IFAD

Investing in rural people

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

Evaluation Committee — Eighty-fifth Session
Rome, 10 October 2014

For: **Review**

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms

ARRI	Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfREA	African Evaluation Association
BOD	Budget and Organizational Development Unit
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CLE	corporate-level evaluation
COSOP	country strategic opportunities programme
CPE	country programme evaluation
CPM	country programme manager
CPMT	country programme management team
DMR	divisional management result
ECD	evaluation capacity development
ECG	Evaluation Cooperation Group
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IFAD9	Ninth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources
IMT	IFAD Management Team
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
KPI	key performance indicator
JCTDP	Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Project
NONIE	Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation
OMC	Operations Management Committee
OSC	Operational Strategy and Policy Guidance Committee
PBAS	performance-based allocation system
PCR	project completion report
PCRV	project completion report validation
PMD	Programme Management Department
PPA	project performance assessment
PPMS	Project and Portfolio Management System
PRISMA	President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions
RIDE	Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness
RMF	Results Measurement Framework
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SSD	Statistics and Studies for Development Division
UKES	United Kingdom Evaluation Society
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
WFP	World Food Programme
WP	work programme

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 the proposed 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.

2. Building on the new format and structure developed in 2013, this document 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. The document provides details of actual expenditures for 2013; 2014 budget utilization at the time this document was prepared; and current estimates of expected 2014 year-end utilization.

3. This year IOE introduced two new features into its work programme and budget document: (i) reported progress against the key performance indicators (KPIs) contained in IOE's results measurement framework (RMF), as adopted by the Board in December 2013; and (ii) a selectivity framework to guide the choice of IFAD-funded projects to undergo impact evaluations by IOE. These new features are explained in section III(A).

4. The proposed work programme and budget have been developed following comments made during the eighty-fourth session of the Evaluation Committee on 2 July, as well as by the Audit Committee and the Executive Board during their September 2014 sessions. The final version of the document will reflect the outcome of discussions with the Evaluation Committee on 10 October 2014, and will be considered by the Executive Board in December 2014. Prior to this, as per past practice, the budget proposal will be considered again by the Audit Committee in November 2014, together with IFAD's 2015 administrative budget. Finally, the budget will be 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 its administrative budget.

5. 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, overall 2013 budget utilization, 2014 budget utilization as of mid-September 2014 and projected utilization for end 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

---

[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, p.29.
[3] Among other tasks, BOD is responsible for preparing IFAD's annual administrative budget and coordinating the organization's annual Strategy Workforce Planning exercise.

activities for 2015. Lastly, section VI outlines the final 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.

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. Some of the key insights 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 their analytical depth and quality. The streamlining of IOE evaluation processes is being carried out in the context of the development of the second edition of the Evaluation Manual, which will be issued in 2015;

- Evaluation recommendations must be useful, prioritized and strategic. This would facilitate discussions on evaluation recommendations by IFAD's governing bodies and enable Management to easily internalize and incorporate them into new policies, strategies and processes and IFAD-supported operations;

- Further opportunities for partnership in evaluation – for example joint evaluations with the Rome-based United Nations agencies, international financial institutions and recipient countries – are needed to foster learning, knowledge-sharing and evaluation capacity development;

- IOE should engage in a dialogue with and support IFAD Management in their efforts to conduct and mainstream (project) impact evaluations;

- IOE should further develop the selectivity framework that 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 which projects will undergo an impact evaluation in 2014 (see paragraph 7 below, last bullet); and

- In addition to the above, more thorough advance planning is needed within IOE and in dialogue with the Office of the Secretary to ensure that documents for IFAD governing bodies, especially the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board, are produced and dispatched in a timely manner.

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. Moreover, it will have conducted several additional activities, such as country visits to collect evidence from the field in the context of the evaluation synthesis report on IFAD's engagement in middle-income countries that was finalized in early 2014. Selected key achievements to date include:

- The completion of the corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's replenishments. This 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 corporate-level evaluation on the IFAD Policy for Grant Financing has been finalized and will be discussed at the Board session in December 2014.

---

[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 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 corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's work in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations is in full swing. A progress report on this evaluation will be presented during the third session of the IFAD10 Consultation in October 2014;

- The completion of the evaluation synthesis report on IFAD's engagement in middle-income countries. In this regard, in April, IOE organized an in-house learning workshop with IFAD Management and staff to exchange views on the topic. The workshop included the participation of the former Director General of the Independent Office of Evaluation of the Government of India and colleagues from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and World Food Programme (WFP);

- The launching of the first joint evaluation synthesis report on pastoral development prepared and cofinanced by IOE and FAO's Office of Evaluation. As this is a collaborative endeavour, opportunities for discussing the final report in a joint session of the IFAD Evaluation Committee and FAO Programme Committee will be explored early next year;

- The 2014 Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRI) has been prepared. This year's ARRI includes a dedicated section on the opportunities and challenges faced by project management. An in-house learning workshop was held on 19 September 2014 to discuss the ARRI's main findings and recommendations. The workshop was attended by IFAD Management, staff and consultants, as well as representatives from the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation and United Nations Development Programme; and

- The second IOE impact evaluation was officially launched in June and is now in full swing. The operation selected, using the newly introduced selectivity framework, is the Jharkhand-Chhattisgarh Tribal Development Programme (JCTDP) 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 KPI included in the IOE results measurement framework for 2014.[5] The data reveals 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 KPIs) will be reported to the Board in December 2014.

9. As requested by the Evaluation Committee in July and the Board in September, IOE has further developed its RMF for 2015 to include sharper KPIs, including on IOE's efficiency. The new RMF for 2015 is presented in annex VII.

10. As mentioned above (paras. 3 and 6), this year IOE has further developed its selectivity framework (see annex VIII), which was first introduced in the 2014 work programme and budget document. The selectivity framework now includes criteria and guiding questions that allow for a more transparent process in selecting projects for impact evaluations by IOE (see annex VIII, table 5). For example, IOE will select projects for impact evaluation if, among other criteria: (i) the operation closed between 1-3 years ago; (ii) they are located in a country where IOE plans a CPE in the near future; (iii) their design includes innovative characteristics that merit further and more detailed study and documentation through independent evaluation; and (iv) the project is not covered by the impact evaluations

---

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

undertaken by IFAD Management - to avoid duplication of effort and ensure usefulness for the organization as a whole.

11. In addition, IOE has introduced a more systematic approach to continuous monitoring and quarterly performance reviews of the implementation of its work programme and budget in order to take stock of progress and flag issues that merit closer attention.

B. 2014 budget utilization

12. Table 1 below provides information on budget utilization by IOE in 2013; budget utilization as of mid-September 2014; and expected utilization by year-end.

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

Evaluation work	Approved budget 2013	Budget utilization 2013 (US$)	Approved budget 2014	2014 Commitment as of mid-Sept. (US$)*	Expected utilization as of year-end 2014
Staff travel	330 000	332 492	345 000	245 237	345 000
Consultant fees	1 525 362	1 685 763	1 465 000	1 523 228	1 465 000
Consultant travel and allowances	352 007	428 719	395 000	356 521	395 000
In-country CPE learning events	30 000	35 690	35 000	45 569	35 000
Evaluation outreach, staff training and other costs	109 342	192 560	155 992	95 380	155 992
Non-staff costs	**2 346 711**	**2 675 224**	**2 395 992**	**2 265 935**	**2 395 992**
Staff costs	**3 667 268**	**3 098 962**	**3 586 690**	**3 142 589**	**3 437 123**
Total	**6 013 979**	**5 774 186**	**5 982 682**	**5 408 524**	**5 833 115**
Utilization		**96.0%**		**90.4%**	**97.5%**

* Based on staff costs committed until year-end.

13. 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.

14. In 2014, against an approved budget of US$5.983 million, the utilization (in terms of commitments) as of mid-September 2014 was US$5.409 million, or 90.4 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 commitments for hiring consultants and for staff/consultants' travel costs as part of the normal business cycle, as funds for most evaluations are committed in the latter part of the year.

15. The expected overall utilization of the IOE budget in 2014 as of year-end is currently projected at US$5.833 million, corresponding to about 97.5 per cent of the approved budget. The anticipated lower utilization relates to staff costs as a result of vacant positions that are currently being filled, and some savings from the IOE Director's position. A small part of the savings has been utilized for recruitment costs in line with IFAD's Human Resources rules and also to fund additional activities, in particular a further evaluation synthesis report on IFAD's work with indigenous peoples.

C. Utilization of the 2013 carry-forward

16. 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.

17. The 3 per cent carry-forward from IOE's 2013 budget amounted to US$180,419; this is being used to undertake the CLE on IFAD's engagement in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations. This evaluation was not adequately budgeted in 2014 as the requirements for this important exercise could only be fully estimated when the evaluation design was finalized in early 2014. In particular, the 3 per cent carry-forward is being used to enhance the evidence base and quality of the evaluation by conducting country visits to capture the views of beneficiaries and other in-country partners and to observe project activities on the ground in fragile states.

IV. IOE strategic objectives

18. As agreed with the Board in December 2013 and in line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy (2011), IOE's strategic objectives for 2014 and 2015 – the remaining two years of the IFAD9 period[6] – 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.

19. 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.

20. Annex I summarizes IOE's strategic objectives, divisional management results (DMRs) and the outputs that the division proposes to deliver in 2015.

21. As mentioned in paragraph 9, the RMF for 2015 (annex VII) includes sharper KPIs that will allow for better performance measurement, including of IOE's efficiency, and reporting against the DMRs.

V. 2015 work programme

22. The full list of proposed 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 following paragraphs provide an overview of the main evaluation activities foreseen for 2015. The major outputs planned for 2015 are summarized in table 2 below.

---

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

Table 2
Major outputs planned by IOE in 2015

Strategic objectives	*Divisional management results*	*Outputs*
SO1: Contribute, through independent evaluation 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	**ARRI**
		CLE on IFAD's work in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations – to be completed
		CLE on IFAD's performance-based allocation system (PBAS) – to start after the completion of the CLE on fragile states
	DMR 2: CPEs that serve as concrete building blocks for better results-based country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs)	**Eight CPEs** – Bangladesh, The Gambia and the United Republic of Tanzania - to be completed; Brazil, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria, 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 project performance assessments⁻
		One impact evaluation of an IFAD-funded project
	DMR 4: Methodology development	Issuance of the second edition of the **Evaluation Manual**
		Development of the **new harmonization agreement** on independent evaluation and self-evaluation methods and processes between IOE and IFAD Management
		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), synthesis report on impact evaluations by IFAD Management, President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions (PRISMA) and selected COSOPs and corporate policies/strategies (e.g. the new IFAD corporate policy on grant financing); 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. Participate in the 2015 annual country visit of the Board to Morocco
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 by the Board in December)
	DMR 7: Systematic communication and outreach of evaluation-based lessons and good practices	Participate in internal platforms (Operational Strategy and Policy Guidance Committee [OSC], quality assurance learning sessions, Operations Management Committee [OMC], IFAD Management Teams [IMTs], 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 good 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/WFP/Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research [CGIAR])
	DMR 8: Evaluation capacity development in partner countries	Engage selectively in evaluation capacity development (ECD) by organizing seminars and workshops on evaluation methodology and processes in the context of regular evaluations (e.g. ongoing CPEs, PPAs or impact evaluations). Moreover, promote ECD, 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.

23. As mentioned earlier, IOE developed a selectivity framework in 2013 to promote transparency and prioritize evaluations for inclusion in its annual evaluation work programme. The expanded selectivity framework (annex VIII) has therefore been used as a basis for constructing the 2015 work programme. It is worth noting that the proposed evaluation activities are timely, as their results are expected to inform future policy and strategy development as well as project design and implementation.

24. In 2015, IOE will complete the CLE on IFAD's engagement in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations, to be presented to the Evaluation Committee and thereafter to the Executive Board in April 2015. As requested by several Member States during the meeting of IFAD10 in June and the Evaluation Committee in July, IOE plans to start a new corporate-level evaluation after April 2015 on IFAD's performance-based allocation system, which was introduced based on a decision taken during the IFAD6 Consultation in 2002. The CLE on the PBAS will be completed in 2016. Other CLEs provisionally planned beyond 2015 are shown in the indicative plan for 2016-2017.

25. IOE plans to start five new country programme evaluations. 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 COSOPs. The new CPEs will be conducted in Brazil, Ethiopia, India, Nigeria and Turkey. IOE will also complete the evaluations started in 2014 in Bangladesh, the United Republic of Tanzania and The Gambia. The latter replaces the Sierra Leone CPE. After thorough consultation with IFAD Management, IOE decided to postpone the Sierra Leone CPE due to compelling circumstances in the country, and instead conduct a new CPE in The Gambia. Though preparatory work will start in 2014 (e.g. preparation of approach paper, and desk reviews), the main mission for the CPE for The Gambia will be undertaken early next year and the evaluation process will be completed by end-2015. In order to accomplish this within the available resources, two of the CPEs planned in 2015 will start later (in March rather than in January 2015) and the total resource allocation for CPE work has been slightly increased.

26. In line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy and the role of independent evaluation offices in other multilateral development organizations, IOE introduced impact evaluations in its 2013 work programme as a new product. Hence, one impact evaluation will be conducted in 2015 (project to be determined based on the selectivity framework). The planned impact evaluation will build on IOE's experience in 2013 and 2014 with impact evaluations. It is important to underline that impact evaluations by IOE are not part of the impact evaluations being undertaken by Management during the IFAD9 period (2013-2015), and that projects selected by IOE for impact evaluations do not overlap with those selected by Management.

27. The main aim of IOE's involvement in impact evaluations is to assess impact in a more quantitative manner while also paying attention to qualitative aspects of IFAD operations, and generate the required evidence for CPEs and other higher-plane evaluations to be carried out by IOE in the near future. Moreover, these evaluations will ensure that IOE is better placed to support IFAD Management in its own efforts to conduct impact evaluations. It will also allow IOE to prepare for eventually undertaking, in 2016 or soon thereafter, subject to the approval of the Board, a CLE on IFAD Management's overall approach to impact evaluations and the results thereof.

28. In 2015, IOE will prepare three evaluation synthesis reports, which focus primarily on generating lessons learned and good practices. 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. Other synthesis reports tentatively planned for 2016-2017 are shown in annex IV, table 2. On this topic, in order to allow evaluation lessons to feed into the decision-making process in a more effective way, IFAD Management has been requested henceforth to prepare a written response to all synthesis reports prepared by IOE.

29. IOE will undertake project evaluations in the form of project completion report validations (PCRVs)[8] and project performance assessments of selected operations.[9] Plans are being made to undertake one joint PPA with the Independent Evaluation Department of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) of a cofinanced project in Lao People's Democratic Republic, which will be the first joint evaluation between IOE and the Independent Evaluation Department. In terms of synthesis reports, all future PPAs will also henceforth include a written response from Management to the recommendations addressed to them. The recommendations agreed by Management will be acted upon and their implementation status reported in the PRISMA, similar to the practice for CLEs and CPEs.

30. IOE will complete and issue the second edition of the Evaluation Manual, which is a major undertaking. The manual is fundamental to ensuring quality and consistency across all evaluations conducted by IOE. Moreover, the manual will contribute to generating "value for money" for IOE, as it will lead to strengthened methodologies for better evaluations and will help streamline evaluation and internal administrative processes.

31. In line with the IFAD Evaluation Policy and the practice of other international financial institutions, IOE will develop a new harmonization agreement[10] with IFAD Management to ensure the full alignment of the IFAD's independent and self-evaluation systems. In particular, special attention will be devoted to ensuring that the main elements of the second edition of the Evaluation Manual will be adequately reflected in the revised harmonization agreement.

32. IOE will prepare the 2015 edition of the ARRI, IOE's flagship annual report. Moreover, IOE will: support recipient countries (selectively) in evaluation capacity-building activities; strengthen partnerships 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.[11] 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.

33. 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 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

---

[7] IOE will closely engage with IFAD Management to determine which region or subregion will be covered by the proposed evaluation synthesis.
[8] In line with the provisions of the IFAD Evaluation Policy, IOE will continue to validate all PCRs, and conduct PPAs on 25 to 30 per cent of closed projects in a given year.
[9] 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.
[10] The first such agreement was signed in 2006, and was updated in 2011.
[11] 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.

consideration of the Executive Board. And, in line with the Evaluation Policy, IOE will review new corporate policies and strategies that are informed by major CLEs and present written comments to the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board.

34. With regard to the latter, 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.

35. In line with established practice,[12] IOE will prepare written comments for consideration by the Evaluation Committee and the Executive Board on the synthesis report by IFAD Management on the 30 impact evaluations to be delivered during the IFAD9 period. IOE comments will focus on the methodology and overall approach taken and the robustness of the results reported. The comments will be discussed by the Committee and the Board along with the final synthesis report.

36. IOE will support the Office of the Secretary in organizing all Evaluation Committee sessions during the year. In addition, as in 2014, IOE will participate in the annual country visit of the Executive Board in 2015 to Morocco. During the visit, IOE will make a presentation to Board members on lessons learned from past independent evaluations undertaken in the country.

VI. 2015 Resource envelope

A. Staff resources

37. IOE's staff requirements are based on a comprehensive strategic workforce planning exercise, which is undertaken on an annual basis. Building on the dialogue established last year, IOE has consulted with BOD to ensure that the methodology used by IOE is the same as that used for the IFAD strategic workforce planning exercise. The 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 number of staff. Therefore, IOE will maintain the same number of staff in 2015 as in 2014 (see annex V). It is worth underlining that the ratio of Professional staff to General Services staff in IOE is around 1:0.46, which is among the best of any division in IFAD.

38. 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,[13] 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,[14] agreed with the Board, to devote greater attention and resources to strengthening dissemination of evaluation-based knowledge and enhancing the internal evaluation learning and feedback loop for better institutional and operational performance.

B. Budget proposal

39. 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). Each table includes both the 2014 approved budget and the proposed budget for 2015, facilitating comparison between the two years.

40. **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.

---

[12] 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 RIDE.
[13] 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 member due to compelling personal reasons.
[14] Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations.

41. **Assumptions.** As in the past, the parameters used in developing the proposed 2015 budget are the same as those used by IFAD Management for developing the IFAD administrative budget for 2015. These include: (i) an average inflation rate of 1.9 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 adjusted for euro/dollar exchange rate has been used; and (iii) the exchange rate for 2015 has now been changed to US$1 = EUR 0.735 – based on the average exchange rate since January 2014.

42. **Budget by type of activity.** As per table 3, US$1.40 million of total non-staff costs of US$2.46 million, or more than 50 per cent of non-staff costs, are allocated to higher-plane evaluations (CLEs and CPEs). These evaluations have the potential to induce 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 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 (started in 2013) requiring fewer resources than new CPEs. To clarify further, each CPE normally takes from 12 to 16 months to complete from start to end, and in 2014, IOE focused on completing a number of CPEs initiated in 2013. As such, and given the time needed to complete a CPE, similar fluctuations in the CPE budget line are likely to occur from time to time.

43. A small allocation has been made in 2015 for the Evaluation Manual. This is necessary because IOE has deferred the finalization of the manual to next year to allow the new IOE Director to provide his input to this fundamental cross-divisional product. The amount allocated will cover the cost of completing the document, its editing and translation, as well as outreach and dissemination. Any savings from the original 2014 allocation for the Evaluation Manual have been used to undertake additional unforeseen activities during 2014 (e.g. evaluation synthesis report on indigenous peoples). The reduction in the ARRI budget allocation for 2015, as compared to 2014, is part of IOE's efforts to cut costs by insourcing part of the ARRI work.

44. 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 38 above.

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

Type of activities	Approved 2014 budget	Proposed 2015 budget
ARRI	150 000	100 000
CLEs	410 000	370 000
CPEs	760 000	1 035 000
PCRVs	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	40 000
Communication, evaluation outreach, knowledge-sharing, partnership activities	198 000	188 000
Evaluation capacity development, training and related administrative costs	117 992	122 892
Total non-staff costs	**2 395 992**	**2 455 892**
Total staff costs	**3 586 690**	**3 614 041**
Total	**5 982 682**	**6 069 933**

45. **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 PPAs and CPEs, or when country visits might be undertaken in the context of CLEs and the preparation of evaluation synthesis reports.[15] The increases in staff and consultant travel reflect the net effect of increases in travel costs, partly offset by savings generated by more stringent monitoring of travel expenses. In this regard, it is worth noting that IOE staff and consultants follow the same travel rules and procedures as applicable to all IFAD staff and consultants. As in 2014, a small increase in 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 paragraph 44.

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

Categories of expenditures	Approved 2014 budget	Proposed 2015 budget
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**
Total staff costs	**3 586 690**	**3 614 041**
Total	**5 982 682**	**6 069 933**

46. **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.

47. SO1 receives a much greater allocation as a larger part of the consultancy resources of IOE will need to be mobilized for the activities (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 good practices with policy and decision makers, IFAD operational staff and other stakeholders.

---

[15] IOE has a coherent conflict of interest policy for consultants. National consultants are required to adhere to the same provisions and standards as international and regional consultants.

Table 5
Proposed budget allocation (by strategic objective)

Strategic objective	Approved 2014 budget		Proposed 2015 budget	
	Amount (US$)	Per cent	Amount (US$)	Per cent
SO1: Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results	4 358 525	73	4 394 220	72
SO2: Promote effective learning and knowledge management to further strengthen the performance of IFAD operations	1 624 157	27	1 675 713	28
Total	**5 982 682**	**100**	**6 069 933**	**100**

48. **Budget proposal.** The proposed 2015 budget is US$6.07 million, reflecting a nominal increase of 1.45 per cent over the 2014 approved budget and less than 1 per cent over that of 2013, well below the overall average inflation assumption. This is lower than the proposed 1.9 per cent in IOE's preview document discussed in the September Board, due to the change in the exchange rate. The 1.45 per cent increase in 2015 includes a 0.9 per cent real increase, partly offset by cost reduction due to change in exchange rate. This real increase is caused by 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.

49. Lastly, as decided by the Executive Board in December 2007, the IOE budget is capped at 0.9 per cent of IFAD's programme of work.[16] IOE's annual budget has been well below this cap since the aforementioned decision was taken. For 2015, the proposed IOE budget is 0.53 per cent of the projected programme of loans and grants. This indicator has been included in the IOE RMF for 2015, together with other measures of efficiency (see annex VII).

50. An overview of IOE's proposed budget including historical trends since 2011 is provided in annex VI, table 1.

---

[16] Although the decision refers to the programme of work, it implies programme of loans and grants.

IOE strategic objectives, divisional management results and outputs for 2015

IOE strategic objectives	IOE divisional management results	Types of outputs
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	PPA PCRV Impact evaluation
	DMR 4: Methodology development	Guidelines and Evaluation Manual New harmonization agreement
	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 reports and ARRI learning themes	Evaluation synthesis ARRI learning theme
	DMR 7: Systematic communication and outreach of IOE's work	Workshop on thematic issues Publications Learning events Website management
	DMR 8: Evaluation capacity development (ECD) in partner countries	In-country workshop on evaluation methodology and processes. Joint evaluations with relevant in-country partners

IOE results measurement framework for 2014

Key performance indicators

IOE objectives	Key performance indicators	IOE divisional management results[a]	Means of verification	2011 baseline	2014 target
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[c]	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
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-September 2014

In 2014, IOE is reporting for the first time on: (i) planned activities (table 1 below); and (ii) key performance indicators (table 2). The matrix below will continue to be updated until the final submission of the work programme and budget document to the Executive Board in December 2014.

Table 1
Reporting on IOE planned activities (January – September 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. It was also discussed at the second session of IFAD10 (June 2014).
	IFAD Policy for Grant Financing	To be completed in June 2014	**Completed**. 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	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. A progress report on implementation will be submitted to the third session of IFAD10 in October.
2. Country programme evaluations	Bangladesh	To start in April 2014	Progressing as planned. Main mission in October 2014.
	Plurinational State of Bolivia	To be completed in March 2014	**Completed.** Will be discussed in the Evaluation Committee in October 2014.
	China	To be completed in March 2014	**Completed.** Will be discussed in 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	The Sierra Leone CPE was started as planned. In September, due to compelling reasons in the country, IOE, in consultation with the West and Central Africa Division, decided to replace it with a CPE for The Gambia.
	United Republic of Tanzania	To start in January 2014	Started as planned. Main mission completed.
	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 PPAs	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 (JCTDP, India) using the new selectivity framework. Preparatory mission in June, approach paper prepared and evaluation launched. Evaluation to be completed in April/May 2015.

Type of work	Evaluation activities	Planned implementation status	Present status
6. Engagement with governing bodies	Twelfth 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). Learning event held on 19 September 2014 and draft ARRI shared with Management on 23 September 2014. Final report to be presented to the Evaluation Committee and Executive Board at 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	**Completed**. PRISMA with IOE comments 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	Undertaken as planned. RIDE with IOE comments will be discussed with the Evaluation Committee 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.
	IOE written comments on IFAD's country and thematic selectivity paper	Unforeseen additional activity undertaken at the request of the Evaluation Committee at its eighty-fourth session in July 2014	**Completed.** IOE comments presented to the September Board.
	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	Three formal Committee sessions (March, June and July 2014) and two informal session (January and June 2014) have been held. Two more sessions are planned for October and November.
	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	Ecuador and Madagascar CPEs will be presented to the Board in December, together with IOE comments on the new COSOPs in the respective countries.
	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. IOE has carried out another unforeseen activity – reviewing and preparing comments on IFAD's new RMF for the third session of IFAD10 in October. At the third session, IOE will also present a progress report on the CLE on fragile states.

Type of work	Evaluation activities	Planned implementation status	Present status
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.
	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. Findings will be presented also at the Indigenous Peoples' Forum, to be held just before the Governing Council session in February 2015.
	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, China, Senegal and Zambia.
	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. Several ad hoc meetings held with the Office of the President and Vice-President on specific evaluations.
	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; and the quality assurance learning sessions	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 the ECG meeting in April. IOE will participate in the ECG meeting in December, and the annual SDC-IOE partnership meeting on 30 October. IOE staff attended the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA), the European Evaluation Society and United Kingdom Evaluation Society (UKES) annual conferences. IOE also participated in a conference to celebrate 10 years of independent evaluation at ADB on innovation and learning in a changing Asia. SDC seconded one senior evaluation officer to IOE starting in May 2014.
	Contribute as internal and external peer reviewer to key evaluations as requested by IFAD and other multilateral/bilateral organizations	January-December 2014	IOE undertook a peer review of the external midterm review of the International Land Coalition, the Participatory Impact Assessment and Learning Approach by IFAD's Policy and Technical Advisory Division and 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 reviewed and provided comments on the draft impact evaluation sourcebook prepared by IFAD Management as well as on the midterm review of a Global Environment Fund-supported operation in Eritrea, requested by the East and Southern Africa Division and the Environment and Climate Division.

Type of work	Evaluation activities	Planned implementation status	Present status
	Implement Joint Statement by CGIAR, FAO, IFAD and WFP to strengthen collaboration in evaluation	January-December 2014	In progress as planned. Examples of joint activities to date include: (i) synthesis on pastoral development undertaken 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. An IOE staff member was part of the recruitment panel for the position of Senior Evaluation Officer (P-5) in the FAO Office of Evaluation.
9. Methodology	Second edition of the Evaluation Manual	January-December 2014	In progress as planned. The revised manual will be finalized and issued in 2015. A divisional workshop on the topic was held in June with the participation of representatives from IFAD Management (PMD, the Statistics and Studies for Development Division [SSD]), FAO and SDC.
	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. An evaluation methodology and process workshop was held in Beijing in July, in conjunction with the China CPE national round-table workshop (see next item).
	Implement statement of intent with the Government of China on ECD	January-December 2014	China CPE workshop held in July. Plans are being made for a joint PPA with the Ministry of Finance of an IFAD-funded project in China.

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

Based on IOE's RMF for 2014, the reporting matrix below provides an overview of IOE achievements against the KPIs agreed with the Executive Board. The structure of the matrix is different from the approved 2014 RMF (see annex II); 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 September 2014)

Strategic objectives	Divisional management results	Key performance indicators	Achievements	Description	Targets
	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 September 2014 because no new corporate policies/strategies or COSOPs were presented to the Board as follow-up to IOE evaluations. However, two such notes will be presented to the Board in December 2014.	According to 2014 WP
		13. ARRI, and number of CLEs, CPEs, PPAs, PCRVs and impact evaluations	On track	ARRI drafted and shared with Management in September 2014. Two CLEs have been completed (replenishment and grants); and a third is under way (fragile states). As planned, of the seven CPEs, four have been completed and 3 have been started. The 2014 impact evaluation has been launched, and PPAs and PCRVs are on track.	
SO1: Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results	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 remark in this column against KPI 1 above.	According to 2014 WP
		13. ARRI, and number of CLEs, CPEs, PPAs, PCRVs and IEs	On track	See remark in this column against KPI 13 above.	
	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	6+	One staff member attended the AfrEA conference. One staff member attended the Annual Evaluation Conference of UKES. One staff member attended the conference on innovation and learning in a changing Asia. One staff member attended the European Evaluation Society. Two staff members participated in International Programme for Development Evaluation Training. Several IOE evaluation officers attended the training that was organized jointly with FAO on evaluating gender.	3 staff

Strategic objectives	Divisional management results	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 remark in this column against KPI 1.	
		3. Number of planned Evaluation Committee sessions held in accordance with the Committee's terms of reference	6	Four formal sessions (March, June, July and October) and two informal sessions (January and 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%	• Executive Board sessions of 2014 • Evaluation Committee sessions of 2014 • Executive Board country visit to United Republic of Tanzania • Governing Council session February 2014 • IFAD10 sessions in February, June and October	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	5	• 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" • Workshop on methodology development in the context of the second edition of the Evaluation Manual held in June • ARRI learning workshop held in September	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	49	IOE has published and disseminated to internal and external audiences a total of: 22 evaluation reports, 8 Profiles and 7 Insights, 4 press releases, 2 overviews on CLEs, 4 quarterly newsletters and the SDC-IOE partnership brochure and 2 videos on evaluation-related matters.	100%
		10. Number of evaluation syntheses and ARRI learning themes	3 syntheses (includes one additional/ unforeseen (indigenous peoples) 1 ARRI learning theme	Syntheses: middle-income countries; pastoral development; and indigenous peoples. ARRI learning theme: project management.	According to 2014 WP

Strategic objectives	Divisional management results	Key performance indicators	Achievements	Description	Targets
		5. Number of key learning events organized by IOE at IFAD	See relevant reference above	See remark in this column against KPI 5.	
		6. Number of in-country learning events co-organized by IOE with governments	4	CPE workshops held: • January - Senegal • April - Plurinational State of Bolivia • April - Zambia • July - China	5 events
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 ⇦	7. Number of in-house learning events attended by IOE staff for knowledge-sharing	9+	• 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 • Time for equality: towards a sustainable future chaired by IOE Deputy Director as per request of PMD • Final quality assurance learning sessions in July and October	4 events
		8. Number of external knowledge events with IOE staff participation to share lessons from evaluation	6	FAO, UNEG, ECG, ADB, 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: ECD in partner countries ⇦	11. Number of ECD workshops organized in partner countries to share knowledge on IOE evaluation methodology and processes	1	Organized a training workshop on evaluation methodology and processes in Beijing in July.	
		12. Number of events attended by IOE staff related to self-evaluation and ECD	4	• 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 • Final quality assurance learning session in July	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	Jan-Mar 2015	Apr-Jun 2015	Jul-Sep 2015	Oct-Dec 2015	2016
				Expected delivery time*				
1. Corporate-level evaluation	IFAD's engagement in fragile states	Jan-14	Apr-15		X			
	IFAD's performance-based allocation system (PBAS)	Apr-15	Sep-16					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	Mar-15	Jun-16					X
	The Gambia	Oct-14	Dec-15				X	
	Turkey	Mar-15	Jun-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 eight 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	
	thirteenth 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 to Morocco	Jan-15	Dec-15	X	X	X	X	

Type of work	Proposed activities for 2015	Start date	Expected finish	Jan-Mar 2015	Apr-Jun 2015	Jul-Sep 2015	Oct-Dec 2015	2016
	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 subregional 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, quality assurance learning sessions, 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			
	Development and implementation of the new harmonization agreement	Jan-15	Mar-15			X		
	Training (Second edition of Evaluation Manual) IOE staff/consultants	June-15	Dec-15			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	

Expected delivery time

* 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	Decentralization model and experience; Management efforts on impact evaluations; knowledge management; additional resource mobilization	2016-2017
	Policy dialogue; Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme; Joint evaluation with FAO and WFP of Reformed Committee on World Food Security	2017
2. Country programme evaluations	Burkina Faso; Burundi; the Philippines; Indian Ocean small island developing states subregional evaluation in English-speaking Caribbean island countries; Sierra Leone	2016
	Cameroon; Malawi	2017
3. Project completion report validation	Validate all PCRs available in year	2016-2017
4. Project performance assessment	About eight PPAs/year	2016-2017
5. Impact evaluation	One per year (project to be determined)	2016-2017
6. Engagement with governing bodies	fourteenth and fifteenth 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 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	2016-2017
	IOE comments on PRISMA and RIDE	2016-2017
	IOE comments on COSOPs when related CPEs are available	2016-2017
	IOE comments on selected IFAD operational policies, strategies an d 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
7. Communication and knowledge management activities	Evaluation reports, profiles, insights, website, etc.	2016-2017
	Evaluation synthesis on IFAD's experience in commodity value chain development; remittances; scaling up; self-evaluation; and fisheries.	2016-2017
	Attend all OSCs that discuss corporate policies and strategies, COSOPs and selected projects evaluated by IOE. Attend OMC, IMT, quality assurance learning sessions 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		Total
				Professional staff	General Service staff	
19.5	19.5	18.5	18.5	**13**	**6**	**19**

Total human resources

Category	2014	2015
Director	1	1
Deputy Director	1	1
Senior evaluation officers	3*	3*
Evaluation officers	6	6
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 for 2015
(United States dollars)

| Evaluation work | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 (1) | 2015 (proposed) | | Total 2015 budget at [b] (4)=(1)+(2)+(3) |
					Real increase/decrease (2)	Price increase/(decrease)[a] (3)	
Non-staff costs	2 238 000	2 289 474	2 346 711	2 395 992	0	59 900	2 455 892
Staff costs	3 645 576	3 734 530	3 667 268	3 586 690	54 385	(27 034)	3 614 041
Total	5 883 576	6 024 004	6 013 979	5 982 682	54 385	32 866	6 069 933

[a] As for the rest of IFAD and conveyed by BOD, average inflation assumption is 1.9 per cent and there is no price increase for staff costs.

[b] The exchange rate applied at this stage is US$1 = EUR 0.735.

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

Type of activity	Absolute number	Relative number in terms of percentage of work done[a]	Standard unit costs[b] (US$)	Proposed non-staff costs in 2015 (US$)
ARRI	1	1	150 000	100 000
Corporate-level evaluations	2	1	Differentiated cost based on scope and nature of issues to be assessed: 200 000-450 000	370 000
• IFAD's engagement in fragile states	1	0.25		
• IFAD's performance-based allocation system	1	0.75		
Country programme evaluations	8	4.1	Differentiated cost based on size of portfolio, size of country, travel costs and availability of evaluative evidence: 225 000-305 000	1 035 000
PCR validation	About 30	About 30	-	50 000
Project performance assessment	About 8	About 8	25 000-30 000	230 000
Impact evaluation	2	1	200 000-300 000	200 000
• 2014 carry-over (JCTDP)	1	0.3		
• 2015 impact evaluation (project tbd)	1	0.7		
Evaluation synthesis	3	3	40 000-65 000	120 000
Revision of IOE Evaluation Manual (finalization)	1	0.3	-	40 000
Communication, evaluation outreach, knowledge-sharing and partnership activities	-	-		188 000
ECD, training (including training on the revised Evaluation Manual) and related administrative costs	-	-		122 892
Total				**2 455 892**

[a] Evaluations often straddle two years. This figure represents percentage of work done for type of evaluation activity 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)

IOE objectives	IOE divisional management results	Proposed budget (staff and non-staff cost)	Percentage overall total proposed budget
Strategic objective 1: Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results	DMR 1: ARRIs and CLEs that provide concrete building blocks for development and implementation of better corporate policies and processes	725 379	12
	DMR 2: CPEs that serve as concrete building blocks for better results-based COSOPs	2 034 156	34
	DMR 3: Project evaluations that contribute to better IFAD–supported operations	1 034 773	17
	DMR 4: Methodology development	339 005	5
	DMR 5: Work related to IFAD governing bodies	260 907	4
Total for strategic objective 1		**4 394 220**	**72**
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	238 191	4
Total for strategic objective 2		**1 675 713**	**28**
Grand total		**6 069 933**	**100**

IOE results measurement framework for 2015

Key performance indicators

IOE objectives	Divisional management results	Key performance indicators	2011 Baseline	2015 Target	Means of verification
Strategic objective 1: Contribute, through independent evaluation work, to enhancing accountability for results	DMR1				ARRI, CLEs, evaluation reports, PRISMA, RIDE, work programme and budget document, Senior Independent Advisor report (for CLEs)
	DMR2	1. Adoption rate of recommendations from CLEs, CPEs and PPAs	n.a.	90%	
	DMR3				
	DMR4	2. Execution rate of key evaluation activities	n.a.	As per WPB	Evaluation reports and IOE records
		3. Number of trained IOE staff members contributing to methodology development	3	4	
	DMR5	4. Number of planned Evaluation Committee sessions held in accordance with Committee's terms of reference	4 regular sessions	4 regular sessions	
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 (including on syntheses and ARRI learning themes)	4	8	Evaluation synthesis reports, Issues Paper, IOE records, report profile and insights, newsletters
	DMR6	6. Number of in-country learning events co-organized by IOE with governments	4	5	
	DMR7	7. Number of in-house learning events attended by IOE staff for knowledge-sharing	2	5	
		8. Number of external knowledge events with IOE staff participation to share lessons from evaluation	3	5	
		9. Number of knowledge management products of CLEs and CPEs published within three months of established completion date and disseminated	80%	100%	

IOE objectives	Divisional management results	Key performance indicators	2011 Baseline	2015 Target	Means of verification
	DMR8	10.Number of ECD workshops organized in partner countries to share knowledge on IOE evaluation methodology and processes	n.a.	1	IOE records
		11.Number of events attended by IOE staff related to self-evaluation and ECD	1	3	
Joint SO1 and SO2 (combining the learning and accountability functions of independent evaluation)		12.ARRI and Learning Themes, and number of CLEs, CPEs, PPAs and PCRVs, evaluation syntheses and impact evaluations	According to 2011 WP	1 ARRI, 2 CLEs, 5 CPEs, 8 PPAs, 25/30 PCRVs, 3 ESs 1 IE	IOE records
		13.Budget cap	< 0.9% of IFAD PLG	< 0.9% of IFAD PLG	
		14.Ratio of General Service staff to Professional staff	n.a.	0.46/1	

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.

IOE Selectivity framework

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

Corporate-level evaluations/Evaluation syntheses	*Country programme evaluations*	*Project performance assessments**
1. Is this an area of interest/priority for IFAD stakeholders?	1. Is this a country of interest/priority for the regional division?	1. Did IOE identify any major information gaps, inconsistencies or analytical weaknesses in the PCR during the validation process?
2. Is this in line with IFAD's strategic priorities and replenishment commitments?	2. How would this evaluation affect the geographical balance of the IOE evaluation portfolio?	2. Does the project use successful innovative approaches that could be scaled up elsewhere?
3. Will this address a knowledge gap in IFAD?	3. Is there a critical decision point in IFAD that would drive the timing of this evaluation?	3. Is there a major disconnect between the ratings contained in the PCR and those generated by IOE during the validation process?
4. What is the evaluation expected to impact?	4. How would this evaluation contribute to IOE's strategic objectives?	
5. Is there a critical decision point in IFAD that would drive the timing of this evaluation?	5. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to?	4. How does this evaluation affect the geographical balance of the IOE evaluation portfolio?
6. How would this evaluation contribute to IOE's strategic objectives?	6. Does IOE have the resources (financial and human) to conduct this evaluation?	5. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to (e.g. CPE)?
7. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to?		6. Does IOE have the resources (financial and human) to conduct this evaluation?
8. Does IOE have the resources (financial and human) 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*

Guiding questions for CLEs	Knowledge management	Additional resource mobilization	Decentralization model and experience	Performance-based allocation system (PBAS)	*Management efforts on impact evaluations*
1. Is this an area of interest/priority for IFAD stakeholders?	4	4	5	5	5
2. Is this in line with IFAD's strategic priorities and replenishment commitments?	5	5	5	5	5
3. Will this address a knowledge gap in IFAD?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
4. What is the evaluation expected to impact?	IFAD's approach to knowledge management	IFAD's efforts to mobilize additional resources, outside the replenishment processes	IFAD's approach in strengthening the capacity of decentralized structures to maximize the organization's impact at country level	The Fund's resource allocation mechanisms, taking into account the organization's mandate to reduce rural poverty in all regions	IFAD's methodology and approach in undertaking impact evaluations
5. Is there a critical decision point in IFAD that would drive the timing of this evaluation?	Not currently, because IFAD developed a new knowledge management framework in 2014, and it requires more time for implementation.	The exploration of new forms of additional resource mobilization is a priority for the financial sustainability of the organization in the IFAD9 period and beyond. However, it might be better to wait until 2016 or 2017 when there is a critical mass of examples (e.g. KfW Development Bank loan to IFAD) of additional resources mobilized to evaluate.	Yes, it is a priority for the IFAD9 period and beyond. However, it would be appropriate to wait until 2016 or beyond, once all the 50 country offices have been established (by end-2015, as agreed with the Board).	Yes, this is high priority because: (i) the PBAS was introduced in the Sixth Replenishment in 2002, and has not undergone any comprehensive review or evaluation; and (ii) the evaluation would also contribute to sharpening IFAD's approaches to resource allocation in the context of country selectivity for better institutional efficiency. Therefore, the evaluation would also contribute to other corporate goals.	Yes, it is a priority for the IFAD9 period and beyond. However, it would be appropriate to wait until 2016 once the 30 impact evaluations done by Management have been completed and the synthesis report on the Impact Evaluation Initiative finalized.
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	Contribute to strategic objectives 1 and 2	Contribute to strategic objectives 1 and 2

Guiding questions for CLEs	Knowledge management	Additional resource mobilization	Decentralization model and experience	Performance-based allocation system (PBAS)	Management efforts on impact evaluations
7. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to?	Draw on CPEs and project-level evaluations. Contribute to other CLEs, CPEs and project-level evaluations, as well as evaluation synthesis reports	Not directly	Draw on other CLEs, CPEs and project-level evaluations	Contribute to other CLEs, CPEs and project-level evaluations	Draw on and contribute to project-level impact evaluations
8. Does IOE have the financial and human resources to conduct this evaluation?	Only one new CLE can be carried out per year due to IOE resource constraints and the absorption capacity of IFAD Management and Governing Bodies	Only one new CLE can be carried out per year due to IOE resource constraints and the absorption capacity of IFAD Management and Governing Bodies	Only one new CLE can be carried out per year due to IOE resource constraints and the absorption capacity of IFAD Management and Governing Bodies	Yes	Only one new CLE can be carried out per year due to IOE resource constraints and the absorption capacity of IFAD Management and Governing Bodies

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

Table 3
Application of the selectivity framework for evaluation syntheses

Guiding questions for CLEs/Evaluation syntheses	Evaluation synthesis on scaling up	Evaluation synthesis on IFAD's self-evaluation mechanisms	Evaluation synthesis on Remittances	Accessing markets: a subregional perspective
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.	3	5
2. Is this in line with IFAD's strategic priorities and replenishment commitments?	5	5	4	5
3. Will this address a knowledge gap in IFAD?	Yes, to a lesser extent as other studies have been undertaken by Management	Yes	Yes	Yes
4. What is the evaluation expected to impact?	IFAD's scaling up approach for wider impact on poverty	IFAD's self-evaluation mechanisms for better results measurement and reporting	IFAD's engagement in and approach to remittances in the context of development finance	IFAD's role in promoting access to markets for enhancing incomes and food security
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	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
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 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 the financial and human resources to conduct this evaluation?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Guiding questions for CLEs/evaluation syntheses	Evaluation synthesis on value chains	Evaluation synthesis on natural resources and environmental management	Evaluation synthesis on non-lending activities in the context of South-South cooperation
1. Is this an area of interest/priority for IFAD stakeholders?	4 (It will be more relevant in 2017)	5	5
2. Is this in line with IFAD's strategic priorities and replenishment commitments?	5	5 (IFAD's RMF 2013-2015 includes new indicators and more ambitious targets in order to support enhanced performance in environmental management. Moreover, IFAD Procedures for Environmental Management and Sustainable Development were presented to the Executive Board in 2009.)	5
3. Will this address a knowledge gap in IFAD?	Yes, to a lesser extent as other studies have been undertaken by Management	Yes	Yes
4. What is the evaluation expected to impact?	IFAD's engagement towards more conducive rural business environments that enable smallholders and the rural poor to gain better access to markets and value chains.	IFAD's approach to natural resources and environmental management	IFAD's engagement in and approach to non-lending activities in the context of South-South cooperation
5. Is there a critical decision point in IFAD that would drive the timing of this evaluation?	To some extent	Yes	Yes
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
7. What other IOE deliverables would this evaluation draw on and/or contribute to?	Draw on CLEs, CPEs and project-level evaluations. Contribute to the CLE on policy dialogue which is included in the tentative plan for 2017	Draw on CPEs and project-level evaluations	Draw on CPEs and project-level evaluations where there are activities relevant to remittances
8. Does IOE have the financial and human resources to conduct this evaluation?	No, only up to 3 evaluation syntheses per year	Yes	Yes

Table 4
Application of the selectivity framework for CPEs

Guiding questions for CPEs	Brazil	Ethiopia	India	Nigeria	Turkey
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	4
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, which the division plans to prepare in 2016). Undertaking a CPE in Brazil would also be justified because around 30 per cent of poor people in Latin America and the Caribbean live there. Finally, the timing of the CPE is extremely favourable, as the CPE will be started after the presidential elections are completed and a new Government should be in place.	Yes (current COSOP covers 2008-2014, the CPE will contribute to the formulation of the new COSOP, which the division plans to prepare in 2016). Moreover, the Ethiopia country programme manager (CPM) will retire at the end of 2014, and the CPE will assist the new CPM with a comprehensive, independent analysis of results and lessons learned for future planning. Ethiopia is the country with the largest portfolio in ESA.	Yes (current COSOP covers 2010-2015, the CPE will contribute to the formulation of the new COSOP). When considering the 2010-2015 COSOP, APR also requested IOE to undertake a CPE in India in 2015/16. A CPE in the country would also be important because India has the largest number of IFAD projects and loans commitment by IFAD in all geographic regions.	Yes (current COSOP covers 2010-2015, the CPE will contribute to the formulation of the new COSOP in 2016/17). Nigeria is the largest portfolio in the West and Central Africa region and this CPE therefore also reflects the prioritization in the use of IOE resources.	Current COSOP is dated 2008, so it is timely to conduct the CPE in preparation of a new COSOP. IFAD has funded nine projects in Turkey, but IOE has never conducted a CPE.
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 and project evaluations conducted since then	Draw on project-level evaluations in Ethiopia and on the previous CPE	Draw on project-level evaluations (including interim evaluations) in India and on the previous CPE	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 impact evaluations	Rating system (5-point scale)		Means of verification
Evaluation results for learning	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
Project status	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≤ 1years		Project and Portfolio Management System (PPMS)
Geographical distribution	A.04	Has IOE conducted an interim or completion evaluation or PPA of this project in the past?	5 = NO	1 = YES	IOE reports/WP
	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 impact evaluation results and lessons learned inform synthesis reports, CPEs and CLEs.

B. Desirable criteria[a]

Criteria	Code	Guiding questions for impact evaluations	Rating system (5-point scale)		Means of verification
Project size	B.01	Is this a country of priority to the regional division, taking into account its performance-based allocation 2013-2015?	*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
Disbursement rate	B.06	What was the disbursement rate at project closure?	5 = highest interval		Loans and Grants System
Innovation and scaling up	B.07	Does the project include innovative characteristics with potential for scaling up?	5 = YES	1 = NO	Project document
Joint evaluations	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.
*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
Evaluability assessment	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 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 Results and Impact Management System 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
	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
Availability of local technical expertise	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.