

Document: EC 2014/84/W.P.3
Agenda: 4
Date: 24 June 2014
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Preview of the results-based work programme and budget for 2015 and indicative plan for 2016-2017 of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD

Note to Evaluation Committee members

*Dispatch delay due to late submission by
the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD to the Office of the Secretary*

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Kees Tuinenburg
Officer-in-Charge
Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
Tel.: + 39 06 5459 2274
e-mail: k.tuinenburg@ifad.org

Ashwani Muthoo
Deputy Director
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2053
e-mail: a.muthoo@ifad.org

Mark Keating
Evaluation Officer
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2048
e-mail: m.keating@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-fourth Session

Rome, 2 July 2014

For: **Review**

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	ii
I. Introduction	1
II. Key insights from the implementation of the 2014 work programme	2
III. Current perspective	2
A. Highlights of 2014	
B. 2014 Budget Utilization	
C. Utilization of 2013 carry-forward	
IV. IOE Strategic objectives	5
V. 2015 work programme	5
VI. 2015 resource envelope	8
A. Staff resources	
B. Budget proposal	
Annexes	
I. IOE strategic objectives, DMRs and outputs for 2015	11
II. IOE results measurement framework for 2014	12
III. IOE reporting on achievements as at end-June 2014	14
IV. IOE proposed evaluation activities for 2015 and indicative plan for 2016-2017	21
V. IOE staff levels for 2015	25
VI. IOE proposed budget for 2015	26
VII. IOE selectivity framework	29

Abbreviations and acronyms

ARRI	Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations
CLE	corporate-level evaluation
COSOP	country strategic opportunities programme
CPE	country programme evaluation
CPMT	country programme management team
DMR	divisional management result
ECG	Evaluation Cooperation Group
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
NONIE	Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation
OSC	Operational Strategy and Policy Guidance Committee
PCR	project completion report
PCRv	project completion report validation
PMD	Programme Management Department
PPA	project performance assessment
PRISMA	President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions
RIDE	Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
WFP	World Food Programme

Preview of the results-based work programme and budget for 2015 and indicative plan for 2016-2017 of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD

I. Introduction

1. This document contains a preview of the work programme and budget for 2015 and indicative plan for 2016-2017 of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE). In line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy (2011), the IOE budget and IFAD's administrative budget are developed independently of each other.¹ As in the past, the proposed IOE work programme document for 2015 has been developed on the basis of consultations with IFAD Management, taking into account IFAD's priorities for the Ninth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD9) period (2013-2015) and the ongoing discussions in the context of IFAD10. The comments made last year by the Evaluation and Audit Committees and by the Executive Board have also been taken into consideration.
2. Building on the new format and structure developed in 2013, this preview presents the proposed IOE work programme and budget "based on a critical assessment of needs, rather than simply using the current budget as a baseline."² It also aims to strengthen the linkage between the work programme and expenditures and provide greater detail in the breakdown of budgeted costs, particularly non-staff costs, including those related to consultants. Details of actual expenditures for 2013, budget utilization up to 30 April 2014 and current estimates of expected 2014 year-end utilization are also provided. Subsequent versions will present updated information and a final document will be submitted to the Board in December 2014.
3. This year IOE introduced two new features into its work programme and budget document: (i) reported progress against the key performance indicators contained in IOE's results measurement framework, as adopted by the Board in December 2013; and (ii) a selectivity framework to guide the choice of IFAD-funded projects to undergo impact evaluation by IOE. These new features will be explained in section III, A: Current Perspective: Highlights of 2014.
4. The document has been organized into six sections. Section II briefly describes the main insights emerging thus far from the implementation of the 2014 work programme; section III highlights the achievements of the 2014 evaluation work programme, the overall 2013 budget utilization, 2014 budget utilization as of end-April 2014 and projected utilization for 2014, and use of the 3 per cent carry-forward from the 2013 IOE budget; section IV provides a brief description of IOE's strategic objectives; and section V focuses on the proposed evaluation activities for 2015. Lastly, section VI outlines the initial proposal for the 2015 budget and human resources required by IOE to implement its work programme and achieve its main objectives in an effective and timely manner.
5. This document contains a summary of the work programme and budget preview for 2015. The document will be further developed, following comments by the Evaluation Committee at its eighty-fourth session in July 2014 and based on feedback from the Audit Committee and the Executive Board during their September 2014 sessions. The revised document will be discussed at the Evaluation Committee session on 10 October 2014. The final document will then be considered by the Executive Board in December 2014. Prior to this, as per past practice, the budget proposal will be considered by the Audit Committee in November 2014, together with IFAD's 2015 administrative budget. Finally, the budget will be

¹ "The levels of the IOE component and ... IFAD's administrative budget will be determined independently of each other." IFAD Evaluation Policy, p. 11.

² See Minutes of the 107th session of the Executive Board, pp. 29.

submitted, upon the recommendation of the Board in December 2014, to the Governing Council in 2015 for approval. On a process-related issue, it is important to highlight that IOE has strengthened its dialogue with IFAD's Budget and Organizational Development Unit (BOD)³ to ensure that the proposal builds on key budgeting principles and parameters used by IFAD Management in preparing the IFAD administrative budget.

II. Key insights from the implementation of the 2014 work programme

6. In preparing this document, IOE undertook an internal assessment of the implementation of its 2014 work programme and budget. Among the key insights that emerged are that:
- Ways and means need to be found to streamline evaluation processes, in particular to shorten the duration of major evaluations, especially country programme and corporate-level evaluations (CLEs), without compromising the analytical depth and quality of evaluations;
 - Evaluation recommendations must be useful, prioritized and strategic;
 - Further opportunities for partnership in evaluation need to be explored;
 - More thorough advance planning is needed within IOE and in dialogue with the Office of the Secretary to ensure documents for IFAD governing bodies, especially the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board, are produced and dispatched in a timely manner;
 - IOE should engage in dialogue with and support IFAD Management in their efforts to conduct and mainstream impact evaluations (of projects); and
 - IOE should further develop the selectivity framework it introduced last year to ensure greater transparency in selecting projects eligible for impact evaluation by IOE.⁴ The IOE selectivity framework has since been further developed, and has been used in identifying the project to undergo an impact evaluation in 2014 (see paragraph 7 below, last bullet).

III. Current perspective

A. Highlights of 2014

7. By the end of the year, IOE expects to have implemented all the activities planned in the 2014 work programme. Selected key achievements to date include:
- The completion of the **corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's replenishments**. The evaluation raised crucial corporate issues that were discussed by the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board, and also by the IFAD10 Consultation at its second session in June 2014;
 - The undertaking of the **corporate-level evaluation on the IFAD Policy for Grant Financing**, which will be discussed by the Board in December. The main recommendation emerging from this evaluation is for IFAD to develop a new grants policy and to further leverage this important instrument to achieve IFAD's mandate;
 - The launching of the **corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's work in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations**. This evaluation is now in full swing;

³ Among other tasks, BOD is responsible for preparing IFAD's annual administrative budget and coordinating the organization's annual Strategic Workforce Planning exercise.

⁴ In this regard, IOE first introduced a selectivity framework in 2013 to guide the selection and prioritize evaluations to be conducted in 2014.

- The completion of the **evaluation synthesis report on IFAD's engagement in middle-income countries**;
 - The launching of the **first joint evaluation synthesis report** by IOE and the Office of Evaluation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on pastoral development;
 - The preparation of the **2014 Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRI)** is ongoing. This year's ARRI will include a dedicated section on the opportunities and challenges faced by project management; and
 - IOE has started the design of its **second impact evaluation**. The operation selected for impact evaluation using the newly introduced selectivity framework is the Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Programme in India.
8. Progress in implementing planned evaluation activities for 2014 is summarized in annex III, table 1; information is also provided (in annex III, table 2) on progress being made against the targets for each key performance indicator included in the IOE results measurement framework for 2014.⁵ The data reveal that activities are on track and that, in some cases, agreed targets have already been achieved and/or surpassed. Updated achievements (in relation to both planned evaluation activities and IOE's key performance indicators) will be reported to the Board in December 2014.
 9. IOE is further developing its results measurement framework (RMF) for 2015 to include sharper key performance indicators that allow for better performance measurement and reporting against divisional management results; it will also specify expected outcomes by strategic objective, creating a more coherent link between results and strategic objectives. The enhanced RMF will be included in the version of the work programme and budget document to be presented at the eighty-fifth session of the Evaluation Committee in October 2014.
 10. In addition, IOE has introduced a more systematic approach to continuous monitoring and quarterly performance reviews of its work programme and budget implementation in order to take stock of progress and flag issues that merit closer attention.

⁵ The IOE results measurement framework for 2014 agreed by the Board is contained in annex II.

B. 2014 budget utilization

11. Table 1 below provides information on the budget utilization by IOE in 2013, as well as budget utilization as of April 2014 and expected utilization by year-end.

Table 1
IOE budget utilization in 2013 and projected utilization in 2014

<i>Evaluation work</i>	<i>Approved budget 2013</i>	<i>Budget utilization 2013 (US\$)</i>	<i>Approved budget 2014</i>	<i>2014 Commitment as of end-April (US\$)</i>	<i>Expected utilization as of year-end 2014</i>
Staff travel	330 000	332 492	345 000	157 139	345 000
Consultant fees	1 525 362	1 685 763	1 465 000	950 615	1 465 000
Consultant travel and allowances	352 007	428 719	395 000	199 052	395 000
In-country CPE learning events	30 000	35 690	35 000	28 963	35 000
Evaluation outreach, staff training and other costs	109 342	192 560	155 992	53 089	155 992
Non-staff costs	2 346 711	2 675 224	2 395 992	1 388 858	2 395 992
Staff costs	3 667 268	3 098 962	3 586 690	3 063 071	3 526 933
Total	6 013 979	5 774 186	5 982 682	4 451 929	5 922 855
Utilization		96%		74%	99%

* Based on staff costs committed until year-end.

12. Actual total expenses against IOE's 2013 budget amounted to US\$5.774 million, or 96 per cent of budget utilization. The lower utilization relates primarily to staff cost savings (vacant positions), offset partly by an increase in consultancy requirements. Some of the staff costs savings were also used to undertake additional outreach work to ensure wider dissemination of evaluation lessons and training programmes during the year.
13. In 2014, against an approved budget of US\$5.983 million, the utilization (in terms of commitments) as of end-April 2014 was US\$4.452 million, or 74 per cent. The high utilization at this time of the year is due primarily to the full-year commitment of staff costs, which is in line with IFAD-wide established practice, and to higher consultancy fees and staff/consultants' travel costs as part of the normal business cycle, as most evaluations are launched in the first part of the year.
14. The expected overall utilization of the IOE budget in 2014 as of year-end is currently projected at US\$5.923 million, corresponding to about 99 per cent of the approved budget. The anticipated lower utilization is in staff costs as a result of vacant positions that are currently being filled, including some savings from the IOE Director's position, part of which will be utilized for recruitment costs in line with IFAD's Human Resources rules.

C. Utilization of the 2013 carry-forward

15. The 3 per cent carry-forward rule, in place since 2004, states that unobligated appropriations at the close of the financial year may be carried forward into the following financial year up to an amount not exceeding 3 per cent of the approved annual budget of the previous year.
16. The IOE 3 per cent carry-forward from 2013 amounted to US\$180,419; this is planned to be used to complete the corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's engagement in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations. This evaluation was not fully budgeted in 2014 as the requirements for this important exercise could only be fully estimated when the evaluation design was finalized in early 2014.

IV. IOE strategic objectives

17. As agreed with the Board in December 2013 and in line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy (2011), IOE strategic objectives for 2014 and 2015 – the remaining two years of the IFAD9 period⁶ – are as follows:
 - (i) Strategic objective 1 (SO1): Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results; and
 - (ii) Strategic objective 2 (SO2): Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations.
18. These two strategic objectives allow IOE to achieve the overarching goal set for independent evaluation, namely to promote accountability and foster learning to improve the performance of corporate policies, strategies, processes and IFAD-supported operations.
19. Annex I summarizes IOE's strategic objectives, divisional management results (DMRs) and the outputs that the division proposes to deliver in 2015.

V. 2015 work programme

20. The proposed list of evaluation activities for IOE in 2015 is presented in annex IV, table 1 and the indicative plan for 2016-2017, in annex IV, table 2. The paragraphs below provide an overview of the main evaluation activities foreseen for 2015. All major outputs planned for 2015 are summarized in table 2 below.
21. In 2015, IOE proposes to complete the CLE on IFAD's engagement in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations. This is a major evaluation of a critical topic for IFAD and will require considerable time and engagement with IFAD Management and governing bodies in 2014 and 2015. Moreover, IOE is considering the possibility of starting a new CLE next year on IFAD's role and interventions in smallholder agriculture for rural poverty reduction. A final proposal will be made to the Evaluation Committee in October.
22. In addition, IOE plans to start five new country programme evaluations (CPEs): in Brazil, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria and Turkey, as well as complete the CPEs started in 2014 in Bangladesh, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Tanzania. The main aim of CPEs is to assess the results and impact of the partnership between IFAD and the Government in reducing rural poverty, and to provide building blocks for preparing new or revising existing results-based country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs).
23. Building on its experience in 2013 and 2014, IOE will undertake one impact evaluation in 2015 (project to be determined based on the selectivity framework). It is important to underline that impact evaluations by IOE are not part of the impact evaluations being undertaken by Management in the IFAD9 period (2013-2015). The main aim of IOE's involvement in impact evaluations is to experiment with innovative methodologies and processes and gain hands-on experience with such evaluations.
24. In 2015, IOE will prepare three evaluation synthesis reports. The proposed topics for the three evaluation synthesis are: (i) accessing markets: a subregional perspective;⁷ (ii) natural resources and environmental management; and (iii) non-lending activities in the context of South-South cooperation.
25. In line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy, IOE will validate all project completion reports (PCRs) and undertake project performance assessments (PPAs) of selected

⁶ It was also agreed with the Board that in 2015, while preparing the 2016 work programme and budget, IOE would reassess its strategic objectives for the IFAD10 period (2016-2018).

⁷ IOE will engage with IFAD Management to determine which region or subregion will be covered by the proposed evaluation synthesis; a final proposal will be included in the work programme and budget document to be discussed with the Evaluation Committee in October 2014.

operations.⁸ It will prepare the 2015 edition of the Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations, IOE's flagship annual report. Moreover, IOE will complete and issue the second edition of the Evaluation Manual, support recipient countries (selectively) in evaluation capacity-building activities, strengthen the partnership with Rome-based United Nations agencies in evaluation, ensure outreach and timely dissemination of results and lessons to key audiences, and organize a series of activities to celebrate the International Year of Evaluation.⁹ The aim of the International Year of Evaluation is to, inter alia, draw the attention of the global development community to the central role of evaluation in development cooperation, and advocate and promote evaluation for evidence-based policy and strategy formulation and for programme development at international, regional, national and local levels.

26. Among the documents for presentation by IOE to the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board are corporate-level evaluations, the ARRI, selected CPEs and comments on the President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA). In addition, it will also present the impact evaluation and the second edition of the Evaluation Manual to the Evaluation Committee and write comments on new COSOPs that have been preceded by CPEs for the consideration by the Executive Board. And, in line with the Evaluation Policy, IOE will review new corporate policies and strategies that are informed by major corporate-level evaluations and present written comments to the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board.
27. IOE will prepare written comments on the new IFAD corporate policy on grant financing, which is expected to be submitted to the Board in 2015. These comments will be provided for review alongside the proposed new policy for consideration by the Committee and the Board.
28. In line with established practice,¹⁰ IOE will prepare written comments for consideration by the Evaluation Committee and the Executive Board on the synthesis report by IFAD Management on 30 impact evaluations to be delivered during the IFAD9 period. These comments will focus on the methodology and overall approach taken, as well as on the robustness of the results reported.
29. IOE will support the Office of the Secretary (SEC) in organizing all Evaluation Committee sessions during the year and, as in 2014, will be represented in the annual country visit of the Executive Board in 2015.

⁸ Projects for PPAs are selected by IOE, taking account of: (i) information gaps in PCRs; (ii) innovative approaches in projects; (iii) information requirements for forthcoming CPEs or CLEs; (iv) geographical balance; and (v) opportunities for scaling-up.

⁹ At the Third International Conference on National Evaluation Capacities held in São Paulo, Brazil from 29 September to 2 October 2013, EvalPartners – the global movement to strengthen national evaluation capacity – announced that 2015 would be declared the International Year of Evaluation. The United Nations Evaluation Group, of which IOE is a member, and other international and regional evaluation networks and associations have joined EvalPartners and have also adopted 2015 as the International Year of Evaluation.

¹⁰ For example, in line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy and the Terms of Reference of the Evaluation Committee, IOE prepares written comments annually on the Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness.

Table 2
Major outputs planned by IOE in 2015

<i>Strategic objectives</i>	<i>Divisional management results (DMRs)</i>	<i>Outputs</i>
SO1: Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results	DMR 1: ARRI and CLEs that provide concrete building blocks for the development and implementation of better corporate policies and processes	ARRI One CLE on IFAD's work in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations – to be completed
	DMR 2: CPEs that serve as concrete building blocks for better results-based COSOPs	Eight CPEs (Bangladesh, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Tanzania - to be completed; Brazil, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria and Turkey – to start)
	DMR 3: Project evaluations that contribute to better IFAD-supported operations	Validate all project completion reports (PCRs) available in the year* Eight PPAs* One impact evaluation of an IFAD-funded project
	DMR 4: Methodology development	Issuance of the second edition of the Evaluation Manual Training of IOE staff and consultants on second edition of Evaluation Manual Contribute to in-house and external debate on impact evaluations
	DMR 5: Work related to IFAD governing bodies to ensure accountability and learning	Comments on the Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness (RIDE), PRISMA and selected COSOPs and corporate policies/strategies (e.g. the new IFAD corporate policy on grant financing and the synthesis report on impact evaluations prepared by IFAD); preparation of the IOE work programme and budget; and participation in all sessions of the Evaluation Committee, Executive Board and Governing Council as well as selected Audit Committee meetings
SO2: Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations	DMR 6: Production of evaluation syntheses and ARRI learning themes	Three evaluation syntheses (on accessing markets from a subregional perspective; natural resources and environmental management; and non-lending activities in the context of South-South cooperation) One learning theme in the context of the 2015 ARRI (topic to be decided)
	DMR 7: Systematic communication and outreach of evaluation-based lessons and good practices	Participate in internal platforms (Operational Strategy and Policy Guidance Committee [OSC], Operations Management Committee [OMC], IFAD Management Teams [IMT], Country Programme Management Team [CPMT], selected learning events, etc.) Organize in-country learning workshops to discuss the main results from CPEs to provide building blocks for the preparation of new COSOPs; and arrange learning events in IFAD related to other evaluations (e.g. CLEs, syntheses, ARRI) to share lessons and best practices Partnerships (Evaluation Cooperation Group [ECG], United Nations Evaluation Group [UNEG], Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation [NONIE], Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation [SDC], and Rome-based agencies - FAO/World Food Programme/Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research [CGIAR])
	DMR 8: Evaluation capacity development in partner countries	Engage in evaluation capacity development (ECD) by organizing seminars and workshops on evaluation methodology and processes in the context of: (i) regular evaluations (e.g. ongoing CPEs or PPAs); and (ii) upon request, in countries where IOE is not undertaking evaluations. Implementation of statement of intent with China on ECD.

*The selection of projects to undergo a PPA may only be determined upon submission of PCRs by the Programme Management Department (PMD) and the subsequent validation exercise (i.e. the preparation of PCR validations) by IOE.

VI. 2015 resource envelope

A. Staff resources

30. IOE's staff requirements are based on a comprehensive strategic workforce planning (SWP) exercise, which is undertaken on an annual basis. The 2015 exercise will be finalized following the presentation of this preview document to the Evaluation Committee in July. Building on the dialogue established last year, IOE will consult with BOD in this initiative to ensure that the methodology used by IOE is the same as that used for the IFAD SWP exercise. The results of the IOE SWP exercise for 2015 will be included in the final proposal submitted for the consideration of the Evaluation Committee in October of this year. Pending the completion of this SWP, it is anticipated that IOE will maintain the same number of staff in 2015 as in 2014 (see annex V). An initial assessment of the 2015 work programme indicates that IOE should be in a position to deliver all planned activities in a timely manner with its current level of staff resources. It is worth underlining that the IOE Professional to General Service staff ratio is around 1 to 0.46, which is among the best of any division in IFAD.
31. An increase of a 0.5 staff year is being considered for 2015, that is, the Evaluation Knowledge and Communication Officer (P-2) will be converted from a part-time to a full-time position,¹¹ starting 1 January 2015. This will result in a slight increase in IOE staff costs. The conversion of the position to a full-time equivalent is consistent with IOE's second strategic objective,¹² agreed with the Board, to devote greater attention and resources to strengthening dissemination of evaluation-based knowledge and enhancing the internal learning loop for better institutional and operational performance.

B. Budget proposal

32. This section outlines IOE budget requirements. The proposed budget is presented by type of activity, category of expenditure and strategic objective (see tables 3-5 below). Each table includes both the 2014 approved budget and the proposed budget for 2015, facilitating comparison between the two years. The proposed preview budget will be further reviewed over the next couple of months based on developments in the second half of the year and will take into consideration inputs from the Evaluation Committee, Audit Committee and the Executive Board in September 2014.
33. **Cost drivers.** The primary cost drivers for the 2015 budget are: (i) the effect of inflation on non-staff costs; and (ii) increased travel costs due to price increase beyond average inflation assumptions.
34. **Assumptions.** As in the past, the parameters used in developing the proposed 2015 budget will be the same as those used by IFAD Management for developing the IFAD administrative budget for 2015, i.e.: (i) inflation rate of 2.5 per cent for non-staff costs; (ii) no increase in salaries of Professional and General Service staff anticipated for 2015 and therefore the same 2014 standard costs will be used; and (iii) the exchange rate applied for 2014 – US\$1 = EUR 0.72 – has been retained for 2015.
35. **Budget by type of activity.** As per table 3 below, US\$1.3 million of total non-staff costs of US\$2.4 million, or more than 50 per cent of non-staff costs, are allocated to higher-level evaluations (CLEs and CPEs). These evaluations have the potential for inducing far-reaching and systemic changes at the institutional level as well as in IFAD-supported country programmes. In particular, in order to inform the development of new COSOPs and feed into COSOP midterm reviews, IOE will carry

¹¹ It is to be noted that this position used to be a full-time equivalent until 2005, but was converted into part time to accommodate a request by the staff due to compelling personal reasons.

¹² Promote effective learning and knowledge management for further strengthening the performance of IFAD operations.

out one new CPE in each of the five geographic regions covered by IFAD operations. This will require a higher allocation for CPEs in 2015, as compared to 2014 – which included some CPE completions requiring fewer resources than new CPEs. A slightly higher allocation towards evaluation capacity development at the country level is provided for 2015.

36. The net effect is a slight increase in non-staff costs for 2015 compared to 2014. The increase in staff costs is due to the conversion of the P-2 position from part-time to full-time, as mentioned in paragraph 31 above.

Table 3
Proposed budget for 2015 (by type of activities)
(See annex VI, table 2 for more detail)

<i>Type of activities</i>	<i>Approved 2014 budget</i>	<i>Proposed 2015 budget</i>
ARRI	150 000	150 000
CLEs	410 000	300 000
CPEs	760 000	1 005 000
PCR validations	50 000	50 000
PPAs	230 000	230 000
Impact evaluation	210 000	200 000
Evaluation syntheses	120 000	120 000
Second edition of Evaluation Manual	150 000	50 000
Communication, evaluation outreach, knowledge sharing, partnership activities	198 000	188 000
Evaluation capacity development, training and other costs	117 992	162 892
Total non-staff costs	2 395 992	2 455 892
Staff costs	3 586 690	3 641 075
Total	5 982 682	6 096 967

37. **Budget by category of expenditure.** Table 4 shows how the proposed non-staff budget is allocated by category of expenditure. On the whole, there are minor differences in budget allocation in 2015 compared to 2014, with over 60 per cent of non-staff budget allocated to consultancy fees to support evaluation work. With regard to consultants, IOE is continuing its efforts to ensure adequate gender and regional diversity across all evaluation types. Moreover, preference is given to hiring consultants from the same country or region where an evaluation is planned, especially for project performance assessments and CPEs, or when country visits might be undertaken in the context of CLEs and the preparation of evaluation synthesis reports. The increases in staff and consultant travel reflect the net effect of increases in travel cost partly offset by savings generated by more stringent monitoring of travel expenses. As in 2014, a small allocation is proposed for staff training, which is essential for continuous professional development to ensure IOE has the required expertise to undertake, inter alia, impact evaluations and to support ECD in partner countries. The slight increase in the staff cost category is explained in the previous paragraph.

Table 4
Proposed budget for 2015 (by category of expenditure)

<i>Categories of expenditures</i>	<i>Approved 2014 budget</i>	<i>Proposed 2015 budget</i>
Staff travel	345 000	355 000
Consultant fees	1 465 000	1 485 000
Consultant travel and allowances	395 000	410 000
In-country CPE learning events	35 000	40 000
Evaluation outreach, staff training and other costs.	155 992	165 892
Total non-staff costs	2 395 992	2 455 892
Staff costs	3 586 690	3 641 075
Total	5 982 682	6 096 967

38. **Budget by strategic objective.** Table 5 below shows how the total IOE proposed budget for 2015, both staff and non-staff costs, is allocated against IOE's two strategic objectives. Further detail including allocation to each DMR can be found in annex VI, table 3.
39. SO1 receives a much greater allocation as a larger part of the consultancy resources of IOE will need to be mobilized for the activities (such as CLEs, CPEs, PPAs, etc.) that contribute to achieving this objective. Moreover, most of the activities undertaken within this objective also contribute to SO2. That is, several activities under SO1 promote effective learning and knowledge management (which is at the core of SO2). For example, in-country workshops at the end of CPEs – which are budgeted under SO1 – provide a unique opportunity to exchange views on main lessons learned and best practices with policy and decision makers, IFAD operational staff and other stakeholders.

Table 5
Proposed budget allocation (by strategic objective)

<i>Strategic objective</i>	<i>Approved 2014 budget</i>		<i>Proposed 2015 budget</i>	
	<i>Amount (US\$)</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Amount (US\$)</i>	<i>Percent</i>
SO1: Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results	4 358 525	73	4 381 254	71
SO2: Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations	1 624 157	27	1 715 713	29
Total	5 982 682	100	6 096 967	100

40. **Budget proposal.** The proposed 2015 budget is US\$6.097 million, reflecting a nominal increase of 1.9 over the 2014 approved budget and 1.4 per cent over that of 2013, well below the overall inflation assumption. The 1.9 per cent increase in 2015 includes a 0.9 per cent real increase. This real increase is due to the fact that the Evaluation Knowledge and Communication Officer who currently works on a part-time basis will be working full time starting in 2015. There is no real increase for non-staff costs. In fact, this is the first time in six years (since 2009) that the proposed IOE annual budget entails a real increase, albeit by a very small margin. An overview of IOE's proposed budget including historical trends since 2011 is provided in annex VI, table 1.

IOE strategic objectives, divisional management results and outputs for 2015

<i>IOE strategic objectives</i>	<i>IOE DMRs</i>	<i>Types of outputs</i>
Strategic objective 1: Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results	DMR 1: Annual Reports on the Results and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRIs) and corporate-level evaluations (CLEs) that provide concrete building blocks for the development and implementation of better corporate policies and processes	ARRI CLE
	DMR 2: Country programme evaluations (CPEs) that serve as concrete building blocks for better results-based country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs)	CPE
	DMR 3: Project evaluations that contribute to better IFAD-supported operations	Project performance assessment (PPA) Project Completion Report Validation (PCRv) Impact evaluation
	DMR 4: Methodology development	Guidelines and Evaluation Manual
	DMR 5: Work related to IFAD governing bodies	Evaluation Committee sessions Audit Committee meetings Executive Board sessions Governing Council session
Strategic objective 2: Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations	DMR 6: Production of evaluation syntheses and ARRI learning themes	Evaluation synthesis ARRI learning theme
	DMR 7: Systematic communication and outreach of IOE's work	Workshop on thematic issues Publication Learning event
	DMR 8: Evaluation capacity development in partner countries	In-country workshop on evaluation methodology and processes. Joint evaluation with relevant in-country partners

IOE results measurement framework for 2014

Key performance indicators

<i>IOE objectives</i>	<i>Key performance indicators</i>	<i>IOE DMRs^a</i>	<i>Means of verification</i>	<i>2011 baseline</i>	<i>2014 target</i>
Strategic objective 1: Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results	1. Number of notes with comments on COSOPs and policy documents	DMRs 1, 2 and 5	IOE records ^b		
	2. Number of IOE staff members sent on evaluation training each year, on a rotational basis	DMR 4	IOE records	3 staff	3 staff
	3. Number of planned Evaluation Committee sessions held in accordance with the Evaluation Committee's terms of reference	DMR 5	IOE records	4 regular sessions	According to 2014 work programme (WP)
	4. IOE participation as required in sessions of Audit Committee, Executive Board, Governing Council and Executive Board annual country visit	DMR 5	IOE records	100%	100%
Strategic objective 2: Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations	5. Number of key learning events organized by IOE within IFAD	DMRs 6 and 7	IOE records	2 events	4 events
	6. Number of in-country learning events co-organized by IOE with governments	DMR 7	IOE records	4 events	5 events
	7. Number of in-house learning events attended by IOE staff for knowledge-sharing	DMR 7	IOE records	2 events	4 events
	8. Number of external knowledge events with IOE staff participation to share lessons from evaluation	DMR 7	IOE records	3 events	5 events
	9. Number of knowledge management products (i.e. Profiles and Insights) of CLEs and CPEs published within three months of established completion date and disseminated to internal and external audiences (once agreement at completion point is signed)	DMRs 6 and 7	IOE records	80%	100%
	10. Number of evaluation syntheses and ARRI learning themes	DMR 6	IOE records		According to 2014 WP
	11. Number of evaluation capacity development (ECD) workshops organized in partner countries to share knowledge on IOE evaluation methodology and processes	DMR 8	IOE records	NA	
	12. Number of events attended by IOE staff, related to self-evaluation and ECD	DMR 8	IOE records	1 event	3 events

<i>IOE objectives</i>	<i>Key performance indicators</i>	<i>IOE DMRs^a</i>	<i>Means of verification</i>	<i>2011 baseline</i>	<i>2014 target</i>
Joint SO1 and SO2 (combining the learning and accountability functions of independent evaluation)	13. ARRI, and number of CLEs, CPEs, PPAs and PCRVs and impact evaluations	DMR 1, 2 and 3	IOE records		According to 2014 WP

^a DMR 1: ARRIs and CLEs that provide concrete building blocks for the development and implementation of better corporate policies and processes; DMR 2: CPEs that serve as concrete building blocks for better results-based COSOPs; DMR 3: Project evaluations that contribute to better IFAD-supported operations; DMR 4: Methodology development; DMR 5: Work related to IFAD governing bodies; DMR 6: Production of evaluation syntheses and ARRI learning themes; DMR 7: Systematic communication and outreach of IOE's work; DMR 8: ECD in partner countries.

^b Depending on the number of COSOPs following CPEs or the number of policy documents following evaluations on the same topics.

^c Depending on requests by Member States.

IOE reporting on achievements as at end-June 2014

In 2014, IOE will report for the first time on: (i) planned activities (table 1 below) and (ii) key performance indicators (KPIs), (table 2). An updated progress report against planned activities and KPIs will be included in the revised document submitted to the Evaluation Committee in October 2014. This matrix will continue to be updated until the final submission of the work programme and budget document to the Evaluation Committee in November and the Executive Board in December 2014.

Table 1
Reporting on IOE planned activities (January – June 2014)

Type of work	Evaluation activities	Planned implementation status	Present status
1. Corporate-level evaluations	IFAD replenishments	To be completed in December 2013	Completed in February 2014. The evaluation report was submitted for review to the Evaluation Committee in March 2014 and then to the Executive Board in April 2014.
	IFAD Policy for Grant Financing	To be completed in June 2014	Progressing as planned. The evaluation report will be presented to the Evaluation Committee in October 2014 and then to the Executive Board in December 2014.
	IFAD's work in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations s	To be completed in mid- 2015	Started as planned. The approach paper was discussed at the eighty-second session of the Evaluation Committee in March 2014.
2. Country programme evaluations	Bangladesh	To start in April 2014	Started as planned
	Plurinational State of Bolivia	To be completed in March 2014	Completed
	China	To be completed in March 2014	Report finalized. Final workshop in July, as per the request of the Government. The final report will be presented to the Evaluation Committee in November 2014.
	Senegal	To be completed in March 2014	Completed ahead of schedule in January 2014
	Sierra Leone	To start in April 2014	Started as planned
	United Republic of Tanzania	To start in January 2014	Started as planned
	Zambia	To be completed in March 2014	Completed
3. Project completion report validation	Validate all PCRs available in the year	To be completed in December 2014	Progressing as planned
4. Project performance assessment	Around eight project performance assessments	To be completed in December 2014	Progressing as planned
5. Impact evaluation	Project to be covered by the impact evaluation	To start in April 2014	Project selected (Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Programme, India) using the new selectivity framework. Preparatory mission in June.

<i>Type of work</i>	<i>Evaluation activities</i>	<i>Planned implementation status</i>	<i>Present status</i>
			Evaluation to be completed in early 2015.
6. Engagement with governing bodies	Twelfth Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD's Operations (ARRI)	To be completed in December 2014	Progressing as planned, including the preparation of a dedicated Issues Paper on the 2014 ARRI learning theme (i.e. project management). Final report to be presented to the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board in end 2014.
	Review of the implementation of the results-based work programme for 2014 and indicative plan for 2015-2016, and preparation of the results-based work programme and budget for 2015 and indicative plan for 2016-2017	To be completed in December 2014	In progress as planned
	IOE comments on the President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA)	To be completed in September 2014	In progress as planned. PRISMA with IOE comments will be discussed with the Evaluation Committee in July 2014 and thereafter by the Board in September 2014.
	IOE comments on the Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness (RIDE)	To be completed in December 2014	Will be undertaken as planned. RIDE with IOE comments will be discussed with the Evaluation Committee at end-November and thereafter by the Board in December 2014.
	IOE comments on selected IFAD operational policies prepared by IFAD Management for consideration by the Evaluation Committee	To be completed in December 2014	N/A to date
	Participation in all sessions of the Evaluation Committee, according to the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Evaluation Committee	To be completed in December 2014	Two formal Committee sessions (March and June 2014) and one informal session (January 2014) have been held. Three more sessions are planned in July, October and November, respectively.
	2014 Executive Board field visit		IOE Officer-in-Charge and a Senior Evaluation Officer took part in the 2014 Executive Board visit to the United Republic of Tanzania in May.
	IOE comments on COSOPs when related CPEs are available	January-December 2014	N/A to date. No new COSOP presented to the Board in April 2014 was informed by a recent CPE.
	IOE engagement in IFAD10	January-December 2014	In progress: IOE delivered a presentation on the eleventh ARRI at the first session of the IFAD10 Consultation in February, and the CLE on IFAD replenishments and evaluation synthesis on middle-income countries were discussed at the second session in June 2014.
7. Communication and knowledge management activities	Evaluation synthesis on IFAD's engagement in middle-income countries	To be completed in June 2014	Completed ahead of schedule in April 2014, including the holding of an in-house learning workshop. Presented to the Evaluation Committee and IFAD10 consultation in June
	Evaluation synthesis on pastoral development	To be completed in December 2014	In progress as planned, undertaken jointly with the FAO Office of Evaluation.





<i>Type of work</i>	<i>Evaluation activities</i>	<i>Planned implementation status</i>	<i>Present status</i>
	Evaluation synthesis on indigenous peoples	To be completed in December 2014	Unforeseen additional activity, included in IOE's 2014 Work Programme, started in March 2014.
	Evaluation Reports, Profiles, Insights, IOE website, etc.	January-December 2014	In progress as planned
	Organization of in-country CPE learning workshops, as well as learning events in IFAD	January-December 2014	Organized CPE learning workshops in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Senegal and Zambia. Another one planned in China in July
	Participate and share knowledge in selected external platforms such as learning events or meetings of evaluation groups	January-December 2014	In progress as planned
	IOE-OPV quarterly meetings	January-December 2014	In progress as planned. First meeting held in May 2014
	Attend IFAD Management Team meetings; OSCs that discuss corporate policies and strategies, COSOPs and selected projects evaluated by IOE; selectively CPMTs; and (as observer) the Operational Management Committee.	January-December 2014	In progress as planned
8. Partnerships	ECG, NONIE, UNEG and SDC partnership	January-December 2014	In progress as planned. Participated in the UNEG Annual General Meeting in March and Spring Meeting of ECG in April. IOE staff attended the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA) and United Kingdom Evaluation Society (UKES) annual conferences. SDC seconded one senior evaluation officer to IOE starting in May 2014.
	Contribute as external peer reviewer to key evaluations by other multilateral/bilateral organizations as requested	January-December 2014	IOE peer reviewed the external midterm review of the International Land Coalition, as well as two evaluation approach papers by the independent evaluation department of the African Development Bank (AfDB) on the: (i) General Capital Increase and African Development Fund (AfDF) replenishments; and (ii) results (outcomes and impact of AfDB support) in client countries. IOE also reviewed and provided comments on the impact evaluation guidance document by IFAD Management.
	Implement Joint Statement by CGIAR, FAO, IFAD and WFP to strengthen collaboration in evaluation	January-December 2014	In progress as planned. Examples of activities to date include: (i) synthesis on pastoral development undertaken jointly with FAO; and (ii) training on how to address gender issues in evaluations for CGIAR, FAO, IFAD and WFP staff. Moreover, IOE participated in a panel discussion with FAO and WFP (and UN Women) on the gender sector-wide action plan at the UNEG evaluation exchange programme in March.
9. Methodology	Second edition of the Evaluation Manual	January-December 2014	In progress as planned. The revised manual will be



<i>Type of work</i>	<i>Evaluation activities</i>	<i>Planned implementation status</i>	<i>Present status</i>
			finalized and issued in 2015 to allow the new IOE Director to make his/her contribution to the process. A divisional workshop on the topic will be held in June.
	Contribute to the in-house and external debate on impact evaluations	January-December 2014	In progress as planned
	Implement the revised harmonization agreement between IOE and IFAD Management on independent and self-evaluation methodology and processes	January-December 2014	In progress as planned
10. Evaluation capacity development	Organization of workshops in partner countries (as per request) on evaluation methodology and processes	January-December 2014	In progress as planned
	Implement statement of intent with Government of China on ECD	January-December 2014	ECD activity in the form of a joint evaluation (project performance assessment) planned in China in the second part of 2014. Also, China CPE workshop planned in July.



Reporting on IOE key performance indicators (January to June 2014)

Based on IOE's 2014 RMF, the below reporting matrix provides an overview of IOE achievements in the first semester of 2014 against the key performance indicators (KPIs) agreed with the Executive Board. The structure of the below matrix is different from the approved 2014 RMF (see table on pages 14-15); however, the strategic objectives, DMRs and KPIs are unchanged. The matrix has been restructured to better illustrate IOE's results chain: strategic objectives and DMRs (first two columns on the left-hand side) are now linked with the KPIs. Given that a KPI can contribute to more than one DMR, arrows are used to highlight how achievements against the KPI are linked with each DMR.

Table 2
Reporting on IOE set key performance indicators (January to June 2014)

Strategic objectives	DMRs		Key performance indicators	Achievements	Description	Targets
SO1: Contribute through IOE work to enhancing accountability for results	DMR 1: ARRIs and CLEs that provide concrete building blocks for the development and implementation of better corporate policies and processes		1. Number of notes with comments on COSOPs and policy documents	0	None until June 2014 because no new corporate policies/strategies or COSOPs were presented to the Board as follow up to IOE evaluations.	
			13. ARRI, and number of CLEs, CPEs, PPAs, PCRVs and impact evaluations (IE)s	On track	ARRI is under production. One CLE has been completed (replenishment); a second (grants) is nearing completion; and a third is under way (fragile states). As per plan, of the 7 CPEs, 4 have been completed and 3 have been started. The 2014 impact evaluation has been launched, and PPAs and PCRVs are on track.	According to 2014 WP
	DMR 2: CPEs that serve as concrete building blocks for better results-based COSOPs		1. Number of notes with comments on COSOPs and policy documents	0	See description for KPI 1	
			13. ARRI, and number of CLEs, CPEs, PPAs, PCRVs and IEs	On track	See description for KPI 13	According to 2014 WP
	DMR 3: Project evaluations that contribute to better IFAD-supported operations		13. ARRI, and number of CLEs, CPEs, PPAs, PCRVs and ES	On track	See remark in this column against KPI 13 above	According to 2014 WP
	DMR 4: Methodology development		2. Number of IOE staff members sent on evaluation training each year, on a rotational basis	4	1 staff member attended the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA) conference 1 staff member attended the Annual Evaluation Conference of the United Kingdom Evaluation Society (UKES) 2 staff members participated in International Programme for Development Evaluation Training events	3 staff

Strategic Objectives	DMRs		Key Performance Indicators	Achievements	Description	Targets
SO1: Contribute through IOE work to enhancing accountability for results	DMR 5: Work related to IFAD governing bodies		1. Number of notes with comments on COSOPs and policy documents	0	See description for KPI 1.	
			3. Number of planned Evaluation Committee sessions held in accordance with the Committee's terms of reference	4	3 formal sessions (March, June and July) and 1 informal session (January). This includes an additional unforeseen formal session held in June.	According to 2014 WP
			4. IOE participation as required in sessions of the Audit Committee, Executive Board, Governing Council and Evaluation Committee annual country visit	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Board session April 2014 Executive Board country visit to United Republic of Tanzania Governing Council session February 2014 IFAD10 sessions in February and June 	100%
SO2: Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations	DMR 6: Production of evaluation syntheses and ARRI learning themes		5. Number of key learning events organized by IOE within IFAD	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation synthesis on IFAD's engagement in middle-income countries Seminar at IFAD on issues and lessons learned from the first impact evaluation (Sri Lanka) Global Staff Meeting learning event: "The role of independent evaluation and its contribution to better operational and institutional performance in IFAD" 	4 events
			9. Number of knowledge management products of CLEs and CPEs published within three months of established completion date and disseminated to internal and external audiences	29	As at June 2014, IOE has published and disseminated to internal and external audiences a total of 29 knowledge management products including: 14 evaluation reports, 4 Profiles and 4 Insights, 3 press releases, 2 overviews on CLEs and 2 quarterly newsletters.	100%
			10. Number of evaluation syntheses and ARRI learning themes	3 syntheses 1 ARRI learning theme	Syntheses: MICs; pastoral development; and indigenous peoples. ARRI learning theme: project management.	According to 2014 WP

Strategic Objectives	DMRs		Key Performance Indicators	Achievements	Description	Targets	
SO2: Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations	DMR 7: Systematic communication and outreach of IOE's work		5. Number of key learning events organized by IOE at IFAD	See above	See description for KPI 5.		
			6. Number of in-country learning events co-organized by IOE with governments	4	CPE workshops <ul style="list-style-type: none"> January - Senegal April - Plurinational State of Bolivia April - Zambia July - China 	5 events	
			7. Number of in-house learning events attended by IOE staff for knowledge-sharing	6+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IFAD Strategic Vision Induction for new IFAD staff Induction for new Member State representatives Several sessions during the Global Staff Meeting Impact evaluation by Oxfam Multidimensional poverty assessment tool 	4 events	
			8. Number of external knowledge events with IOE staff participation to share lessons from evaluation	5	FAO, UNEG, ECG, AfrEA and UKES	5 events	
			9. Number of knowledge management products of CLEs and CPEs published within three months of established completion date and disseminated to internal and external audiences	See above	See remark in this column against KPI 9 above	100%	
	DMR 8: Evaluation capacity development in partner countries						
			11. Number of ECD workshops organized in partner countries to share knowledge on IOE evaluation methodology and processes	0	Will be implemented in second part of 2014		
			12. Number of events attended by IOE staff related to self-evaluation and ECD	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board discussion on private-sector grant proposal in support of impact evaluation Operational Management Committee discussion on IFAD's quarterly performance report Dedicated session on ex ante quality assurance of new project proposals 	3 events	

IOE proposed evaluation activities for 2015 and indicative plan for 2016-2017

Table 1
Proposed IOE work programme for 2015 by type of activity

Type of work	Proposed activities for 2015	Start date	Expected finish	Expected delivery time ^a				
				Jan-Mar 2015	Apr-Jun 2015	Jul-Sep 2015	Oct-Dec 2015	2016
1. Corporate-level evaluation	IFAD's engagement in fragile states	Jan-14	June-15		X			
2. Country programme evaluation	Bangladesh	May-14	Jul-15				X	
	Brazil	Jan-15	Mar-16					X
	Ethiopia	Jan-15	Mar-16					X
	India	Oct-15	Dec-16					X
	Nigeria	Jan-15	Mar-16					X
	Sierra Leone	Jan-14	Mar-15				X	
	Turkey	Jan-15	Mar-16					X
	United Republic of Tanzania	Jan-14	Mar-15		X			
3. Project completion report validation	Validate all PCRs available in year	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
4. Project performance assessment	About 8 PPAs	Jan-15	Dec-15			X	X	
5. Impact evaluation	One (project to be determined)	Jun-15	Jun-16					X
6. Engagement with governing bodies	Review of implementation of results-based work programme for 2015 and indicative plan for 2016-2017, and preparation of results-based work programme and budget for 2016 and indicative plan for 2017-2018	Jan-15	Dec-15			X	X	
	13 th ARRI	Jan-15	Dec-15					X
	IOE comments on PRISMA	Jun-15	Sep-15			X		
	IOE comments on RIDE	Oct-15	Dec-15					X
	IOE comments on selected IFAD operational policies, strategies and processes prepared by IFAD Management for consideration by the Evaluation Committee and the Board, including comments on the new IFAD corporate policy on grants financing, and on the synthesis report on impact evaluations prepared by IFAD	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	Participation in all sessions of the Evaluation Committee, Executive Board and Governing Council, selected Audit Committee meetings, and the 2015 country visit of the Executive Board	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	

Type of work	Proposed activities for 2015	Start date	Expected finish	Expected delivery time [*]				2016
				Jan-Mar 2015	Apr-Jun 2015	Jul-Sep 2015	Oct-Dec 2015	
	IOE comments on COSOPs when related CPEs are available	Jan-15	Dec-15		X	X	X	
7. Communication and knowledge-management activities	Evaluation synthesis on accessing markets: a sub-regional perspective	Jan-15	Jun-15				X	
	Evaluation synthesis on natural resources and environmental management	Jun-15	Dec-15				X	
	Evaluation synthesis on non-lending activities in the context of South-South cooperation						X	
	Evaluation reports, Profiles, Insights, website, etc.	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	Organization of in-country CPE learning workshops and learning events in IFAD	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	Activities related to the International Year of Evaluation	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	Participate and share knowledge in selected external platforms such as learning events or meetings of evaluation groups	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	IOE-OPV quarterly meetings	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	Attend all OSCs that discuss corporate policies and strategies, COSOPs and selected projects evaluated by IOE. Attend OMCs, IMTs and selected CPMTs	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
8. Partnership	ECG, UNEG, NONIE and SDC partnerships	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	Contribute as external peer reviewer to key evaluations by other multilateral/bilateral organizations as requested	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	Implement joint statement by CGIAR, FAO, IFAD and WFP to strengthen collaboration in evaluation	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
9. Methodology	Second edition of Evaluation Manual	Jan-14	Apr-15		X			
	Training (Second edition of Evaluation Manual) IOE staff/consultants	June-15	Dec-15		X	X	X	
	Contribute to in-house and external debate on impact evaluations	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
10. ECD	Engage in ECD in context of regular evaluation process	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	Organization of workshops in partner countries (as per request) on evaluation methodology and processes	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	
	Implementation of statement of intent with the Peoples' Republic of China on ECD in the country	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	

* The quarterly delivery time is marked with an **X** only for an expected specific deliverable.

Table 2
IOE indicative plan for 2016-2017 by type of activity *

Type of work	Indicative plan for 2016-2017	Year
1. Corporate-level evaluation	IFAD's decentralization model and experience	2016-2017
	IFAD's approach and results in policy dialogue	2016-2017
	IFAD's efforts in conducting impact evaluations	2016-2017
	Joint evaluation with FAO and WFP of Reformed Committee on World Food Security	2016-2017
2. Country programme evaluations	Burkina Faso	2016
	Burundi	2016
	Cameroon	2017
	Malawi	2017
	The Philippines	2016
	Indian Ocean small island developing states	2016
	Sub-regional evaluation in English-speaking Caribbean island countries	2016-2017
3. Project completion report validation	Validate all PCRs available in year	2016-2017
4. Project performance assessment	About 8 PPAs/year	2016-2017
5. Impact evaluation	1 per year (project to be determined)	2016-2017
6. Engagement with governing bodies	14 th and 15 th ARRIs	2016-2017
	Review of implementation of results-based work programme for 2016 and indicative plan for 2017-2018, and preparation of results-based work programme and budget for 2017 and indicative plan for 2018-2019	2016
	Review of implementation of results-based work programme for 2017 and indicative plan for 2018-2019, and preparation of results-based work programme and budget for 2018 and indicative plan for 2019-2020	2017
	IOE comments on PRISMA	2016-2017
	IOE comments on RIDE	2016-2017
	IOE comments on selected IFAD operational policies, strategies and processes prepared by IFAD Management for consideration by Evaluation Committee	2016-2017
	Participation in all sessions of Evaluation Committee, according to revised terms of reference and rules of procedure of Evaluation Committee. Participation in Executive Board meetings and Governing council. Participate in annual country visit of the Board.	2016-2017
	IOE comments on COSOPs when related CPEs are available	2016-2017

<i>Type of work</i>	<i>Indicative plan for 2016-2017</i>	<i>Year</i>
7. Communication and knowledge management activities	Evaluation reports, Profiles, Insights, website, etc.	2016-2017
	Evaluation synthesis on IFAD's experience on value chains	2016
	Evaluation synthesis on remittances	2016
	Evaluation synthesis on opportunities and challenges for scaling up to achieve a wider impact on rural poverty	2016
	Evaluation synthesis on IFAD's self-evaluation mechanism	2016
	Attend all OSCs that discuss corporate policies and strategies, COSOPs and selected projects evaluated by IOE. Attend OMC, IMT and selected CPMTs	2016-2017
8. Partnership	ECG, UNEG, NONIE and SDC partnerships	2016-2017
	Implement joint statement by CGIAR, FAO, IFAD and WFP to strengthen collaboration in evaluation	2016-2017
9. Methodology	Contribute to in-house and external debate on impact evaluation	2016-2017
	Implement revised harmonization agreement between IOE and IFAD Management on independent and self-evaluation methodology and processes	2016-2017
10. Evaluation capacity development (ECD)	Implementation of activities in partner countries related to ECD	2016-2017

*The topics and number of CLEs, CPEs and evaluation synthesis report are tentative and the actual priorities and numbers to be undertaken in 2016 and 2017, respectively, will be determined in 2015.

IOE staff levels for 2015

2011 level	2012 level	2013 level	2014 level	2015		
				Professional staff	General Service staff	Total
19.5	19.5	18.5	18.5	13	6	19

Human resource category

Category	2014	2015
Director	1	1
Deputy Director	1	1
Senior evaluation officers	2*	2*
Evaluation officers	7	7
Evaluation research analyst	1	1
Evaluation knowledge and communication officer	0.5	1
Total Professional staff	12.5	13
Administrative assistant	1	1
Assistant to Director	1	1
Assistant to Deputy Director	1	1
Evaluation assistants	3	3
Total General Service staff	6	6
Grand total	18.5	19

* An additional senior evaluation officer has been seconded from SDC to IOE since May 2014, with no impact on IOE staff costs.

IOE General Service staff levels

2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015 (proposed)
9.5	8.5	8.5	8	8	8	6	6	6

IOE proposed budget for 2015

Table 1
IOE proposed budget 2015
 (United States dollars)

<i>Evaluation work</i>	<i>2011 budget^a</i>	<i>2012 budget^a</i>	<i>2013 budget^a</i>	<i>2014 budget^a</i> <i>(1)</i>	<i>Proposed 2015 budget</i>			
					<i>Real increase/decrease</i> <i>(2)</i>	<i>Price increase^b</i> <i>(3)</i>	<i>Exchange rate increase/decrease^c</i> <i>(4)</i>	<i>Total 2015 budget at US\$1 = EUR 0.72</i> <i>(5)=(1)+(2)+(3)+/-(4)</i>
Non-staff costs	2 238 000	2 289 474	2 346 711	2 395 992	0	59 900	0	2 455 892
Staff costs	3 645 576	3 734 530	3 667 268	3 586 690	54 385	0	0	3 641 075
Total	5 883 576	6 024 004	6 013 979	5 982 682	54 385	59 900	0	6 096 967

^a As approved by the Governing Council (at the exchange rate of US\$1 = EUR 0.722 in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014).

^b As for the rest of IFAD and conveyed by BOD. Price increase for non-staff costs is 2.5 per cent, and there is no price increase for staff costs.

^c As conveyed by BOD, the exchange rate to be applied at this stage is the same exchange rate as applied for the 2014 budget, i.e. US\$1 = EUR 0.72 to facilitate comparison.

Table 2
2015 IOE budget proposal breakdown for non-staff costs

Type of activity	Absolute number	Relative number in terms of % of work done ^a	Standard unit costs ^b (US\$)	Proposed non-staff costs in 2015 (US\$)
ARRI	1	1	150 000	150 000
Corporate-level evaluation	1	0.75	Differentiated cost based on scope and nature of issues to be assessed: 200 000-450 000	300 000
Country programme evaluation	8	4.1	Differentiated cost based on size of portfolio, size of country, travel costs and availability of evaluative evidence: 225 000-305 000	1 005 000
PCR validation	About 30	About 30	-	50 000
PPA	About 8	About 8	25 000-30 000	230 000
Impact evaluation	1	0.7	200 000-300 000	200 000
Evaluation synthesis	3	3	40 000-65 000	120 000
Revision of IOE Evaluation Manual (Finalization)	1	0.3	-	50 000
Communication, evaluation outreach, knowledge sharing and partnership activities	-	-	-	188 000
ECD, training (including training on the revised Evaluation Manual) and other costs	-	-	-	162 892
Total				2 455 892

^a Evaluations often straddle two years. This figure represents percentage of work done for those evaluations in 2015.

^b Standard unit costs also include staff travel when necessary.

Table 3

IOE proposed budget allocation (staff and non-staff costs) by objective and divisional management result

(United States dollars)

<i>IOE objectives</i>	<i>IOE DMRs</i>	<i>Proposed budget (staff and non-staff cost)</i>	<i>Percentage overall total proposed budget</i>
Strategic objective 1: Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results	DMR 1: ARRI and CLEs that provide concrete building blocks for development and implementation of better corporate policies and processes	702 413	11
	DMR 2: CPEs that serve as concrete building blocks for better results-based COSOPs	2 034 156	33
	DMR 3: Project evaluations that contribute to better IFAD-supported operations	1 034 773	17
	DMR 4: Methodology development	349 005	6
	DMR 5: Work related to IFAD governing bodies	260 907	4
Total for strategic objective 1		4 381 254	71
Strategic objective 2: Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations	DMR 6: Production of evaluation syntheses and ARRI learning themes	708 514	12
	DMR 7: Systematic communication and outreach of IOE's work	729 008	12
	DMR 8: ECD in partner countries	278 191	5
Total for strategic objective 2		1 715 713	29
GRAND TOTAL		6 096 967	100

IOE Selectivity framework

Table 1
Guiding questions for the selection and prioritization of evaluations for inclusion in IOE's work programme

<i>Corporate-level evaluations/Evaluation syntheses</i>	<i>Country programme evaluations</i>	<i>Project performance assessments*</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is this an area of interest/priority for IFAD stakeholders? 2. Is this in line with IFAD's strategic priorities and replenishment commitments? 3. Will this address a knowledge gap in IFAD? 4. What is the evaluation expected to impact? 5. Is there a critical decision point in IFAD that would drive the timing of this evaluation? 6. How would this evaluation contribute to IOE's strategic objectives? 7. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to? 8. Does IOE have the resources (financial and human resources) to conduct this evaluation? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is this a country of interest/priority for the regional division? 2. How would this evaluation affect the geographical balance of the IOE evaluation portfolio? 3. Is there a critical decision point in IFAD that would drive the timing of this evaluation? 4. How would this evaluation contribute to IOE's strategic objectives? 5. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to? 6. Does IOE have the resources (financial and human resources) to conduct this evaluation? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did IOE identify any major information gaps, inconsistencies or analytical weaknesses in the PCR during the validation process? 2. Does the project use successful innovative approaches that could be scaled up elsewhere? 3. Is there a major disconnect between the ratings contained in the PCR and those generated by IOE during the validation process? 4. How does this evaluation affect the geographical balance of the IOE evaluation portfolio? 5. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to (e.g. CPE)? 6. Does IOE have the resources (financial and human resources) to conduct this evaluation?

*The selectivity framework cannot be applied for PPAs at this stage, as IOE has not yet been provided with the list of PCRs that will need to be validated in 2015.

Table 2

Application of the selectivity framework for CLEs*

<i>Guiding questions for CLEs/Evaluation syntheses</i>	<i>CLE on IFAD's approach to and results in policy dialogue</i>	<i>Joint evaluation with FAO and WFP of Reformed Committee on World Food Security</i>	<i>CLE on IFAD's decentralization model and experience</i>
1. Is this an area of interest/priority for IFAD stakeholders?	4	5	5
2. Is this in line with IFAD's strategic priorities and replenishment commitments?	5	5	5
3. Will this address a knowledge gap in IFAD?	Yes, to a lesser extent, as the 2012 ARRI focused on policy dialogue.	Yes	Yes
What is the evaluation expected to impact?	IFAD's approach in policy dialogue	IFAD's engagement in debate on world food security.	IFAD's approach in strengthening the capacity of decentralized structures to maximize the organization's impact at country level
5. Is there a critical decision point in IFAD that would drive the timing of this evaluation?	No	No	Yes, it is a priority for the IFAD9 period and beyond
6. How would this evaluation contribute to IOE's strategic objectives?	Contribute to strategic objectives 1 and 2	Contribute to Strategic objectives 1 and 2	Contribute to strategic objectives 1 and 2
7. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to?	Draw on CPEs and project-level evaluations, as well as the 2012 ARRI learning theme on policy dialogue	Not directly	Draw on other CLEs, CPEs and project-level evaluations
8. Does IOE have the resources (financial and human resources) to conduct this evaluation?	Only one new CLE can be carried out in a given year due to capacity and resources within IOE, IFAD Management and the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board	Only one new CLE can be carried out in a given year due to capacity and resources within IOE, IFAD Management and the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board	Yes

* In constructing the work programme, each proposed evaluation was validated against the guiding questions, using a 5-point score, where 5 represents the highest score and 1 the lowest.

Table 3
Application of the selectivity framework for evaluation syntheses

<i>Guiding questions for CLEs/Evaluation syntheses</i>	<i>Evaluation synthesis on scaling-up</i>	<i>Evaluation synthesis on IFAD's self-evaluation mechanisms</i>	<i>Evaluation synthesis on the collaboration among the United Nations Rome-based Agencies</i>	<i>Evaluation synthesis on Remittances</i>	<i>Accessing markets: a sub-regional perspective</i>
1. Is this an area of interest/priority for IFAD stakeholders?	5	4 (because the topic has been studied to some extent in the CLE on efficiency and CLE on IFAD replenishment.	5	3	5
2. Is this in line with IFAD's strategic priorities and replenishment commitments?	5	5	5	3	5
3. Will this address a knowledge gap in IFAD?	Yes, to a lesser extent as other studies have been undertaken by Management	Yes	No, as the Policy and Technical Advisory Division is conducting a similar study	Yes	Yes
4. What is the evaluation expected to impact?	IFAD's scaling up approach	IFAD's self-evaluation mechanisms	IFAD's role in the collaboration among the United Nations Rome-based agencies	IFAD's engagement in and approach to remittances in the context of development finance	IFAD's role in promoting access to markets
5. Is there a critical decision point in IFAD that would drive the timing of this evaluation?	Yes, it is a priority for the IFAD9 period	Yes	Yes	To some extent	Yes, it is a priority for the IFAD9 period
6. How would this evaluation contribute to IOE's strategic objectives?	Contribute to strategic objective 2	Contribute to strategic objective 2	Contribute to strategic objective 2	Contribute to strategic objective 2	Contribute to strategic objective 2
7. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to?	Draw on CLEs, CPEs and project-level evaluations	Draw on CLEs, CPEs and project-level evaluations	Draw on CPEs and project-level evaluations where the collaboration among Rome-based agencies is foreseen	Draw on CPEs and project-level evaluations where there are activities relevant to remittances	Draw on CPEs and project-level evaluations where there are activities relevant to accessing markets
8. Does IOE have resources (financial and human resources) to conduct this evaluation?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 4
Application of the selectivity framework for CPEs

<i>Guiding questions for CPEs</i>	<i>Brazil</i>	<i>Ethiopia</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Nigeria</i>	<i>Turkey</i>
1. Is this a country of interest/priority for the regional division taking into account its performance based allocation 2013-2015?	5	5	5	5	3
2. How would this evaluation affect the geographical balance of the IOE evaluation portfolio?	5	5	5	5	5
3. Is there a critical decision point in IFAD that would drive the timing of this evaluation?	Yes (current COSOP covers 2008-2012, the CPE will contribute to the formulation of the new COSOP)	Yes (current COSOP covers 2008-2014, the CPE will contribute to the formulation of the new COSOP)	Yes (current COSOP covers 2010-2015, the CPE will contribute to the formulation of the new COSOP)	Yes (current COSOP covers 2010-2015, the CPE will contribute to the formulation of the new COSOP)	Current COSOP dated 2008
4. How would this evaluation contribute to IOE's strategic objectives?	Contribute to strategic objectives 1 and 2	Contribute to strategic objectives 1 and 2	Contribute to strategic objectives 1 and 2	Contribute to strategic objectives 1 and 2	Contribute to strategic objectives 1 and 2
5. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to?	Draw on the previous CPE of 2007 and project evaluations conducted since then	Draw on project-level evaluations in Ethiopia and on the previous CPE of 2008	Draw on project-level evaluations (including IE) in India and on the previous CPE of 2009	Draw on previous CPE	Draw on project-level evaluations in Turkey
6. Does IOE have the resources (financial and human resources) to conduct this evaluation?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 5
Selectivity framework for Impact Evaluations by IOE

A. ESSENTIAL CRITERIA ^a					
Criteria	Code	Guiding questions for IEs	Rating system (5-point scale)		Means of verification
<i>Evaluation results for learning</i>	A.01	Is a CPE planned in this country in 2015/2016? ^b	5 = YES	1 = NO	IOE indicative rolling WP
	A.02	Would the findings of this evaluation, given the subsector nature of the project, also feed into ongoing or planned evaluation synthesis reports or CLEs?	5 = YES	1 = NO	IOE indicative rolling WP
<i>Project status</i>	A.03	Did project implementation end between 1 and 3 years ago?	1 = > 5 years 2 = 5 years 5 years ≤ 3 ≤ 4 years 4 = 3 years 3 years ≤ 5 ≤ 1 years		PPMS
<i>Geographical distribution</i>	A.04	Has IOE conducted an interim or completion evaluation or PPA of this project in the past?	5 = NO	1 = YES	IOE reports/Work Programme
	A.05	Does IFAD Management plan an impact evaluation of this project by the end of 2015?	5 = NO	1 = YES	PMD; Strategy and Knowledge Management Department

^a Only projects meeting the essential criteria will be validated also against desirable criteria as detailed in section B of the table.

^b To ensure that IE results and lessons learned inform synthesis reports, CPEs and CLEs.

B. DESIRABLE CRITERIA^a					
<i>Project size</i>	B.01	Is this a country of priority to the regional division, taking into account its performance based allocation 2013-2015?	^a See rating system for B.01		PBAS report
	B.02^b	Of the countries selected, which has the highest performance-based allocation?	5 = largest interval		PBAS
	B.03	What are the total project costs?	5 = largest interval		PPMS
	B.04	What is the IFAD loan amount?	5 = largest interval		PPMS
	B.05	What is the project size in terms of the number of households at design expected to directly benefit from project support?	5 = largest interval		Project document
<i>Disbursement rate</i>	B.06	What was the disbursement rate at project closure?	5 = highest interval		LGS
<i>Innovation and scaling up</i>	B.07	Does the project include innovative characteristics with potential for scaling up?	5 = YES	1 = NO	Project document
<i>Joint evaluations</i>	B.08	Is there potential to undertake the impact evaluation jointly with relevant national institutions (e.g. Government's independent evaluation office (where possible), national evaluation association, etc.)?	5 = YES	1 = NO	IOE interaction with the country and country programme manager

^a Only projects meeting the criteria in section B of the table are exposed to the technical criteria set forth in section C of the table.

^b The rating system will be developed once the countries are selected consistently with the essential criteria in section A of the table.

34

Rating system for B.01 (minimum and maximum regional PBAS allocation for 2013 – 2015)
(Millions of United States dollars)

Asia and the Pacific	East and Southern Africa	Latin America and the Caribbean	Near East, North Africa and Europe	West and Central Africa
3 million ≤ 1 ≤ 26.2 million	3 million ≤ 1 ≤ 17.2 million	1 million ≤ 1 ≤ 9.5 million	1 million ≤ 1 ≤ 13 million	3 million ≤ 1 ≤ 16 million
26.3 million ≤ 2 ≤ 52.5 million	17.3 million ≤ 2 ≤ 24.5 million	9.6 million ≤ 2 ≤ 19.1 million	13.1 million ≤ 2 ≤ 26.1 million	16.1 million ≤ 2 ≤ 32.1 million
52.6 million ≤ 3 ≤ 78.8 million	24.6 million ≤ 3 ≤ 52.4 million	19.2 million ≤ 3 ≤ 28.7 million	26.2 million ≤ 3 ≤ 39.2 million	32.2 million ≤ 3 ≤ 48.2 million
78.9 million ≤ 4 ≤ 105.1 million	52.5 million ≤ 4 ≤ 69.7 million	28.8 million ≤ 4 ≤ 38.3 million	39.3 million ≤ 4 ≤ 52.3 million	48.3 million ≤ 4 ≤ 64.3 million
105.2 million ≤ 5 ≤ 131.4 million	69.8 million ≤ 5 ≤ 87 million	38.4 million ≤ 5 ≤ 47.9 million	52.4 million ≤ 5 ≤ 65 million	64.4 million ≤ 5 ≤ 80.4 million

C.TECHNICAL CRITERIA				
Criteria	Guiding questions for impact evaluations		Rating system (5-point scale)	Means of verification
<i>Evaluability assessment</i>	C.01 01.1 01.2 01.3	Is a baseline survey available? If so: What is its quality rating? Did it include control or comparison groups? Is an electronic database available?	5= YES 1 = NO	C.01 PMD front office; SSD; CPM 01.1 IOE assessment 01.2 IOE assessment 01.3 CPM
	C.02 02.1 02.2 02.3	Is a Results and Impact Management System (RIMS) baseline survey available? If so: What is its quality rating? Did it include control or comparison groups? Is an electronic database available?	5= YES 1 = NO	C.02 PMD front office; SSD; CPM 02.1 IOE assessment 02.2 IOE assessment 02.3 CPM
	C.03 03.1 03.2 03.3	Is a RIMS completion survey available? If so: What is its quality? Did it include control or comparison groups? Is an electronic database available?	5= YES 1 = NO	C.03 PMD front office; SSD; CPM 03.1 IOE assessment 03.2 IOE assessment 03.3 CPM
	C.04 04.1 04.2 04.3	Are other surveys available? If so: What is their quality rating? Did they include control or comparison groups? Is an electronic database available?	5= YES 1 = NO	C.04 CPM 04.1 IOE assessment 04.2 IOE assessment 04.3 CPM
Criteria	Guiding questions for IEs		Rating system (5-point scale)	Means of verification
<i>Evaluability assessment</i>	C.05	How would you rate the quality of the PCR including in terms of data and analysis on impact?	5 = high quality 1 = low quality	IOE assessment
	C.06	Is a midterm review available?	5 = YES 1 = NO	CPM
	C.07	How would you rate the quantity and quality of data generated by the project's monitoring and evaluation system?	5 = high quality/quantity 1 = low quality/quantity	CPM; Project Authorities
	C.08	Does the President's report contain a logical framework, and if so, how would you rate its quality?	5 = logframe available/high quality 1 = logframe not available/low quality	IOE assessment
	C.09	Are qualitative thematic studies available?	5 = thematic studies available	CPM
	C.10	Did the project experience implementation delays?	5 = NO serious delay in implementation	PPMS
<i>Availability of local technical expertise</i>	C.11	Is national technical expertise in quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis available?	5 = available/high quality	IOE (research on internet)

Application of the selectivity framework

The selectivity framework for impact evaluations is the master tool guiding the identification of projects for impact evaluation by IOE. The framework groups criteria into three categories: essential, desirable and technical. The framework filters operations as follows: (i) only projects meeting the essential criteria are exposed to the desirable criteria and, thereafter, (ii) those with the highest rating are assessed against the technical criteria and subjected to an evaluability assessment, which guides IOE's final decision on the project to be evaluated.

For the 2014 impact evaluation, eight projects met the requirements of the first two subcriteria (evaluation results for learning and project status) under the essential criteria. These two subcriteria are fundamental to maximize learning, and ensure that the project can be evaluated with due consideration of context in order to obtain adequate understanding of impact and sustainability. All eight projects were assessed against the remaining guiding questions under the essential criteria. This narrowed down the sample from eight to three projects, which were assessed against the desirable criteria. This further restricted the choice to two projects, namely the India Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Project and the Nigeria Roots and Tuber Expansion Programme), to be exposed to the evaluability assessment (i.e. the technical criteria).

The results of the evaluability assessment indicated that the India project was the most suitable for evaluation in terms of both reliability of data and cost-effectiveness.