

a

**IFAD**

**INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Evaluation Committee – Fourth Special Session**

Rome, 20 February 2004

**DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE REVIEW OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND  
RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>OBJECTIVE AND BACKGROUND</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>PROCESS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>KEY DISCUSSION ISSUES</b>	<b>1</b>

## I. OBJECTIVE AND BACKGROUND

1. **Objective.** The main objective of this paper is to stimulate a first discussion in the Evaluation Committee on some of the issues that the Committee might wish to consider in revising its terms of reference (TOR) and rules of procedure (ROP) - (see paragraphs 4 and 5).
2. **Background.** The Evaluation Committee (EC) was established in 1987 to assist the Executive Board (EB) by undertaking in-depth reviews of a selected number of evaluations and related topics. The Committee was, *inter-alia*, mandated to report to the Board on an *ad-hoc* basis and to draw its attention to key insights and recommendations emerging from evaluations undertaken by the Office of Evaluation (OE).
3. Until 1999, the EC's work was governed by *organizational principles* adopted at the first session of the Committee in 1987, which stated that the Rules of Procedure of the EB should be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the work of the EC. However, in order to ensure a more timely and proactive consideration by the Board of evaluation issues, in 1999 the EB requested the EC to revise its *organizational principles*. Therefore, following thorough discussions both in the EC and the EB, the Committee developed its first Terms of Reference (TOR) and specific Rules of Procedure (see Annex 1), which were approved by the Board in December 1999. The deliberations in 1999 established that the overall objectives of the Committee, as contained in the *organizational principles*, were still broadly valid and the EC was asked to continue to enhance the ability of the EB to assess the overall quality of IFAD-supported activities and provide, as and when necessary, its advises and recommendations to the EB. However, at the time, some changes were introduced into the overall *modus-operandi* of the Committee's work. For example, a common understanding was developed on a number of operational issues, such as the frequency of EC meetings, the composition of the Committee, the role of observers, the reporting requirements to the Board, etc.

## II. PROCESS

4. **Process.** In 2003, the Executive Board approved the IFAD Evaluation Policy. The policy was prepared in response to the decision by the Consultation on the Sixth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources for IFAD to establish OE as an independent evaluation office within IFAD, reporting directly to the EB. The adoption and implementation of the Evaluation Policy has created the need for a further review of the objectives and overall functioning of the EC, including the latter's interactions both with OE and the EB. Subsequently, at its April 2003 session, the EB decided that the EC should revise its TOR and Rules of Procedure established in 1999, and submit a proposal for the Board's consideration by the end of 2004.
5. Consequently, at its Special Session in October 2003 session, the EC charted out the road map and timeframes for revising its TOR and Rules of Procedure in 2004. In summary, this will include an initial discussion during the EC's fourth special session on 20 February 2004, which would provide the main elements for the preparation of the EC's draft revised TOR and Rules of Procedure. The latter would be comprehensively discussed by the EC during its session on 16 April 2004. Based on the comments and guidance provided by the EC, a final proposal would be developed and considered by the Committee in its September 2004 session. Lastly, and following any additional refinements, the proposal would be dispatched to Board Directors for their consideration in the EB's December 2004 session.

## III. KEY DISCUSSION ISSUES

6. The discussion issues that follow have emerged mainly as a result of the evolution of the IFAD evaluation function in the past 3-4 years, including the adoption of the IFAD Evaluation Policy and the increasing emphasis provided by member states to evaluation as an instrument for promoting organizational accountability and learning. The key discussion issues have been identified following a

documentary review of the EC's *organizational principles* of 1987, its 1999 TOR and Rules of Procedure, the EC minutes from 1999 till date, the various Reports of the Evaluation Committee Chairperson presented to the EB since 1999, as well as discussions with staff in OE and the Secretary's Office at IFAD. The issues contained in this paper are not exhaustive, and there are other items that may merit consideration by the EC during this process. The issues are therefore presented as a means to stimulate reflection and deliberation among Committee members, with the intention of generating critical inputs in developing the revised TOR and Rules of Procedure of the EC. A summary of the issues identified and discussed in the paper is provided here below:

- **Objectives and scope of the Evaluation Committee's work.** That is, whether the current objectives and scope of work are still valid in light of the approval of IFAD's Evaluation Policy, and the evolution both in the work of OE and the Committee's overall functioning in the past 4-5 years.
- **The Evaluation Committee's annual agenda.** What is the appropriate mix of evaluation topics for the Committee to consider in a given year to enable it to fulfill its objectives effectively? How and when should the agenda be defined?
- **The frequency of Committee sessions & reporting to the Executive Board.** Given the increasing number of sessions the Committee has been holding and in view of the additional demands generated by the Evaluation Policy, how many sessions should be planned for in any given year? When should the sessions be held in order to also ensure timely and adequate reporting to the Executive Board?
- **Documentation provided by OE to the Committee for its sessions.** What documentation should OE provide to the Committee on each agenda item it is invited to discuss?
- **Records of Evaluation Committee sessions.** In 2003, the chairman presented five written reports to the Board on the various Committee sessions. Subsequently, OE prepared as per standing practice detailed minutes on the same EC sessions. Does the Committee feel that the minutes provide value added over and above the contents of the chairman's written reports?
- **Evaluation Committee field visits.** These have been a very useful instrument to expose members to the operations of IFAD on the ground. However, it may be useful to define more specifically the role of the Committee and the reporting requirements based on field visits undertaken.
- **Composition, observers and chairperson of the Committee.** Is the current number of members and EC composition, that is, 4 Board members from List A, 2 from List B and 3 from List 3 still valid? Given the increasing number of observers participating in EC sessions, what should be their role? Is the EC satisfied with the chair being permanently elected from its List B and C members?

7. **Objectives and scope of the Evaluation Committee's work.** The adoption and implementation of the Evaluation Policy has created new requirements from the Committee, and the following key question arises: to what extent are the present objectives and scope of work of the EC still relevant in the new overall evaluation context at IFAD? The objectives as captured in the 1999 TOR are as follows: (a) "to enhance the ability of IFAD's EB to assess the overall quality and impact of programmes and projects through a discussion of selected evaluations and reviews conducted by the Office of Evaluation and Studies"; and (b) "to fortify the EB's knowledge of lessons learned in IFAD's projects and to enable member states to better assess the Fund's role in pursuit of a global development strategy".

8. There is need to fine-tune these objectives, particularly in light of the approval of the Evaluation Policy. There are a number of issues the Committee may wish to consider in this regard. Firstly, objective (a) in paragraph 7 will need to taking into account the fact that, in line with the

IFAD Evaluation Policy, OE's mandate is to conduct independent evaluation work and not to undertake "studies" or "reviews" that could be undertaken by other organizational units in IFAD. Secondly, both the above-mentioned Committee objectives are largely project-oriented, paying limited attention to the evolution in the IFAD's evaluation function in the last 4-5 years and the approval of the Evaluation Policy. For example, OE undertakes every year numerous country programme, thematic and corporate level evaluations. Since 2003, it has also started preparing the Annual Report on the Results and Impact of IFAD Operations. Such evaluation work provide the building blocks for the development of IFAD's processes, policies and strategies. In fact, recognizing their importance, in the past few years the Committee has been increasingly discussing these type of evaluation work, which are more strategic in nature and have broader consequences for IFAD operations, policies, strategies and processes. Moreover, the Committee has also taken a keen interest and contributed to the development of OE evaluation methodologies. Therefore, the Committee is invited to reflect whether it would like to refine its objectives from 1999 to reflect the *defacto* evolution in its objectives.

9. The EC may also wish to consider its eventual role regarding IFAD's self evaluation processes. In this context, the attention of the EC is drawn to the fact that these processes are still evolving in IFAD and that in many other IFIs, governing bodies equivalent to IFAD's EC play a role in their development and oversight. As such, members may wish to debate whether it is desirable for the EC to play a role in assuring IFAD's EB that adequate self evaluation capabilities and processes are in place to perform this crucial function and deliver required outputs.

10. An important item the EC might like to discuss relates to the new reporting modalities for OE that has emerged as a result of the introduction of the Evaluation Policy. More specifically, OE now reports to the Executive Board. However, unlike in other International Financial Institutions (IFIs), the IFAD Board meets merely three times in a year and thus may not be in a position to carry out the necessary supervision of OE. One possibility is for the Evaluation Committee to provide oversight, as already discussed during the Consultation on the Sixth Replenishment of IFAD Resources (refer to the OE paper presented to the Consultation in October 2002, namely Strengthening the Effectiveness of the Evaluation Function at IFAD). The paper, which included a survey of the reporting arrangements of evaluation outfits in other IFIs, considered the possibility for the Committee to play an important role in overseeing the work of OE. For instance, it noted that under this scenario, all evaluation reports of OE would be sent to the Committee (which is already the case, as OE regularly provides all completed evaluation reports to Executive Board members). It also stated that the Committee would need to meet frequently to review the reports and discuss other evaluation issues and offer advice, instruction and support to the evaluation office. In this regard, it should be noted that the EC has already increased the number of sessions it holds per year (last year six sessions were held and in 2004 five meetings are planned, as opposed to three that are normally envisaged in a given year). The paper also said that to effectively provide oversight, the Committee chairperson would meet the chief evaluator and other staff several times before and after each session in order to facilitate the process. Finally, the paper noted that an enhanced role of the Committee might have cost implications that would need to be taken into account.

11. **EC Agenda.** The practice in the past five years has been for the Committee to define its agenda during the December EC session based on the list of evaluations OE would undertake in the following year. With regard to its agenda, the Committee will need to reflect on the mix of topics it would like to discuss, which in the past years has evolved (see paragraph 8). In addition, with the introduction of the Evaluation Policy there are some evaluation items and related topics that will need to feature as standing items in the Committee's annual agenda (see paragraphs 12 and 13). As experienced in 2003, the impact of the Evaluation Policy has already been felt in terms of the several unforeseen items the Committee discussed during the year and the number of special sessions that were organized for the

purpose<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, in defining the standing agenda items the Committee should discuss in a given year, the provisions in the IFAD Evaluation Policy that have an implication for the EC will need to be clearly identified, and consequently, the role of and contribution expected from the EC articulated.

12. OE prepared its first independent work programme and budget for 2004. The EC initially reviewed the preview document prepared by OE on this topic during its September 2003 session. It then discussed in a special session in October 2003 a more comprehensive document on the same subject. Building on the EC's guidance and comments, OE prepared its final proposal, which was approved by the EB in December 2003. The comments of the EC were extremely useful for OE in defining its priority areas and details of the 2004 work programme, as well as for determining the human resource and budget requirements for the year. Therefore, the EC's proactive role in discussing the OE annual work programme and budget proved to be beneficial for OE, but it also reassured the EB that a thorough review had been undertaken of OE's proposal before the EB was invited to approve the same during its December session. Therefore, it may be necessary to include the review of this important OE document by the EC as a standing feature in the EC's annual agenda. This will however have an implication on the number and timing of EC sessions (see paragraphs 14 and 15).

13. Likewise, in 2003 OE prepared the first Annual Report on the Result and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRI), which was initially discussed with the EC and subsequently with the EB in their respective sessions in September 2003. Given the unique nature of the document and its operational and strategic importance for the Fund, the EC may also wish to include the review of the ARRI as a standard annual item in its agenda.

14. **Frequency of Committee sessions and reporting to the Executive Board.** Historically, the EC has held three regular sessions, in conjunction with the EB meetings. Special sessions were also held on an ad-hoc basis. However, in 2003, in addition to the three regular sessions planned, three special sessions were held in March, April and October respectively. Two were convened to discuss the Independent External Evaluation of IFAD (in March and April) and one (in October) to discuss the 2004 OE work programme and budget. Again in 2004, two special sessions (in February and October) have been planned in addition to the three regular sessions. Given the above trend, would it be advisable to increase the number of regular sessions to at least four, or perhaps five, in order for both the EC and OE to plan their schedules and resources accordingly. In addition to the above issue, in the past, some members have expressed as a possibility to prolong the duration of each EC session (which are normally 3 hours long) to enable an adequate coverage of all agenda items. One option is to determine on a case by case basis whether or not a session needs to be held for more than three hours, depending on the agenda items to be discussed. So, the issue the EC may wish to deliberate upon is whether the EC would like to have more than the currently planned 3 regular sessions per year and to discuss the duration of each session.

15. Normally, as mentioned above, three regular EC sessions are held per calendar year. The first meeting is usually held the day before or after IFAD's annual Governing Council session in February, and the other two have been traditionally held on the day preceding the September and December EB sessions. This schedule was established for logistical reasons and to ease the participation of EC members not based in Rome, as well as for cost considerations. In terms of reporting to the EB, a single report covering three EC sessions (the ones held in September and December in the previous year and in February of the next year) used to be prepared and discussed at the annual April EB session in the context of the Annual Report on Evaluation<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Take, for example, the OE 2004 work programme and budget, and the Annual Report of the Results and Impact of IFAD Operations. The EC also discussed extensively the independent external evaluation of IFAD.

<sup>2</sup> While approving the Evaluation Policy, the EB requested OE to discontinue the production of the Annual Report on Evaluation.

16. Last year, the Evaluation Committee Chairperson provided five separate written reports to the Board, two on its special sessions in March and October, and three on its regular sessions in April, September and December. The reports have served to inform the EB on the EC's discussions and to make recommendations and seek decisions by the EB on important evaluation matters. The EB has been appreciative of receiving regular reports from the Chairperson. However, the proximity between the EC sessions and the EB meetings does not allow sufficient time for the EC Chairperson to easily prepare the Committee's report to the EB, particularly as such reports require editing and translating before they can be presented to the EB. Moreover, the critical issue is the need to provide adequate lead time to Board members to review the overall contents of and recommendations contained in the EC Chairperson's reports, so that meaningful discussions can be held in the EB and the reports endorsed accordingly. On this note, some EB members have in fact expressed their reservations in receiving such reports as tabled documents on the day of the EB. Therefore, the Committee is invited to reflect on both the timing of the EC sessions and the reporting requirements to the EB.

17. **Documentation provided by OE to the EC for its sessions.** In the past, as background documentation for their consideration, the EC would be provided with the concerned project, country programme, thematic or corporate level evaluation summary and, when available, the corresponding Agreements at Completion Point. However, the Committee has expressed that such documentation may not always provide it with an adequate understanding of the evaluation's results and outcomes. Therefore, in response to this concern, on an experimental basis in 2003 OE provided the EC with the full evaluation reports on the Philippines Rural Micro-Enterprise Finance Project and the Corporate Level Evaluation on the supervision modalities in IFAD-supported projects. Both documents were in English only, being the language in which the reports had been originally written. The EC expressed the usefulness of receiving such comprehensive documentation for their review and deliberations, and requested OE to provide it with the full evaluation reports in the future. On this issue, OE highlighted that there would be a significant cost escalation in the work of the EC, as per IFAD governing body requirements the entire evaluation reports would need to be translated into all official languages. Therefore, the EC may like to discuss this issue more deeply to establish a practice for the future, taking into consideration on one hand the added advantage of receiving the entire evaluation documentation, and on the other the eventual cost implications. One possibility the EC could consider is to receive the main report in the original language of production, and as and when required, the evaluation summary and the corresponding Agreement at Completion Point would be translated into all official languages.

18. **Records of Evaluation Committee Sessions.** Since 1999, the proceedings of the EC sessions are summarized in the minutes (which are normally around 5 pages long) of the meeting prepared by OE soon after each session and dispatched to the participants for their observations. As mentioned previously, however, in 2003 the Chairperson of the EC has provided a number of written reports to the EB for their consideration. The Chairperson's reports contain a summary of the deliberations and the key EC recommendations for the Board's approval. It will be noted that there is a quite an amount of overlap between the two documents, namely the EC minutes and the Reports of the EC Chairperson to the EB. Both documents in fact deal with the same issues. Although the minutes normally are more comprehensive in nature, the issue the EC is invited to deliberate upon is whether, given that the EC Chairperson will continue to provide written reports to the EB on a regular manner, they find the minutes still retain their usefulness over and above what is contained in the Report of the EC Chairperson or whether we can discontinue this in order to save time and resources.

19. **EC Field Visits.** In order to allow EC members to gain a better understanding of IFAD's work at the field level and to exchange knowledge and experiences with various stakeholders, there is a provision in the current TOR and Rules of Procedure, that the Committee would undertake field visits as and when required. A field visit for the Committee as a whole took place to Syria in 2001 in the context of the Country Programme Evaluation national roundtable workshop. Another similar field visit is planned to Indonesia in March 2004. Some members have also participated individually on an ad-hoc basis in other OE evaluation activities in the field. On the whole, field visits have been

constructive. However, it may be useful to determine the nature and role of the participation of the EC, in particular the reporting requirements to the EC and EB of members participating in field visits and the funding of these activities.

20. **Composition, observers & Chairperson of the EC.** Currently the composition of the Committee includes four Executive Board members from List A, two from List B and three from List C. In this regard, at its April 1997 session, the Board also decided to allow other directors to participate in the deliberation of the Committee as observers. Lastly, as per the decision of the Board in September 1997, the chairperson of the Committee would permanently be drawn from List B or C members.

21. The Committee may wish to discuss: (a) whether the prevailing composition and number (9) of Committee members remains suitable; (b) if it is still appropriate to confine the chairpersonship to Lists B and C or should there be an alternative arrangement; and (c) the participation and role of observers will need to be discussed. In this regard, the increasing attention by member states to evaluation matters has in the past few years enhanced the participation of observers. Some observers attend on a more or less regular basis, and as no distinction is made between the role of members and observers, this has implications on the functioning of the Committee, for example, in terms of the duration of the discussions, the distribution of documents, and so on.



# A

**IFAD**  
**INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**Executive Board – Sixty-Eight Session**  
Rome, 8-9 December 1999

**TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE**  
**OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

1. Based on a proposal made in 1987 by the United States, a committee to deal with evaluation matters was established by the Executive Board at its Thirty-First Session. The first session of the Evaluation Committee adopted organizational principles, which state that the rules of procedure of the Executive Board should be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the work of the Evaluation Committee. No specific terms of reference were drawn up for the committee.
2. The Evaluation Committee has been operating for more than eleven years, and several Executive Board Directors (“Directors”) have expressed the wish that the committee be revitalized and take a more proactive role. On several occasions some Directors have proposed that evaluation issues be discussed more frequently in the Executive Board, in addition to the April sessions when evaluation appears systematically on the agenda. Other Directors would like to see a reorientation of the discussions in the Evaluation Committee along lines and themes regarded as a priority by the Executive Board.
3. Some Directors see a main role for the Evaluation Committee in reporting to the Board on whether IFAD’s evaluations produce useful recommendations and lessons, and whether these lessons are actually used, leading to desired changes and qualitative improvement in the way IFAD’s projects are conceived, implemented and supervised. In addition, other Directors would favour a more strategic role for the evaluation function, and would welcome discussion by the Evaluation Committee of more thematic, country and strategic evaluations and reviews. For these reasons, in the Sixty-Sixth Session of the Executive Board it was decided that the Evaluation Committee would review its role and its practices in reporting to the Executive Board.
4. With the above objective in mind, between June and September 1999 the Evaluation Committee reviewed its overall scope, objectives and modalities of operation.

5. **Objectives of the Evaluation Committee.** According to the 1987 proposal, the Evaluation Committee was “to study and report on the evaluation activities of the Fund”. The two main objectives of the Evaluation Committee were: (a) “to enhance the ability of IFAD’s Executive Board to assess the overall quality of projects through a review of selected completion and ex-post evaluations of Fund projects”; and (b) “to fortify the Board’s knowledge of lessons learned in IFAD’s projects and to enable Member States to better assess the Fund’s role in the pursuit of a global development strategy...”.

6. The review concluded that these objectives are still relevant and valid, although section (a) needs to be expanded to include other evaluation instruments and activities developed by the Office of Evaluation and Studies to meet the demands of its clients and other work exigencies. Thus objective (a) should be rewritten as follows: “(a) to enhance the ability of IFAD’s Executive Board to assess the overall quality and impact of programmes and projects through a discussion of selected evaluations and reviews conducted by the Office of Evaluation and Studies.”

7. **Scope of work of the Evaluation Committee.** The Board’s decision to establish an Evaluation Committee states that “the Board would, each year, select from the list of available completion evaluation reports (CERs) of completed IFAD-financed projects approximately three CERs, together with any cross-cutting evaluation study that may be available, which would be referred to the Evaluation Committee for its study, in-depth review and report to the Executive Board”. The decision to emphasize completion evaluations was based on the assumption that IFAD would increasingly shift its evaluation focus from design and mid-term evaluations to completion and ex-post evaluations. In fact, partly due to the introduction of a number of new evaluation instruments, IFAD’s evaluation process has evolved quite differently. Annex III provides an explanation of the various evaluation instruments used by the Office of Evaluation and Studies.

8. Given this evolution, the Evaluation Committee proposes to consider all types of evaluation for discussion, including interim and mid-term evaluations (IEs and MTEs). These evaluations will give the committee a “real-time” picture of programme performance during implementation and will document the inclusion of emerging lessons and recommendations in ongoing programmes and in the design of new programme proposals. The Evaluation Committee also proposes to review more thematic and country evaluations. Any policy evaluation undertaken by the Office of Evaluation and Studies upon the request of the Executive Board and/or the Evaluation Committee or IFAD management may also be considered by the committee. Finally, the annual work programme of the Office of Evaluation and Studies will be discussed by the Evaluation Committee during its December sessions.

9. **Evaluation Committee agenda.** The agenda is based on the committee’s organizational principles, which have provided the framework for the type of issues to be discussed during committee meetings. Although the 1987 proposal specified that the Office of Evaluation and Studies would inform the committee of its plans for the next calendar year with regard to the agenda at the September Evaluation Committee sessions, the actual practice has been that the Office of Evaluation and Studies has proposed the agenda items on a session-by-session basis. This process has impeded the planning of an annual programme of work for the Evaluation Committee. It has also limited the proactive role that committee members could play in the selection of evaluation work to be discussed.

10. The committee agreed, therefore, that they will draw up a tentative agenda for the year’s sessions at the December committee session, drawing on the annual work programme of the Office of Evaluation and Studies. However, the Evaluation Committee will retain the flexibility to adjust its agenda during the course of the year according to its workload and changing priorities. This process is expected to provide all concerned with an opportunity to plan and organize Evaluation Committee sessions in a more orderly and interactive manner.

11. **Reporting to the Executive Board.** In the past, evaluation has appeared on the Executive Board agenda only at April sessions. On this occasion, two items covering the previous year have been discussed: the Progress Report on Evaluation (PRE) and the Report of the Evaluation Committee (REC). The PRE deals with evaluation issues and activities, while the REC provides a summary of the deliberations and work of the Evaluation Committee. While the PRE is dispatched to Directors according to established Executive Board schedules, the REC is tabled at the Board session.

12. The Evaluation Committee was established to assist the Executive Board by undertaking in-depth reviews of a selected number of evaluations and studies, relieving the Board of those duties. Nevertheless, some Directors have supported the proposal to discuss important evaluations and related issues at Board meetings and to reserve a regular Board agenda item for this purpose, in addition to the yearly discussion of the PRE and REC. There have been suggestions that the Board should, for example, consider key evaluation reports on such strategic evaluations as a review of IFAD's participatory approaches or innovative and replicable aspects of the Fund's projects and programmes, as well as review and discuss their policy implications for IFAD. Since the Evaluation Committee was established with the specific purpose of assisting the Board in considering evaluation issues, it would seem improper to reserve for Board discussions evaluation issues that can be dealt with more efficiently and extensively in the committee.

13. It might be more appropriate for evaluation issues to be referred by the Evaluation Committee to the Board for discussion when the committee feels that it is important for the Board to be informed on certain evaluation issues of exceptional importance – issues that cannot wait to be addressed in the PRE – and on which the Executive Board's guidance is required. In such cases, the Evaluation Committee may wish to avail itself of its prerogative to request a Board discussion on extraordinary evaluation issues and reports. There seems, however, to be no necessity for the introduction of a permanent evaluation item onto the Board agenda.

14. The Evaluation Committee suggests that the PRE be redesigned as a vehicle to draw the Board's attention to, and, if necessary, seek the Board's guidance on, key policy and strategic issues emerging from the evaluation process. Given the complementarity between the REC and PRE, the Evaluation Committee feels that a unique document outlining those evaluation issues requiring Board consideration and guidance would be more appropriate and would remove potential redundancies. The Evaluation Committee proposes, therefore, that the REC be amalgamated with the PRE and that the document be dispatched to Board Directors in a timely manner for their consideration during April Executive Board sessions.

15. **Information requirements and field visits of Evaluation Committee members.** In order to allow Evaluation Committee members to gain a better understanding of IFAD's work at the field level and to exchange knowledge and experiences with various stakeholders, some members have participated in evaluation missions, country-level round tables and workshops to discuss evaluation findings and recommendations. Both committee members and the Office of Evaluation and Studies have found these field visits useful, and they have enhanced the quality of dialogue within the Evaluation Committee.

16. Committee members' participation in field visits has usually been decided on an ad hoc basis. There is a consensus within the Evaluation Committee that these arrangements have by and large worked well and should be maintained. However, it was also agreed that during December committee sessions, in the context of elaborating its agenda for the subsequent year, the committee would discuss and select options for suitable field visits to be undertaken during the year, which would enable the Office of Evaluation and Studies to plan ahead and make timely, appropriate arrangements.

17. **Evaluation summaries.** In order to expedite the sharing of evaluation results, it was suggested that the EC be informed of all executive summaries of evaluation reports prepared by OE upon finalization. The summaries will be made available in their original language to EC members upon request. In addition, the EC proposes that, in the future, all OE executive summaries contain a section that captures the outcomes agreed upon by the various stakeholders, in terms of the main recommendations, lessons and related follow-up generated through the evaluation process.”

18. **Composition and chairpersonship.** The Evaluation Committee is made up of nine members drawn from the thirty-six Executive Board members and alternate members: four countries from List A, two from List B and three from List C. Committee members are elected by the Executive Board for a three-year term of office, coinciding with that of the Executive Board. The term of office of the present Executive Board will expire in February 2000, at the Twenty-Third Session of the Governing Council. The September 1997 Executive Board Session decided that the chairpersonship of the Evaluation Committee would remain permanently with List B and C countries. During the Sixtieth Session, the Board endorsed a proposal to allow other Directors to sit in during committee sessions as observers. The Evaluation Committee considers all current arrangements to be satisfactory.

19. **Frequency and timing of Evaluation Committee sessions.** Three Evaluation Committee sessions are normally held in a calendar year, usually one day before Executive Board meetings for logistical reasons, but also to ease the participation of committee members not based in Rome. Informal Evaluation Committee sessions have been held occasionally and have proved useful in promoting additional consultation and dialogue, paving the ground for more formal discussions. The committee proposes to continue holding three sessions per year, with the opportunity for deliberations through informal meetings, called at appropriate intervals of time, if and when required.

20. The timing of the meetings has a direct implication on the modality and scope for reporting to the Executive Board. Since the report of the Evaluation Committee has usually been tabled at the April Board session, it has not contained a synthesis of the most recent deliberations of the Evaluation Committee that take place the day before the April Board.

21. Therefore, in order to make the reporting of the work of the Evaluation Committee more current, and to enable the inclusion in the annual report of major issues and conclusions arising from the two committee sessions of the previous year *and* the committee session held before the April Board, a consensus was reached in the committee to organize its first session of the year in conjunction with IFAD’s annual Governing Council session, on the day before or after, according to the convenience of committee members.

22. **Translation/interpretation cost implications.** For Evaluation Committee sessions, the Office of the Secretary arranges for translation of all executive summaries of evaluation reports and studies into the four official languages of IFAD and simultaneous interpretation of deliberations.

23. The Evaluation Committee examined the possibility of adopting one working language, which has been the practice of the Audit Committee since 1982, in order to save costs related to translation and interpretation. However, it was generally thought desirable to allow each member the opportunity to express himself/herself in the official language in which they are most comfortable, and thus to ensure higher quality deliberations. Consequently, the Evaluation Committee will continue to operate in all four languages, and the IFAD Secretariat will continue to make the executive summaries of all reports available in four languages, as well as other committee documentation. The main text and annexes of evaluation and related reports will be available upon request in the language of issuance only. The Secretariat is in a position to absorb the costs of translation and interpretation provided that sessions are held close to other governing body meetings, a practice that has been and will continue to be followed.

*Recommendation*

24. Following the review of the role of the Evaluation Committee and its practices in reporting to the Board, the committee proposes to replace its organizational principles with the terms of reference and rules of procedures presented in Annexes I and II for the consideration of the Executive Board. The Board is invited to approve the proposed terms of reference and rules of procedures of the Evaluation Committee.

**ANNEX I**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

- (1) To enhance the ability of the Executive Board to assess the overall quality and impact of IFAD programmes and projects through a discussion of selected evaluations and reviews conducted by the Office of Evaluation and Studies, as well as to fortify the Board's knowledge of lessons learned in IFAD's programmes and projects and to enable Member States to better assess the Fund's role in the pursuit of a global development strategy;
- (2) to discuss with the Office of Evaluation and Studies the scope and contents of its annual work programme and strategic directions;
- (3) to satisfy itself that the Fund has an effective and efficient evaluation function;
- (4) to report to the Executive Board on the committee's work and, as appropriate, make recommendations and seek guidance on evaluation issues of policy and strategic importance; and
- (5) to undertake field visits, as and when required, and participate in evaluation missions, workshops, round-table meetings and related activities in order to assist the Evaluation Committee in conducting its duties.

ANNEX II

**RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The Rules of Procedure of the Executive Board shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the proceedings of the Evaluation Committee, except as specified below:

**Rule 1**  
**Convening of Meetings**

The Evaluation Committee shall hold three sessions in each calendar year. The first meeting shall be held the day before or after IFAD's annual Governing Council session, whichever is more convenient for committee members. The remaining two sessions shall be held on the day preceding the September and December Executive Board sessions, respectively. Additional informal meetings in the same calendar year may also be called on an ad hoc basis by the chairperson.

**Rule 2**  
**Notification of Sessions and Agenda**

The IFAD Secretariat shall inform each committee member of the date and place of a session at least thirty days in advance. During its December session, the Evaluation Committee shall draw up a tentative agenda for all three sessions in the subsequent year. To facilitate this work, the Office of Evaluation and Studies shall provide the committee with its proposed work programme for the year. The committee retains the prerogative to revise by adding, deleting, defining or amending items on the agenda during the course of the year. The agenda shall be communicated by the Secretariat to all Evaluation Committee members along with the notification of sessions.

**Rule 3**  
**Membership and Terms of Office**

The composition of the Evaluation Committee shall consist of nine Executive Board members or alternate members: four members from List A, two from List B and three from List C. The term of office of the Evaluation Committee shall be three years and coincide with the term of office of the Executive Board.

**Rule 4**  
**Quorum**

The quorum for any meeting of the Evaluation Committee shall be constituted by five members.

**Rule 5**  
**Chairperson**

The committee shall elect its chairperson from List B and C committee members. In the absence of the chairperson during a scheduled meeting of the committee, the chair shall be temporarily assumed by another member from List B or C selected by the committee.

**ANNEX II**  
**Rule 6**  
**Decisions**

The committee shall make every effort to arrive at decisions by consensus. Where such efforts have been exhausted, the chairperson's rulings shall stand when supported by four other members.

**Rule 7**  
**Attendance at Meetings**

In addition to Evaluation Committee members and the Director of the Office of Evaluation and Studies, the said Director may designate members of his staff to participate in the deliberations of the committee. The Director shall also invite other IFAD staff members to provide, pursuant to the committee's request, such information as may be required in carrying out the committee's responsibilities. Other Executive Board members not members of the Evaluation Committee may also attend the meetings as observers.

Rule 8

**Documentation, Records and Reports**

The proceedings of the committee, documents provided to the committee and the records of the committee's deliberations shall be restricted and available only to members of the committee and members of the Executive Board. The proceedings of the committee shall be reflected in the Minutes of the Evaluation Committee, unless the committee decides otherwise.

**Rule 9**  
**Reporting to the Executive Board**

The Evaluation Committee shall provide a written report of its deliberations to the Executive Board during the latter's April session. The report, which shall be included in the Office of Evaluation and Studies' Annual Progress Report on Evaluation, shall be dispatched to Board members according to established Board procedures. The chairperson of the committee may, in addition, provide an oral report during the April Executive Board session. The Evaluation Committee may also provide ad hoc written or oral reports to the Board during its September and/or December sessions.



## **TYPE OF EVALUATION CONDUCTED BY IFAD**

**Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE)** of project or programme: MTEs are undertaken towards the mid-life of project implementation. The timing is generally related to the 50% disbursement mark, but other factors might justify an earlier or later evaluation and disbursement rates do not often have a linear correlation to progress in implementation.

**Interim Evaluation (IE)** of project or programme: IEs are compulsory before embarking on a second phase of a project or launching another project broadly similar in the same region. In such cases findings, recommendations and lessons learned for IE become the basis for project design of the subsequent intervention.

**Completion Evaluation (CE)** and **Ex-Post Evaluation (EXP)** of project or programme: CEs are typically conducted after the finalization of the project completion report prepared by the Borrower (often with some help from the cooperating institution) or the cooperating institution itself (in the case of the World Bank). CEs are generally conducted 6-18 months after the project closing date, whereas EXPs are usually conducted three years after project closure.

**Country Portfolio Evaluation (CPE)**: CPEs aim at drawing lessons from all IFAD-financed projects in a given country. CPEs do not intend to evaluate each closed or ongoing project, but rather to provide comparative information on the most essential aspects of project performance and to develop strategic and operational orientations for IFAD's project pipeline in the country.

**Thematic Study (TS)**: TSs are intended to examine IFAD's experience regarding a specific aspect or theme of IFAD interventions. They may be region/subregion-specific or may cut across all IFAD interventions. Various TSs have been undertaken to date on credit, integrated rural development, IFAD's relationship with cooperating institutions, etc. In such evaluations, the Fund's accumulated experience across countries and regions is synthesized and analysed, and cross-cutting lessons are drawn.