

Document: EC 2013/81/W.P.8
Agenda: 10
Date: 25 November 2013
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

Working paper on budget considerations related to the recruitment and appointment of the Director, 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 — Eighty-first Session
Rome, 29 November 2013

For: Review

Document: EB 2013/110/R.2/Add.
 Agenda: 3
 Date: _____
 Distribution: Public
 Original: English

E

Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

Working paper on budget considerations related to the recruitment and appointment of the Director, Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD

Note to Executive Board representatives

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

Executive Board — 110th Session
Rome, 10-12 December 2013

For: Review

Working paper on budget considerations related to the recruitment and appointment of the Director, Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD

1. At its eightieth session on 18 November 2013, the Evaluation Committee discussed the proposed amendments to the procedures for selecting and appointing the Director, Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE) as contained in the IFAD Evaluation Policy. Among other issues, as highlighted by the Director, Human Resources Division (HRD), costs related to the recruitment of the Director, IOE will have to be financed from IOE's 2014 administrative budget. These costs will cover a number of items, including – but not limited to – the fees of a headhunting firm, should the ad hoc search panel entrusted with the recruitment decide to engage such a firm.
2. As conveyed by the Officer-in-Charge, IOE, the IOE 2014 budget proposal did not factor in the costs associated with the recruitment of the Director, IOE. In particular, it should be noted that, following the recommendations of the Evaluation Committee and the Executive Board in July and September 2013, IOE's budget proposal for 2014 includes a real decrease with respect to the 2013 budget. For these reasons, the budget has very limited flexibility to absorb additional costs.
3. In light of the above situation, at its eightieth session, the Evaluation Committee recommended that IOE's budget for 2014 be kept at the same level as in the proposal discussed at the Committee's seventy-ninth session (US\$5.98 million). At the same time, it recommended that IOE review the list of planned evaluation activities to identify selected evaluations that could be delayed to generate savings. The Committee requested that a proposal on how to realize such savings be discussed at the eighty-first session of the Committee.
4. To assess the feasibility of the above proposal, IOE has obtained estimates on standard recruitment costs from HRD and elaborated two scenarios: (i) a lower-case scenario, without engagement of a headhunting firm; and (ii) a higher-case scenario, including a headhunting firm. The former scenario would amount to US\$89,000, whereas the costs of the latter would amount to US\$189,000 (see table below).

Cost estimate for recruiting the Director, IOE (United States dollars)

<i>Cost Item</i>	<i>Value</i>
Media advertising campaign	25 000
Travel-related costs for two panellists and four candidates	60 000
Testing and other related costs	4 000
Subtotal without a headhunting firm	89 000
Headhunting firm fees:	100 000
Total costs including a headhunting firm	189 000

Source: HRD, November 2013

5. IOE has considered several options for generating savings by modifying the schedule of evaluations planned in 2014. In assessing alternative options, IOE sought to minimize: (i) possible delays in IOE's institutional processes (e.g. preparation of corporate-level policies or strategic documents, or country programme strategies); (ii) changes in the work programme of the Evaluation Committee in 2014 and (iii) the number of evaluation assignments affected by the proposed changes.
6. As a result, IOE proposes to delay the start-up of the planned impact evaluation, originally foreseen to start in January 2014. This is the preferred option as it complies best with the above criteria. As a complementary measure, IOE may also delay the start-up of the country programme evaluation (CPE) in Sierra Leone.

7. Under the lower-cost scenario, both the impact evaluation and the CPE would be delayed by three months; therefore the impact evaluation would start in April 2014 and end in April 2015, while the CPE would begin in April 2014 and end in June 2015. Under the higher-cost scenario, the impact evaluation would start in July 2014 and be completed in July 2015, while the schedule of the CPE would be maintained as in the lower-case scenario. Under both scenarios, approximately half of the savings would come from staff expenditures and half from non-staff costs. IOE proposes to proceed in a phased approach, first by adopting the lower-case scenario, and move to the higher-case scenario only if the ad hoc search panel decides to engage a headhunting firm.