive assignments in the Mathematical Techniques, Industry, and Balance of Payments groups.
- Responsibilities included econometric model building, monitoring and reporting on economic impact of developments in key U.K. industries, and balance of payments forecasting.

II. EDUCATION

Georgetown University, Washington, DC

Annex V

Center for Professional Development, Certificate in Leadership Coaching, 2007

Cranfield University School of Management, United Kingdom
Executive Development Program, 2001

University of Maryland, College Park, MD
Leadership Development Program, 1992

London School of Economics and Political Science, United Kingdom
Postgraduate Diploma, Personnel Management, 1971

University of Warwick, United Kingdom
Bachelor of Arts, *with Honors*, Economics & Sociology, 1968

III. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

International Monetary Fund Retirees Association, Washington, (DC), Board Member, 2010 - Present.

International Coach Federation (ICF), Washington (DC), Member, 2007 - Present.

Volunteers of America Community Shelter, Fairfax County (Virginia), Part-time Volunteer, 2009 - Present.

Assn. for Human Resources Management in International Organizations, Board Member, 2001 - 2007.

Strength Deployment Inventory (SDI), Certified Administrator/Facilitator.

I.M.F. Management Development Program, Trained as an Assessor.

Arlington County Youth Soccer, Arlington County (Virginia), Coach, 1987 - 1995.