

Harmonization Agreement between IFAD's independent evaluation and self-evaluation methods and systems

(2011)

Background

1. The Peer Review of IFAD's Office of Evaluation and Evaluation Function recommended that IOE and IFAD management update the harmonization agreement signed in 2006, bringing it in line with developments in IFAD's independent and self-evaluation functions over the past 4 years.

2. This note therefore includes the areas (listed below) that require further harmonization between IFAD's independent and self-evaluation methods and systems. The Associate Vice President of the Programme Management Department and the Director of the Office of Evaluation fully subscribe to the below provisions and their timely implementation.

Project Evaluations

3. PMD in due course will update the self-assessment system in such a way that it allows the use of same evaluation criteria (including for gender, scaling up and climate change), as and when applicable, as contained in Evaluation Manual (and its recent expansion) in Project Status Reports, Supervision Reports, Mid Terms Reviews, Project Completion Reports and the in-house portfolio review process. PMD might however rate additional evaluation criteria - over and above those included in the Evaluation Manual - or use sub-areas or sub-domains (e.g., measure agricultural productivity gains within the domain of food security). Additional indicators will be used particularly in relation to the activities/input and output areas, which are not explicitly covered by independent evaluation.

4. PMD should use the same or equivalent guiding questions to make an assessment of each criterion contained in the Evaluation Manual and its expansion.

5. Ratings on a six point scale should be provided in IFAD self-evaluation reports (see paragraph 3 above), as per the Evaluation Manual across each evaluation criteria adopted therein.

6. The ratings should be shared with the concerned regional division director and CPM as well as the government.

7. It is important that PCR ratings are provided by PMD to IOE in three to four batches, beginning end January of each year and completed by end-March, to facilitate the production of the ARRI for the December Board. The dates for sharing of each batch of PCRs along with the ratings will be agreed between the PMD and IOE at the start of each calendar year.

Results-based COSOP Review

8. PMD will follow the same methodology for COSOP completion reviews, as contained in the Evaluation Manual for CPEs. This includes using and rating the same three key criteria, namely portfolio performance, non-lending activities (disaggregated by Knowledge Management, policy dialogue and partnership building), and COSOP performance (in terms of relevance and effectiveness).

9. The COSOP completion reviews should also contain an overall government IFAD partnership ratings, building on the ratings for the three key CPE criteria (see preceding paragraph).

PRISMA

10. The PRISMA will continue to report on the implementation of recommendations contained in CLEs, thematic evaluations and CPEs.

11. As already agreed by IOE and the IFAD management, there will be no Agreement at Completion Points for Project Completion Report Validations (PCRVs) and Project Performance Assessments (PPAs). However, starting from its 2011 edition, the PRISMA will include a new section reporting on the follow-up to the recommendations Management found feasible in the PCRVs and PPAs. The PRISMA will also include an inventory in a matrix format (possibly to be included in an Annex) of recommendations not adopted by the Management with a short explanation why they were not found pertinent.

12. The final PRISMA will be provided to IOE for its written comments four weeks before it is planned for presentation to the Evaluation Committee.