

Document: EC 2013/76/W.P.6/Rev.1  
Agenda: 8  
Date: 4 April 2013  
Distribution: Public  
Original: English

**E**



Enabling poor rural people  
to overcome poverty

## **Corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's replenishments: Approach paper**

### **Note to Evaluation Committee members**

#### Focal points:

#### Technical questions:

**Ashwani Muthoo**  
Acting Director  
Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD  
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2053  
e-mail: a.muthoo@ifad.org

#### Dispatch of documentation:

**Deirdre McGrenra**  
Head, Governing Bodies Office  
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2374  
e-mail: gb\_office@ifad.org

Evaluation Committee — Seventy-sixth Session  
Rome, 3-4 April 2013

---

**For: Review**

## Contents

<b>Abbreviations and acronyms</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>I. Background and context</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Background	1
B. IFAD replenishments	1
C. Experience of peer institutions	2
D. Conclusion	5
<b>II. Objectives of the evaluation</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. Evaluation framework and process</b>	<b>5</b>
A. Scope	5
B. Focus	6
C. Evaluation questions	6
D. Approach	7
E. Methodology	7
F. Evaluation criteria	8
G. Limitations	8
H. Evaluation process	9
<b>IV. Core Learning Partnership</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>V. Evaluation team and schedule</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>VI. Communication and dissemination</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Annex</b>	
Evaluation framework	13

## Abbreviations and acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
ADF	African Development Fund
AsDB	Asian Development Bank
AsDF	Asian Development Fund
CLP	Core Learning Partnership
FSO	Fund for Special Operations
IDA	International Development Association
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFAD10	Consultation on the Tenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
MDB	multilateral development bank

# Corporate-level evaluation on IFAD's replenishments: Draft approach paper

## I. Background and context

### A. Background

1. IFAD's replenishment exercise is an essential process for the Fund and is indeed referred to by some as "mission-critical":
  - (a) It mobilizes, on a predictable three-year basis, the resources needed to sustain IFAD's operations.
  - (b) It gives IFAD an opportunity to present its strategy and disseminate its achievements and results.
  - (c) It gives Member States an opportunity to provide feedback and strategic guidance for the short and medium term.
2. In an environment of rapidly changing international agendas combined with constrained volumes of development assistance, it was recognized that it could be useful to examine this fundamental process in depth to ensure that it accomplished its purpose and achieved its full potential. Learning from experience and from peer institutions would not only strengthen the replenishment process itself but could also generate substantial benefits for IFAD, its Member States and others. In view of this, the Executive Board of IFAD, at its December 2012 session, approved the proposal that a corporate-level evaluation (CLE) on IFAD's replenishments be carried out by the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE) in 2013.
3. The CLE is particularly well timed. It will allow lessons from the past three replenishments, and from the recent replenishments of multilateral development banks (MDBs), to feed into the Consultation on the Tenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD10) in 2014, thus having an immediate impact on a fundamental corporate and governance process.

### B. IFAD replenishments

4. The Agreement Establishing IFAD provides that, in order to assure continuity in the Fund's operations, the Governing Council "shall periodically, at such intervals as it deems appropriate, review the adequacy of the resources available to the Fund.... If the Governing Council, as a result of such a review, deems it necessary or desirable, it may invite Members to make additional contributions to the resources of the Fund ...." Such additional contributions to IFAD's core resources are made through a consultation on the replenishment of IFAD's resources. The consultations have taken place every three years since the first in 1981. IFAD is currently in its Ninth Replenishment period (2013 to 2015).
5. The consultation consists of all Member States from Lists A and B; List C selects consultation representatives from its membership. The Governing Council established that, starting with the Seventh Replenishment Consultation, the representation of List C would be 15 Member States; in 2011, at its thirty-fourth session, it enlarged List C representation to 18.
6. While the first eight replenishments were chaired by the President of IFAD, the Governing Council decided that the Ninth Replenishment Consultation in 2011 would be chaired by an external chairperson, following the practice of other MDBs.
7. Although IFAD governing bodies rarely have recourse to voting, it should nevertheless be noted that replenishment contributions also carry voting rights. Votes are made up of membership votes – distributed equally among all members of the Consultation – and core contribution votes – distributed among members in proportion to the resources contributed to the Fund for each replenishment. The

total number of votes to be allocated as both membership votes and contribution votes is decided by the Governing Council. In the allocation of votes, the Governing Council ensures that those members classified as members of Category III before 26 January 1995 (now List C) receive one third of the total votes as replenishment votes.

8. The replenishment process comprises two phases: negotiations and appropriations. During negotiations, members of the Consultation<sup>1</sup> meet with IFAD Management to determine the appropriate size of the replenishment (target level). They also discuss and make recommendations on the Fund's policies, programme direction and scope of institutional reforms, and negotiate the contributions from each donor Government during the negotiation phase. This phase usually requires four to five meetings, held at IFAD headquarters, over approximately one year.
9. Upon conclusion of the negotiation phase, a report on the results of the deliberations, and any recommendations, is submitted to the Governing Council, with a view to adopting such resolutions as may be appropriate.
10. Subsequent to the negotiations, appropriations take place at the national level, where donor Governments work within their own legislative frameworks to allocate the necessary funds committed to IFAD during replenishment negotiations. As IFAD has no influence over this phase, the evaluation focuses exclusively on the negotiation phase.
11. The amounts of the total pledges for the last three replenishments were:
  - IFAD7: US\$0.7 billion
  - IFAD8: US\$1.2 billion
  - IFAD9: US\$1.5 billion

### **C. Experience of peer institutions**

12. All of the MDBs and a number of funds, such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, mobilize resources through replenishments.
13. **World Bank/International Development Association (IDA).** With respect to IDA, donors meet every three years and the most recent replenishment of IDA's resources, the sixteenth (IDA16), was finalized in December 2010, resulting in a record replenishment of US\$49.3 billion to finance projects over the three-year period ending 30 June 2014. Fifty-two countries contributed to the replenishment. Donors met in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, to review the progress of IDA16 at a mid-term review meeting in November 2012 where issues such as climate change, gender, fragile states and regional integration were discussed. A retrospective review of IDA15 was also on the agenda. The first IDA17 meeting will take place in Paris, France, from 20 to 21 March 2013.
14. To increase openness and help ensure that IDA's policies are responsive to country needs and circumstances, representatives of borrower countries from each IDA region have, since IDA13, been invited to take part in the replenishment negotiations. Nine borrower representatives participated in the IDA16 negotiations. In addition, since IDA13, background policy papers have been publicly released, as well as drafts of the replenishment reports before their finalization.
15. In terms of evaluation, the IDA deputies commissioned the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group to conduct an independent review of IDA's performance in implementing the undertakings of IDA10, 11 and 12 covering a seven-year period and IDA's compliance with more than 150 replenishment undertakings. The report, published in 2004, focused mainly on performance and

---

<sup>1</sup> In the replenishment process of peer institutions the term deputies is used to denote members of the Consultation. In IFAD different terms are used and in this document the terms deputies, delegates, members and participants are used interchangeably.

results, but did also suggest fine-tuning of the replenishment process. It concluded, inter alia: "Although consistent with the evolving development paradigm, replenishment undertakings have been perceived to be both overdetermined and overloaded. Greater realism about what IDA and its borrowers could reasonably accomplish in a three-year period is desirable. Equally, the replenishment process needs stronger connections with all development partners. IDA, in consultation with its borrowers, should develop a longer-term vision focused on results. It should engage developing countries in both setting replenishment priorities and monitoring IDA performance, and it should define commitments in terms of monitorable and achievable objectives."<sup>2</sup>

16. **African Development Bank (AfDB)/African Development Fund (ADF).** Initial contributions to the ADF were pledged in 1972. Since its establishment, donor countries have replenished the ADF with additional resources every three years, the current replenishment period being ADF-12. The governors of the donor countries (currently 26) each designate a representative to participate in the replenishment process; these ADF deputies, Bank Management and four observing regional member countries participate in four or five large meetings, which take place in various locations over the course of about nine months. During the meetings, participants review how the ADF's resources have been spent, and discuss issues such as the development results achieved, the ADF's long-term financial outlook, its policy framework and the operational priorities for the coming three years. At the final meeting, the donor countries make their pledges of new resources.
17. For every replenishment, a mid-term review, conducted by Management, takes place about 18-20 months after the replenishment enters into force. The latest mid-term review was held in Cape Verde in September 2012. Discussions focused primarily on the AfDB's operational priorities, institutional effectiveness, resource allocation, financing capacity and sustainability over the long term, as well as its development results.
18. Looking ahead to ADF-13 discussions, participants at the latest mid-term review agreed to aim for an efficient process, with three replenishment meetings, beginning in February 2013. They welcomed the continuing participation and valuable contributions of African ministers in the discussions, and also called for wider ADF consultation with African private-sector and civil society representatives in the replenishment process.
19. No evaluation has been carried out of the replenishment process as such, but an independent evaluation by the Bank's Operations Evaluation Department was conducted of ADF-7, 8 and 9 in 2004 to assess results. The evaluation did not measure the impact of the ADF's interventions but adopted an approach that looked into best practice to "assess how international development assistance can be most effectively applied in reducing and eradicating poverty."<sup>3</sup>
20. **Asian Development Bank (AsDB)/Asian Development Fund (AsDF).** AsDF resources were first mobilized to conduct AsDB's concessional lending operations in 1973-1975. Initial contributions to the AsDF were designated as AsDF I. Starting with AsDF VIII, a mid-term review meeting is held during each replenishment period to monitor progress and keep donors fully informed about all aspects of AsDF operations. In addition, starting with AsDF X, an annual consultation with donors is also conducted to monitor progress of the utilization and implementation of the AsDF during the replenishment period.
21. AsDF resources have been replenished ten times, the latest being AsDF XI for the period 2013-2016. AsDF XI negotiations concluded in April 2012 with a total replenishment of US\$12.4 billion. The Bank and the AsDF will be guided under AsDF

<sup>2</sup> IDA's Partnership for Poverty Reduction: An Independent Evaluation of Fiscal Years 1994-2000, World Bank, 2002.

<sup>3</sup> Stepping up to the Future: An independent evaluation of ADF VII, VIII and IX. OPEV, 2004.

XI by the three complementary development agendas set out in Strategy 2020: Working for an Asia and Pacific Free of Poverty: (i) inclusive economic growth; (ii) environmentally sustainable growth; and (iii) regional integration. Donors also agreed to give special consideration to “fragile and conflict-affected situations” and gender issues, and reconfirmed the importance of development effectiveness as a central underlying theme of the AsDF XI negotiations.

22. AsDF donors' reports, prepared at the conclusion of replenishment negotiations, provide the framework for AsDF resource allocation to eligible countries. These reports also contain commitments or statements agreed on during negotiations. According to the Bank's website: “The draft ADF XI Donors' Report was made available for comment to civil society and comments were posted on the ADF website and provided to the ADF donors for their consideration prior to the third ADF XI replenishment meeting.”
23. In terms of evaluation, a special evaluation study<sup>4</sup> by the Bank's Independent Evaluation Department reviewed the development effectiveness of AsDF operations approved during AsDF VIII and AsDF IX (2001-2008) and reported on progress in the first two years of implementing AsDF X (2009-2010). It focused on the development effectiveness of AsDF-financed operations. Key issues were identified and recommendations for strengthening AsDF operations in developing member countries made, but the replenishment process itself was not evaluated.
24. **Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)/Fund for Special Operations (FSO).** The IDB equivalent to the concessional funds of the above MDBs is the Fund for Special Operations. FSO resources totalled US\$9.8 billion at the end of 2009 and are used to provide concessional loans to the poorest countries of the region. However, IDB diverges from practice in the other MDBs, as the FSO is not replenished on a regular three- or four-year cycle. Therefore, it is not included among the peer institutions to be examined by the evaluation.
25. IDB's board of governors in July 2010 agreed, during deliberations on the Ninth General Increase in Resources of the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB-9), to increase the Bank's ordinary capital by US\$70 billion, and to increase, by US\$479 million, new contributions to the FSO to provide full debt relief and additional resources to Haiti and to ensure FSO sustainability until 2020. The governors also agreed to review the need for a new FSO replenishment before 2020.
26. In terms of evaluation, two FSO evaluations have been carried out. The first, “Oversight Note on the Performance Criteria for Allocating Concessional Resources” (RE-279), was presented to the board of executive directors in 2003 and provided a preliminary review of the new performance-related allocation criteria introduced in 2002. In October 2010, the “Evaluation of the Fund for Special Operations during the Eighth Replenishment (1994-2010) - Part I” (RE-376) was presented in anticipation of the FSO replenishment through IDB-9. This evaluation focused primarily on the implications of the changing methodologies for allocating FSO resources. Its objective was to complete the assessment of the performance of IDB's FSO loan programme during the Eighth Replenishment period, focusing as stated in RE-376 on financing and results. Neither evaluation reviewed the replenishment process as such but instead, like the IDA and AfDB evaluations, paid attention to the performance of the programme of loans financed with its concessional fund resources.
27. IDB-9 resulted in a time-bound reform agenda, the Agenda for a Better Bank, and Management agreed that, from 2011, it would present yearly reports to the board of executive directors on progress in implementing the agenda. The report for IDB-9 furthermore explicitly states: “At the midterm point of the subscription of IDB-9,

---

<sup>4</sup> The Asian Development Fund Operations: A Decade of Supporting Poverty Reduction in the Asia and Pacific Region. Independent Evaluation Department, Asian Development Bank, October 2011.

OVE [the Office of Evaluation and Oversight] will conduct an evaluation to assess that the reforms are being implemented fully and effectively as set forth in the Overview Framework of the Cancún Declaration (AB-2728) and as further elaborated in this report. This evaluation is to be considered by Governors on or before March 31, 2013. Governors will then formally determine that reforms have been implemented.”<sup>5</sup>

#### **D. Conclusion**

28. It is difficult to find in IFAD another process that has implications for and involves as many aspects and stakeholders of the organization as the replenishment process does. It touches on issues ranging from governance to financing, from operations to corporate effectiveness, and it involves staff, Management and all Member States at different levels. This is also true in other international financial institutions; yet, the few independent evaluations conducted of these replenishments have all focused on the implementation of the commitments and results of the replenishment, not on the process itself. While this is understandable given the strong focus in recent years on development effectiveness, country-level results and value for money, there are nonetheless many aspects of the replenishment processes that merit review.
29. IFAD is thus breaking new ground, and it is anticipated that the process of the evaluation, raising issues, providing space and time for joint reflection, engaging with the different actors involved, will be as important as the findings. It is hoped that the evaluation will be a useful input to IFAD10, not only for IFAD but also for the Consultation members, and that some findings and conclusions may also be useful in the replenishment processes of other international financial institutions.

## **II. Objectives of the evaluation**

30. The proposed objectives of the evaluation are to:
  - (a) Help ensure accountability and especially learning from the replenishment;
  - (b) Assess the links between the replenishment process and policy and organizational change;
  - (c) Assess the relevance of the replenishment in its current form; and
  - (d) Identify potential areas of improvement, and good practice from peer institutions.
31. The independent evaluation is intended to be a highly focused piece of evaluative work to feed into and improve the IFAD10 process. Therefore, the preparatory phase included extensive consultations within IFAD, with selected representatives of Member States, and with key informants within the peer MDBs, in order to sharpen the evaluation’s focus and identify the key issues affecting IFAD’s ability to fulfil its strategic mission. Preserving this sharp focus throughout the process will be the key to a successful evaluation outcome.

## **III. Evaluation framework and process**

### **A. Scope**

32. The evaluation will cover the Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Replenishments. Earlier replenishments may also be reviewed, on a selective basis, for specific issues. Two such issues are the drop in resources experienced between the Third and the Fourth Replenishment, and the possible explanations for this; and the change in focus of the replenishments from being mainly a pledging session to including discussion of strategic issues.

---

<sup>5</sup> Report on the Ninth General Increase in the Resources of the Inter-American Development Bank, AB-2764, 21 May 2010.

## **B. Focus**

33. The replenishment process as such is at the core of the evaluation, the aim being to examine and document its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency in meeting its objectives. The key issues to be examined are cost, duration (every three years), communication to and engagement with stakeholders throughout the process, if and how the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness are applied, and how new ideas and practices may have contributed to incremental improvements in the process.
34. To the degree possible within the time available, the evaluation will assess existing evidence on how commitments made under the Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Replenishments have influenced policy and organizational change within IFAD. The evaluation will not, however, evaluate whether these policy and organizational changes have enhanced IFAD's development results on the ground, as the time and resources needed to do this are not available.
35. Instead, the evaluation will look at results and change to determine: (i) what links there are between the replenishment process and policy and organizational change; (ii) how well systems in place track and report commitments made and capture the effects of replenishment commitments; and (iii) what systems exist to address deviations from meeting replenishment undertakings.
36. Given the major assumed impact that replenishments have on an organization, the evaluation will examine this aspect from different angles. It will look at how replenishments influence both policy and organizational change in the context of other drivers of policy and organizational change; the extent to which issues raised by members in the replenishment exercise are specific to IFAD; how replenishments have become an instrument of global policymaking within current development architecture; and ways in which replenishments may sometimes reinforce change that was already under way before the start of the replenishment process.
37. The replenishment clearly has implications for governance in IFAD, and the evaluation will look at different dimensions of this. One is the differing perceptions within the Governing Council membership of the implications of the replenishment process in terms of legitimacy, voice and representation; in other words, where decision-making power is perceived to lie within the differing constituencies and IFAD Senior Management. Another is to examine the level and type of discussion and commitments; this will shed light on changes over time in the type of policy or organizational issues discussed, and the appropriateness given the respective roles of Management, Consultation members, the Executive Board and the Governing Council. A third dimension is to examine the implication of agreeing IFAD's results framework as part of the replenishment outcome.
38. Finally, an analysis will be made of the importance of the replenishment process in resource mobilization in IFAD. The evaluation will not only look at the volume of funds mobilized but also examine issues such as predictability and the implications for IFAD of a changing ratio of core/non-core funding in terms of the relevance and role of the replenishment process, and what alternatives may exist.

## **C. Evaluation questions**

39. The evaluation will therefore be organized around five broad evaluation questions:
  - (a) How relevant, effective and efficient is IFAD's replenishment process?
  - (b) To what extent and with what effect do replenishments drive policy and organizational change?
  - (c) Is the current practice of ensuring voice and representation to all Lists adequate, and does it serve IFAD well?

- (d) What are the implications of developing the results framework as part of the replenishment process?
  - (e) What are the pros and cons of raising funds through replenishments, including in terms of the partnership involved, and how can funds raised through replenishments best be supplemented by other resources?
40. Priority issues that stakeholders identified during initial consultations have formed the basis for developing detailed questions under each of these five overarching evaluation clusters. These are set out in the evaluation framework in the annex to this document and have been limited to a maximum of six questions for each cluster. For each question, more detailed research questions may be developed as necessary as evaluation tools are fine-tuned.

## **D. Approach**

41. The approach will be engaging, staged, exploratory and evidence-based. It is a forward-looking (formative) evaluation in the sense that it is conducted in parallel with and feeds into the preparations for IFAD10, providing information on what works effectively and is relevant to whom, and identifying how improvements may be made. It is retrospective (summative) because it looks back to IFAD's Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Replenishments and examines how the Fund has responded to members' requests and directives, looking at effectiveness and results of these past replenishments.
42. A preparatory phase has helped frame the evaluation by examining: (i) how different stakeholders understand the objectives of the replenishment process; and (ii) how relevant the objectives are perceived to be. It is important to ascertain perceptions about the usefulness of the replenishment because perceptions drive expectations and behaviour, and are therefore essential for understanding the dynamics of the process.
43. The evaluation will build to a large extent on interviews and secondary data, and use to the maximum existing data sources and processes for data collection, such as client surveys. It will also make extensive use of existing evaluative results, including the most recent corporate-level evaluations, such as the CLE on IFAD's efficiency.
44. Experience from peer institutions will constitute the essential context for IFAD's replenishment process, and provide both the basis for comparison and possible examples of good practice.
45. The evaluation recognizes that there are many different stakeholders and participants in the replenishment process and will take care to capture their unique perspectives on the replenishment process through a variety of data sources.

## **E. Methodology**

46. The evaluation will rely on a mix of methods to achieve its objectives. These include:
- (a) A desk review of documents;
  - (b) Interviews with Consultation members, Evaluation Committee and Board members, and IFAD Management and staff;
  - (c) Focus group discussions with management and staff;
  - (d) Surveys to capture members' perceptions and perspectives;
  - (e) Visits to selected peer institutions; and
  - (f) A context and stakeholder analysis.
47. The evaluation framework (see annex) outlines the evaluation by the proposed components, and links these with the principal questions to be addressed and the activities to be undertaken to answer these questions.

48. The evaluation will include the following building blocks, which will provide inputs into the preparation of the main evaluation report:
- (f) A framing/evaluability study of the perceived objectives and relevance of the replenishment process by different stakeholder groups, and of the availability and accessibility of data and information;
  - (g) A study of the experience of peer institutions including the World Bank, AsDB and AfDB as a central input on the context of the replenishments and possible good practice;
  - (h) A “light” assessment of results achievement, building on available results information;
  - (i) A review of the systems in place to track commitments made during replenishments and their results; and
  - (j) A review of multilateral financing trends.

## F. Evaluation criteria

49. The evaluation criteria used by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development will guide the evaluation, with relevance, effectiveness and efficiency the main criteria (see box 1). These criteria are also included in IFAD’s Evaluation Manual.
50. IFAD has recently carried out a comprehensive evaluation of its institutional efficiency, and therefore information will be drawn from this work to cover the efficiency dimension to the extent possible. Impact and sustainability will not be assessed directly, but an effort will be made to assess the systems in place to ensure these two aspects in IFAD’s operations.

## G. Limitations

51. A good evaluation outcome will largely depend on maintaining focus on a few key issues. The evaluation will be carried out by a small team of experts, in a limited timeframe of about six months; it is therefore necessary to concentrate on the key issues, ensure their continued relevance and provide for flexibility if new issues emerge as the process unfolds.

Box 1

### Evaluation criteria used by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

**Relevance:** The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

When evaluating the relevance of a programme or project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

**Effectiveness:** A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.

When evaluating the effectiveness of a programme or project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- To what extent were the objectives achieved or are likely to be achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

**Efficiency:** Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term that signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.

When evaluating the efficiency of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- Were activities cost-efficient?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared with alternatives?

52. One major limitation may be the dependence on interviews and perceptions, as there will be no documented evaluative evidence available on a number of the evaluation questions. The evaluators will therefore make sure that informants are carefully selected, and that findings are triangulated and validated as part of the quality assurance process.
53. Another limitation is that only a few Consultation members will have experience from more than one replenishment meeting. Furthermore, several are based in their capital cities, making access an issue. However, on the positive side, various members are likely to have experience from replenishment processes in other MDBs thus enhancing the value of their contributions.
54. A further challenge is that no standards or benchmarks exist to help frame the evaluation and set something to measure against. This will be addressed by using, where relevant, stakeholders' perceptions of usefulness as an important "standard". Where possible and feasible, comparisons with peer institutions will also be used to frame assessments and judgements.
55. Lastly, it is essential that information on the evaluation be transparently and openly provided to stakeholders. The process is as important as the final report, and therefore good communication and open-ended opportunities for feedback are essential. However, with a small evaluation team, based in their respective home countries, careful thought needs to be given to evaluation management and to the communication and dissemination aspects of the evaluation.

## H. Evaluation process

56. The evaluation process is designed to ensure credibility, promote internal learning and generate ownership among stakeholder groups through: (i) a preliminary dialogue (December 2012) with key informants and stakeholders on the evaluation's precise scope and objectives, which helped inform this approach paper; (ii) a framing/evaluability phase that explores different stakeholders' perceptions of the objectives and relevance of the replenishment process, and the availability and accessibility of the necessary evidence base; (iii) organization-wide interviews, focus groups, workshops and feedback sessions; (iv) transparent dialogue on findings and recommendations through an "emerging lessons workshop"; and (v) other platforms for feedback from stakeholders organized as and when pertinent and useful.
57. The evaluation is designed to feed into the IFAD10 negotiation process and will therefore be conducted between January and October 2013. The final report will be completed in time for discussion with the Evaluation Committee in November 2013 and presentation at the December 2013 meeting of the Executive Board. However, to enhance the evaluation's usefulness, the evaluation team will present emerging findings in late June/early July 2013.
58. The evaluation will have four stages:
  - (a) **Framing of the evaluation/assessment of evaluability:** This preparatory phase helped ensure that the evaluation could be conducted as effectively and efficiently as possible by:
    - Exploring different stakeholders' understanding of the objectives and relevance of the replenishment process;
    - Testing the use of a logic model;
    - Ascertaining that necessary evidence was available and accessible, and that the areas identified at the concept stage were indeed those considered by key stakeholders as most central to IFAD for fulfilling its strategic mission; and
    - Raising awareness of the evaluation, and demonstrating a commitment to a broad engagement with key stakeholders.

**(b) Desk review:** This phase will have the following activities:

- Review of key IFAD documents;
- Review of documents from peer institutions; and
- Literature search on methodological issues.

**(c) Engagement with informants:** This phase will have the following activities:

- Interviews with IFAD Management and staff, both individually and in focus groups;
- Interviews/videoconferences with peer institutions, to capture the perspectives of different stakeholder groups, and to examine in greater detail the issues and hypotheses generated during the desk review phase;
- Discussions with IFAD staff, Consultation members, Governing Council and Executive Board members, and others engaged in IFAD's replenishment process or other similar processes;
- Design and administration of surveys; and
- An "emerging lessons" workshop, which will provide a platform for feedback from key stakeholders, ensuring that all key stakeholders have an opportunity to reflect jointly on the issues uncovered by the evaluation and that possible gaps in the evidence base are identified, thus shaping the final analysis.

**(d) Analysis of data and drafting of final report**

59. Building on various deliverables produced during the desk review, the evaluation team will carry out the necessary analysis and prepare the draft final report. This report will be shared with all concerned for their comments. IOE will prepare an "audit trail", which will clearly illustrate how and in which sections of the evaluation report the written comments received from Management have been included in the revised version of the evaluation report. The audit trail, which will be a separate document and not included in the evaluation report, will be shared for information with Management before the evaluation report is finalized. The final report will then be prepared, taking into account the various comments received in line with the provisions of the IFAD Evaluation Policy. IOE will be responsible for the overall evaluation process, contents of the final report, and all other deliverables produced during the evaluation as per the evaluation policy.

## **IV. Core Learning Partnership**

The objective of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) is to strengthen ownership of the evaluation across the organization, and to help ensure that findings are pertinent and realistic and will be implemented. Its role is to provide guidance to the evaluation process and to review key evaluation deliverables. In the inception phase, the CLP members (see box 2) will flag issues and information sources for the evaluation, engaging actively with the team prior to and during the emerging findings workshop. After the completion of the evaluation, the CLP will discuss the report's findings and recommendations. It then will work out the operational implications of the evaluation recommendations and the division of labour and responsibilities for their implementation among the various stakeholders involved. IOE representatives will facilitate the CLP discussions.

Box 2

**Envisaged composition of the Core Learning Programme**

Associate Vice-President, Programme Management Department  
 Associate Vice-President, Strategy and Knowledge Management Department  
 Associate Vice-President, Financial Operations Department  
 Associate Vice-President, Corporate Services Department  
 Director, Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD  
 Secretary of IFAD  
 Director, Office of the President and Vice-President  
 Director, Human Resources Division  
 Director, Office of Partnership and Resource Mobilization  
 Director and Treasurer, Treasury Services Division  
 General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel  
 Senior Advisor to the President, Office of the President and Vice-President  
 High-level experts on selected topics

60. Members of the CLP will be asked to meet various times during the evaluation to discuss the approach paper, the draft final report and other deliverables.
61. The activities of the CLP should be seen in conjunction with the communication and dissemination activities. To ensure effectiveness and focus, the CLP has been limited to a small group of high-level staff who will all be directly involved in IFAD10. However, to capitalize fully on the existing institutional knowledge among all staff, as findings begin to emerge, short briefing sessions may be held, led by the Director, IOE, to allow other staff to provide feedback to the process.

**V. Evaluation team and schedule**

62. IOE will organize a small team of core consultants (evaluation team) to conduct the exercise. The team will be supported on an ad hoc basis by high-level experts for short assignments to address very specific issues. The consultants' team leader – Dorte Kabell – has considerable experience with complex evaluations, including the evaluation of the Paris Declaration Phase I and II, She has been closely involved in replenishment processes at both AsDB and AfDB, at the latter in her capacity as Senior Advisor to the President. The evaluation team between them cover issues in the following areas: evaluation expertise; multilateral financing; political analysis; organizational development; and results-based management. All have considerable knowledge of IFAD. Detailed terms of reference will be developed for each team member and will form the basis for his or her collaboration.
63. The evaluation will, in addition, be supported by two senior independent advisers who will help ensure independent quality assurance of the evaluation process and the evaluation report: Robert Picciotto and Callisto Madavo.
64. Ashwani Muthoo, Acting Director, IOE, will supervise and guide the evaluation team. He will be supported by IOE staff members including Laura Morgia (Assistant to Director IOE) and Francesca Palombo (Intern).
65. The schedule for the evaluation is presented below.

**Schedule for CLE on IFAD's replenishments**

<i>Date</i>	<i>Activity</i>
<b>2012</b>	
December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary dialogue to investigate feasibility, scope and purpose</li> <li>• Concept paper/PowerPoint presentation finalized</li> </ul>
<b>2013</b>	
January	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drafting of approach paper, preliminary evaluative work</li> </ul>
22 February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft approach paper discussed with IFAD Management</li> <li>• Exploratory interviews</li> </ul>
March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exploratory desk review/framing study/evaluability assessment</li> </ul>
3-4 April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach paper presented to the Evaluation Committee of the Executive Board</li> <li>• Inception phase: contracting of evaluation team, finalizing evaluation instruments and detailed timelines. Inception workshop and preparation of inception report</li> </ul>
April-May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review phase for all evaluation components</li> <li>• Mission to comparator organization(s)</li> <li>• Design and administration of survey</li> <li>• Interviews and focus group discussion</li> </ul>
June- July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey analysis</li> </ul>
June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Emerging findings" workshop within IFAD</li> </ul>
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft final report to Management</li> <li>• Management comments on draft report</li> </ul>
October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report transmitted to the Office of the Secretary</li> </ul>
27-28 November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final report discussed at the Evaluation Committee together with IFAD Management's response</li> </ul>
11-12 December	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final report discussed at the Executive Board together with IFAD Management's response</li> </ul>

**VI. Communication and dissemination**

66. An effort will be made to communicate widely throughout the evaluation process. Platforms will be created for exchanges on preliminary findings to capture as many views as possible.
67. A workshop to discuss emerging findings is planned for June, and other short briefing sessions or workshops may be held from April to August 2013, as pertinent and useful.
68. Hard copies of the full evaluation report will be distributed in-house to concerned staff, Executive Board members and others. The main report will not exceed 50 pages. An evaluation Profile and Insight will be prepared, to be distributed more widely both within and outside IFAD. These are two communication tools (two-page brochures) prepared by IOE for a wider audience. The Profile will contain a succinct summary of the evaluation's findings and recommendations. The Insight will focus on one learning theme emerging from the evaluation, with the aim of promoting debate among development practitioners, policymakers and others on the topic.
69. In accordance with the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the Evaluation Committee of the Executive Board, the Committee discusses revisions to corporate-level policies that have been evaluated by IOE or to new policies that have emerged as a follow-up to an IOE CLE. To facilitate the Committee's work in this regard, IOE provides its written comments to the Committee on each policy document that the Evaluation Committee may decide to examine. This will apply to any eventual production of policy/strategy on replenishments by IFAD Management as an outcome of this evaluation. Moreover, as per usual practice, Management will report on the follow-up to the evaluation's recommendations through the President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Action (PRISMA), which is presented to the Board annually.

**Evaluation Framework**

<i>Components</i>	<i>Key Questions</i>	<i>Key activities</i>
<b>Phase I – framing study/ evaluability assessment</b>		
<i>Replenishment Objectives</i>	<p><i>What do interviewees see as the objectives of the Replenishment process?</i></p> <p><i>Is there a perceived consensus on these objectives?</i></p> <p><i>Have there been shifts over time?</i></p> <p><i>Are there indications of future changes in these objectives?</i></p> <p><i>Do they remain relevant?</i></p>	<p><i>Interviews with Deputies, Board members, and Management</i></p>
<b>Phase II, III, IV</b>		
<i>Replenishments and Change</i>	<p><i>To what extent and with what results have Replenishment consultations triggered or influenced policy and organizational change?</i></p> <p><i>How has IFAD Management demonstrated leadership of the processes?</i></p> <p><i>How do these changes compare to those resulting from Replenishments in peer organizations?</i></p> <p><i>Is there an equal responsiveness to issues raised by the different lists, and how different are they?</i></p>	<p><i>Interviews with Management and Board members</i></p> <p><i>Document Review</i></p> <p><i>Comparative analysis of Peers</i></p> <p><i>Case study of key policy commitment from a replenishment</i></p>
<i>Voice, Representation and accountability</i>	<p><i>Are the distinctive mandates, accountability, and reciprocal obligations of Management, the Executive Board, the Governing Bodies, and the Replenishment Deputies respectively, clear, well disseminated and explained, and well understood and respected by all parties?</i></p> <p><i>What is the relative and effective weight of participation and representation in the replenishment exercise – formal (Deputies) and informal (Observers), by list, capacity and level of participation?</i></p> <p><i>Is there a perceived need to adjust rules governing the link between voting rights and funding obligations in the replenishment process?</i></p> <p><i>Is the process of ensuring consensus on the scope and level of Replenishments sufficiently broad based, and is there scope for more informal working groups to deepen and widen the dialogue, during and in between Replenishments?</i></p> <p><i>Do the MTR and RIDE constitute effective accountability mechanisms?</i></p>	<p><i>Interviews with Management, Deputies and Board member and peers</i></p> <p><i>Document Review</i></p>
<i>Effectiveness and Results</i>	<p><i>Have all Replenishment commitments been fulfilled, or are on track to be fulfilled? If not, what explanations can be given?</i></p> <p><i>Are monitoring mechanisms and reporting instruments for the Replenishment decisions and commitments adequate, consistent with, and aligned to the Results Measurement Framework?</i></p> <p><i>How did the introduction of a Results Framework affect the Replenishment process, including in terms of volume of resources committed?</i></p> <p><i>How large a share of IFAD's resources is spent within the Results Framework agreed by Deputies?</i></p> <p><i>What results are not captured by the Results Framework?</i></p>	<p><i>Interviews with Management, Deputies and Board members</i></p> <p><i>Document Review</i></p>
<i>Future Financing Framework</i>	<p><i>What would be the implications for IFAD of declining replenishments and an increasing share of non-core funding in terms of effectiveness and governance?</i></p> <p><i>In terms of relevance, what are the implications of expected changes in the sources of financing, i.e. types of donors, types of funds, including funding from emerging and non-government donors? ? Is there a potential conflict between classical cofinancing and alternative sources? Are there lessons from peers?</i></p> <p><i>Can the current quality of funding be upheld in the future, i.e. no tying, concessionality, no conditionality?</i></p> <p><i>What are examples of possible innovative financing mechanisms, and are there useful lessons from peers?</i></p> <p><i>What are the most important reasons why IFAD is currently not in a position to raise funds through the capital markets?</i></p>	<p><i>Interviews with Management, Deputies, Board members, and peers</i></p> <p><i>Document Review</i></p> <p><i>Scanning of trends from IFIs/UN funding sources</i></p>

<p><i>Relevance and Effectiveness of the Replenishment Process</i></p>	<p><i>What are the direct and indirect costs of each Replenishment exercise?</i></p> <p><i>Is the 3-year replenishment period appropriate? Is the number and location of meetings for each replenishment appropriate?</i></p> <p><i>What has been the effect of incremental improvements that have been made over time, including the introduction of an independent chair for IFAD9?</i></p> <p><i>In terms of legitimacy, effectiveness, efficiency and impact, how wide should the scope of replenishment discussions and commitments be, i.e. number of recommendations and level of detail? How prescriptive should Deputies be? How well does IFAD use replenishment discussions to advocate the role of smallholders?</i></p> <p><i>To what extent are issues common to those raised in replenishments of peers?</i></p> <p><i>To what extent has communication to all stakeholders contributed to strengthen the process?</i></p> <p><i>What explanations can be given for the relatively larger replenishments of peer institutions and are there good practices from peers that IFAD should consider?</i></p>	<p><i>Interviews with Management, Deputies and Board members and former Chair</i></p> <p><i>Document Review</i></p>
--	---	---