

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP



**ADB/IFAD: A JOINT EVALUATION OF AGRICULTURE AND
RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA**

Draft Approach Paper

**OPERATIONS EVALUATION DEPARTMENT
(OPEV)**

27 October 2006

**AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK
&
INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT**

**A JOINT EVALUATION OF AGRICULTURE AND
RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA**

Draft Approach Paper

**Operations Evaluation Department (AfDB)
and
Office of Evaluation (IFAD)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page N°.
Abbreviations and Acronyms	i
Summary Note	ii
I Background, Rationale and Jointness	1
II Feasibility and Risk Management	3
III Agricultural and Rural Development Context in Africa	5
IV Policies and Strategies for ARD in the AfDB and IFAD	6
V Evaluation Objectives and Sources of Evidence	8
VI The Evaluation Framework	13
VII Scope of Work and Country Choice	13
VIII Methods	15
IX Governance and Management	18
X Overview of Tasks and Indicative Composition of the Evaluation Team	19
XI Deliverables, Timetable and Resources	20
XII Communication and Outreach	22
<u>Annex</u>	<u>N°. of Pages</u>
Annex 1 Draft Timetable for the AfDB/IFAD Joint Evaluation	2

This Draft Approach Paper was prepared by a Consultant, Mr. Roger SLADE, on behalf of the African Development Bank (AfDB) and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). Any further matters relating to this Paper should be addressed to Mr. D. A. BARNETT, Acting Director, OPEV, extension 2041.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AfDB	African Development Bank
AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ARD	Agriculture and Rural Development
BOAD	West African Development Bank
BSF	Belgian Survival Fund
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DBSA	Development Bank of Southern Africa
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECOWAS	Economic Commission for West African States
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GNP	Gross National Product
IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
OE	Office of Evaluation of the International Fund for Agriculture Development
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPEV	Operations Evaluation Department (AfDB)
PBAS	Planning, Budgeting and Allocation System
PPER	Project Performance Evaluation Report
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper

A JOINT EVALUATION OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA
DRAFT APPROACH PAPER

SUMMARY NOTE

1. CODE members will recall the Information Note (ADB/BD/IF/2006/241/Rev.2 of 4 October 2006) sent by OPEV on its intent to undertake a joint evaluation of the agriculture sector assistance with IFAD and to submit the (draft) approach paper of the joint evaluation to CODE just as soon as it is finalized in late October / early November.
2. The joint evaluation would have two principal objectives:
 - (i) to assess the performance and impact of AfDB's and IFAD's agriculture and rural development policies and operations in Africa during 1996-2005; and
 - (ii) to develop a series of findings and recommendations that would serve as building blocks for future operational modalities for, and between AfDB and IFAD, in Africa.
3. The purpose of the Approach Paper is to present the background and rationale of the joint evaluation of the agriculture sector assistance and to suggest the evaluation framework which captures and develops the main questions the evaluation would seek to cover together with the proposed evaluation methodology. The Approach Paper also provides suggestions for the governance and management of the evaluation and the deliverables timetables and resources.
4. The core evaluation is expected to cost a total of up to US\$ 1.287 million and the two institutions would equally contribute to this cost. Plans are under consideration for the potential creation of a funds pooling arrangement in order to facilitate implementation.
5. The Core Evaluation Team will consist of five internationally recruited consultants. This Evaluation Team will meet the highest quality standards commensurate with the tasks to be accomplished, the timetable and availability and diversity considerations.
6. The first deliverable of the evaluation will be an Inception Report. It will contain a final description of the evaluation methodology and framework, the specific projects and countries to be covered, articulate the instruments for data collection, as well as provide a detailed roadmap and timetable for the evaluation. The Inception Report will be submitted to CODE once available. The last deliverable will be a Final Report which is expected to be submitted around September 2008. In between will come a number of intermediate deliverables. These reports will mainly be desk reports.

7. A communications plan will be prepared early in the evaluation process and included in the Inception Report. The advent of the evaluation would be preceded by an identical and simultaneous announcement, by both organizations that would briefly explain the purpose, methods and expected benefits of the evaluation. From the outset, the evaluation would be as open and transparent as possible, with all key documents being published on the two institutions websites. And, early in the overall timetable, and before the Inception Report is finalized, a stakeholder workshop would be held to elicit comment and suggestions on the substance of the evaluation as well as to assist in spreading information about its goals and methods.
8. A Core Learning Partnership will be constituted for the evaluation, which will provide inputs at key stages during the evaluation, and serve as a key instrument for enhancing communication. The composition of the Core Learning Partnership made up of key stakeholders internal and external to the institutions, will be defined during the inception phase of the evaluation.
9. Finally, at a suitable time after the draft final report has been tabled an international workshop would be convened to discuss the evaluation's findings and recommendations. It is hoped that this gathering may prove to be a convenient moment for IFAD and the AFDB to engage others in a discussion of a long run strategy for African agriculture and rural development.
10. OPEV seeks CODE's approval and guidance to pursue further this important endeavor.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK
&
INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

A JOINT EVALUATION OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA

Draft Approach Paper

I. BACKGROUND, RATIONALE AND JOINTNESS

1. **Background:** Agricultural and rural development is moving up the world development agenda. And, in Africa, meeting their challenges is being seen as the key to greater prosperity, more jobs, faster poverty reduction and achievement of the MDGs.¹ For example, there is good evidence of strong growth multipliers from agriculture in Africa.² However, agricultural and rural development can no longer be treated as an undifferentiated whole, amenable to simple ideas about integrated development. Differentiation is needed which will allow policies and instruments to be calibrated to different agendas such as growth, vital sub-sectors, domestic and international competitiveness, poverty reduction and environmental sustainability.

2. IFAD and the AfDB are both important players in agriculture and rural development in Africa. In this sense they are natural partners. They have been grappling with agricultural and rural development since 1968 (AfDB) and 1978 (IFAD) and have provided the continent with a combined cumulative total of more than \$10 billion in loans and grants for agriculture and rural development. This sum increases to \$17 billion when co-financing and borrower contributions are included. These are substantial sums, yet by common consent results have been less than hoped for.³ Hence, there is a need to take stock of what has been achieved and what has been learned to help set the course for the future.

¹ This is not to imply that there are no other challenges or that growth and poverty reduction are solely dependent on agriculture. There are many other challenges and several other sectors that must combine to produce growth with equity. However, the early growth that is needed to start the process of materially reducing poverty is most likely to come from higher agricultural (including, forestry and fisheries) production.

² These multipliers lie in the range 1.5 – 2.7. See Spencer D.S.C. 1995. Past Trends and Future Prospects for Agriculture Development in Sub-Saharan Africa. Paper presented to a workshop on Agricultural Transformation in Africa, September 26-29, Abidjan.

³ There is considerable evidence from evaluative work in IFAD, the AfDB and the World Bank of the relatively disappointing results of aid in Africa. For example only around half of all evaluated projects have a satisfactory and sustainable overall impact. There is also abundant evidence from studies at research institutions such as ODI and IDS and the work done to support the UK's Commission on Africa.

3. **Rationale:** A focus on Africa is entirely natural for the AfDB but it is also highly relevant for IFAD whose global operations are organized into five regions, three of which cover Africa.⁴ Moreover, both institutions have partnerships with regional institutions in Africa such as NEPAD, the West African Development Bank (BOAD) and the the Belgian Survival Fund (BSF), in addition to a joint partnership agreement between them. They administer region specific grant programmes and participate in international initiatives such as the Special Programme for Africa. Thus an evaluation with a clear focus on the continent as a whole as well as its sub-regions has a high natural degree of utility for management in both institutions.

4. In IFAD operations in Africa comprise more than 40% of the ongoing portfolio. Naturally, accountability for the management of such substantial resources is a matter of considerable institutional importance. Additionally, unlike the AfDB's focus on a single continent, IFAD's African agenda is managed by its three regional divisions, each guided by its own strategy and annual work programmes.⁵ Similarly, in the AfDB agriculture and rural development operations constitute about one third of the ongoing project portfolio that has been guided by a policy and strategy defined in the late 1990's and whose current relevance and efficacy is thought to be doubtful.

5. Moreover, Africa, like other large geographical and geo-political units has a certain natural integrity, although its agro-climatic, cultural and institutional diversity suggests this notion should not be over-emphasized. Nevertheless, Africa, as a continent, has long been recognized as worthy of special consideration. There are, for example, organizations such as the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), the Economic Commission for West African States (ECOWAS) and the AfDB itself, all specifically devoted to the pursuit of African development. More recently the advent of the new Economic Programme for African Development (NEPAD)⁶ and the report of the UK's Commission for Africa have refocused international attention on the need for updated policies and strategies tailored to Africa's needs.

6. Both the AfDB and IFAD are driven by the need for more and deeper rural knowledge as well as better internalization and external dissemination of that knowledge. A comprehensive sector evaluation is a key instrument for helping to satisfy such needs, and is likely to be especially valuable in adding knowledge about what works in important sub-sector and thematic areas such as gender, empowerment, pastoralism, small-holder agriculture, water resource management and fisheries.

7. The evaluation would be timely. For example, July 2007 will see the release of the World Bank's World Development Report, which will focus on Agriculture. The World Bank is also planning a global evaluation (for delivery in 2008) of its work in the agricultural sector based on performance in key regions such as Africa. FAO's strategy and performance in Africa will be examined in the context of an ongoing independent external evaluation to be completed in 2007. Some bilateral donors (e.g. DfID) are also re-assessing their approach to agriculture in Africa.

⁴ These are: West and Central Africa, East and South Africa, and Near East and North Africa Regions. From the latter only the African counties of Algeria, Djibouti, Egypt, Morocco, Somalia, Sudan, and Tunisia would be relevant to the joint evaluation.

⁵ Regardless of the future of such strategies in IFAD, the questions of performance and accountability for resource use remain.

⁶ The AFDB houses NEPAD's Secretariat.

8. The evaluation would also provide an opportunity to draw together the substantial volume of evaluative evidence about success and failure in African agricultural and rural development accumulated in recent years by the two institutions as well as by others and to tap research knowledge about the rural sector generated by organizations such as FAO, the World Bank and IFPRI. Hence, the proposed evaluation can be expected to provide IFAD and the AfDB with independent evidence for use in forthcoming international discussions of agriculture and rural development in Africa.

9. These common interests, substantial operational similarities, the potential for mutual learning, the growing international focus on development results, achievement of the MDG's and greater international cooperation all argue for a collaborative or joint evaluation. Moreover, the evaluation may also serve to promote a fuller operational partnership between IFAD (and its global mandate) and the AfDB (and its regional mandate).

10. **Jointness:** It is generally recognized that joint evaluations confer a greater degree of independence and deepen accountability and learning, compared with evaluations done solely by one agency of its own policies and programmes. On the other hand they also tend to increase costs and risks.

11. The proposed evaluation would have a high degree of jointness. This means that the evaluation would be governed by the evaluation policies of the two institutions, share the same evaluation framework, criteria and methods, be conducted by a single team of evaluators and that there would be a joint report at the end. It also means that the management and administration would be jointly undertaken. Such an evaluation, between two independent international agencies of their own programmes would be path breaking and, if successfully accomplished, would (as called for in the Paris and Rome declarations) contribute substantially to the harmonization of agricultural development policy in Africa as well as the alignment of evaluation practice.

12. The high degree of jointness will also extend to the budget which, it is planned, will be shared equally. This is consistent with the two organizations level of activity in Africa during the past ten years when they have funded roughly equal numbers of projects (130 for IFAD, 140 for AfDB). Although, IFAD has provided a greater level of agriculture and rural development (ARD) funding in Africa than the AfDB since they both started work. Equal funding in two party joint evaluations helps to ensure an equality of effort and control, funding asymmetry tends to create a superior/inferior relationship and is inimical to successful joint endeavors.

II. FEASIBILITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT

13. **Feasibility:** As described below the evaluation is fully feasible. It derives from an initial impetus in the AfDB directed toward a continent wide study of its own policies and performance in the agriculture sector for which there was broad support. Subsequently the idea that there should be a joint evaluation was inspired by President's Kaberuka and Bage. In IFAD the evaluation has the broad support of the Evaluation Committee of the Board and the Operations complex. Broad feasibility is assured by this strong array of commitment and by careful assessment of the technical and organizational challenges by OE and OPEV. Moreover, and as shown in Section IV, there is a very close correspondence between the two institutions corporate goals, strategic objectives and operational instruments.

14. At an early point thought was given to broadening the joint arrangement to include FAO and the World Bank. Eventually these potential partners were ruled out on the grounds that timetables were difficult to coordinate and the unknown degree of additional complexity (and cost) that would be added. Moreover, the hopes of fostering improved partnership between IFAD and the AfDB are likely to be best served by an evaluation jointly undertaken by the two parties alone.

15. From a technical viewpoint both institutions have the capacity to conduct the evaluation. Indeed, OE in IFAD is particularly experienced having recently successfully managed the Independent External Evaluation of IFAD (the IEE) and an evaluation of IFAD's regional strategy in Asia. Likewise OPEV successfully managed the Independent Evaluation of the ADF VII-IX in 2003.

16. Adequate funds have been included in the 2007 budget submissions of OE and OPEV which are pending approval by the governing bodies of the two institutions. Plans are under consideration for the potential creation of a funds pooling arrangement in order to facilitate implementation. Both institutions have the requisite day-to day management capacity and the ability to efficiently recruit and supervise a substantial team of international consultants.

17. **Risk Management:** As many commentators have noted joint evaluations are more risky than single owner studies. This is because there is increased scope for disagreement about methods, priorities or findings, actual or perceived financial shortcomings and because the reputations of the evaluation units and the agencies as a whole are on the line. Both parties realize that these risks are real. Moreover, neither AfDB nor IFAD have so far carried out any true joint evaluations with other major partners. For both institutions this would be a first.

18. The firm ownership by management in both institutions gives the evaluation special strength, but does not eliminate all risks. Accordingly, IFAD and AfDB plan to put in place appropriate risk mitigation measures, by reaching firm advance agreements and by building mutual trust. A key element will be a Memorandum of Understanding that, *inter alia*, would spell out the obligations of both parties, define how the evaluation would be managed, partition the budget, provide a simple protocol governing communications, spell out terms of reference for an Oversight Committee and procedures for periodic review and dispute resolution.

19. Additionally, the principal components of the evaluation will be phased, largely undertaken as discreet tasks, and have clear deliverables and timetables. This should make monitoring relatively easy and provide opportunities for stocktaking and adjustment as the evaluation proceeds. Organizational clarity, minimal task overlap (consistent with an integrated evaluation) and realistic schedules will do much to manage the risks adduced above. But above all, an evaluation conducted in a spirit of cooperation, openness and equality is the greatest guarantor of a smooth passage.

III. AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT IN AFRICA

20. Against a continent wide background of political instability, conflict, and drought and despite recent improvements in overall economic growth,⁷ economic fundamentals have improved only slowly.⁸ Similarly, agriculture output, which accounts for about 37% of Africa's GNP, has been increasing only slowly for many years. At the same time population, despite the ravages of AIDS, has increased slightly faster so that agricultural output per capita was the same in 2003 as in 1980, and was lower for most of the intervening period. Accordingly, food availability per caput has declined compared to a generation ago and chronic food insecurity has increased. Indeed, over the forty-five years since 1961 calorie availability per capita in Africa as a whole has only increased by about 15%, but in sub-Saharan Africa it has scarcely changed at all. At the end of the 1990's, 30 countries had over 20 percent of their population undernourished and in 18 of these, over 35 percent of the population were chronically hungry.

21. In line with the rise in the number of hungry people, there has been a progressive growth in food imports.⁹ Imports of agricultural products have been rising faster than exports since the 1960s and Africa as a whole has been a net agricultural importing region since 1980. Agriculture now accounts for less than 20 percent of total merchandise exports from Africa, having declined from over 50 percent in the 1960s.

22. Unlike in other regions of the world, the productivity of agriculture per worker in Africa has declined during the past twenty years. Value-added per worker averaged just \$365 during the 1990s (constant 1995 \$). This is 12 percent lower than in 1980, when value-added per worker stood at \$424. Although these data are somewhat out of date, they are not thought to have greatly changed since 2000.

23. Low agricultural productivity is the product of many factors including weakly integrated markets, deficient infrastructure and a weak knowledge base. Among these factors R&D has a special place. Yet, agricultural yields have been level or falling for many crops in many countries of Africa. Significantly, yields of the most important food crops (maize, millet, sorghum, yams, cassava, groundnuts) in most African countries are no higher today than in 1980. Cereal yields average 1,120 kg per hectare, compared with 2,067 kg per hectare for the world as a whole. Low productivity has seriously eroded the competitiveness of African agricultural products on world markets. While distorted trade arrangements with OECD countries as well as the difficulties of intra-African trade, have made matters worse. Africa's share of total world agricultural trade fell from 8 percent in 1965 to 3 percent in the mid nineteen nineties.

24. Low productivity is the result of low investment in all the factors that contribute to agricultural growth. For example, public spending for agricultural research in Africa stagnated in the 1980s and the 1990s at about US\$1.2 billion per year, only slightly higher than the level reached in 1976. As a result public spending on agricultural research in Africa as a share of agricultural GDP has also declined, from a peak in 1981 of 0.93 percent to 0.69 percent in 1991 and to about 0.53 in 2001.

⁷ Continent wide GDP has grown by an average of nearly 5% for the past two years, but such growth has been mal-distributed and largely reflects sharply higher world commodity prices.

⁸ In several of the poorest countries the HIPC initiative has recently greatly helped to improve fiscal balance.

⁹ The remainder of this section draws on the African Development Report 2004, ADB, Oxford, 2004.

25. Thus, on a continental scale, the cumulative effect of the past forty years of policies, programmes and projects - funded by donors and governments alike - on the rate of agricultural growth and on rural poverty has been highly unsatisfactory. Tellingly, the absolute number of poor people in sub-Saharan Africa is increasing – 227 million in 1990 and 314 million in 2001 and 70 percent of them are women.

26. In sum, extensive aid to the agriculture sector from multiple donors, but slow or stagnant agricultural growth provides the context in which the role, performance and impact of the AfDB's and IFAD's work in the rural sector must be evaluated. The wide scope of the two institutions actions in agriculture and rural development as mandated by their current policies and strategies provide a challenging evaluative agenda.

IV. POLICIES AND STRATEGIES FOR ARD IN THE AfDB AND IFAD

27. The current ARD policy in the AfDB and the regional strategies for Africa in IFAD were developed to meet and overcome shortcomings in existing policy and strategic frameworks. Strategies that seemed not to be meeting the challenges posed by important constraints in the rural sector (e.g. population growth, endemic drought and environmental degradation, inadequate infrastructure complex land tenure systems, weak financial intermediation and the spread of HIV aids). Nor did they pay enough attention to the wider needs of rural communities such as empowerment and better governance and they were not focused sharply enough on reducing poverty.

28. Thus in the AfDB, a new and comprehensive policy for agriculture and rural development was crafted during 1998 and 1999¹⁰ and in IFAD three new sub-continental strategies were developed in 2001 and 2002.¹¹ The resulting policy and strategic frameworks are summarized in Table 1 that shows there is a very close correspondence between the goals, strategic objectives and instruments of the two institutions.

29. The AfDB tends to emphasize economic growth and its determinants rather more than IFAD, the latter stresses self-help, capacity building, equity and empowerment. Both use an almost identical array of instruments in pursuit of their objectives. This close correspondence of objectives and instruments adds to the feasibility of a joint evaluation and makes it legitimate, as well as practical, to use a common evaluation framework (Section VI) and the same evaluation toolkit.

¹⁰ Agriculture and Rural Development Sector: Bank Group Policy, OCOD, African Development Bank, January 2000, Abidjan.

¹¹ Regional Strategy Papers Near East and North Africa, Eastern and Southern Africa, and Western and Central Africa, IFAD, 2002.

Table 1. Strategic Objectives for Agriculture and Rural Development

	AfDB (1998-2008)	IFAD (2202-06)
Corporate Goals	Play a leading catalytic role in supporting the technological, institutional and policy changes that will trigger a lasting transformation of the rural economies of regional member countries, by empowering their rural populations in order to improve their productivity and real incomes in an equitable and environmentally sustainable manner.	Enable the poor to overcome their poverty by fostering social development, gender equity, income generation, improved nutrition, environmental sustainability and good governance through empowering poor people, giving them more and better knowledge, expanding their influence on policy and enhancing their bargaining power in the marketplace. ¹²
Strategic Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accelerated growth with equity via better/more: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • private sector and agribusiness development • regional cooperation and integration • technology generation and adoption • rural financial intermediation • irrigation development 2. Poverty reduction and greater food security via: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased farm output • better infrastructure • market improvement • land tenure reform • more off-farm jobs 3. Natural resource management and environmental protection 4. Human and institutional capacity building especially at the grass roots 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen the capacity of the rural poor through empowerment and institution building 2. improve rural development policies 3. Raise agricultural and natural resource productivity and improve access to technology 4. Increase access to financial and other markets 5. Reduce vulnerability to major shocks 6. Diversify rural employment
Cross-cutting themes	None specifically identified in the policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender equity • Participation • Using indigenous knowledge • innovation
Instruments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in depth sector work • policy dialogue with, and advice to, governments • investment projects • regional projects/grants • grants • partnerships • knowledge management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy dialogue, with government but mostly with civil society • investment projects • regional grants • grants • partnerships • knowledge management

¹² From the Strategic Framework for IFAD 2002 – 2006, Rome, 2002.

V. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

30. The joint evaluation would have two principal objectives:

- (i) to assess the performance and impact of AfDB's and IFAD's agriculture and rural development policies and operations in Africa during 1996-2005; and
- (ii) to develop a series of findings and recommendations that would serve as building blocks for future operational modalities for, and between AfDB and IFAD, in Africa.

31. The evaluation will seek to answer four overarching questions in order to achieve its main objectives:

- (i) In assessing the AfDB's and IFAD's performance in the continent, what have been the opportunities and constraints in achieving developmental results?
- (ii) Have AfDB and IFAD made appropriate strategic choices with respect to sub-sector and geographic focus, emphasis on target groups, selection of partner institutions, and the range of instruments deployed?
- (iii) How have business and management processes in both organizations contributed to their performance, impact and strategic objectives?
- (iv) How useful has the partnership agreement between AfDB and IFAD been and what is the two agencies relative comparative advantage in furthering their common objective of reducing poverty in Africa?

32. To facilitate the work of the evaluation team and to ensure that stakeholders are able to gain an overview of, and comment on, the main issues being covered, a detailed, but provisional, evaluation framework has been prepared (Section VI), which captures and develops the main questions the evaluation would seek to cover and links them to the overarching questions above. The evaluation framework will be finalized during the inception phase of the evaluation.

33. **Sources of Evidence:** To be persuasive the evaluation must assemble credible evidence. That is evidence that is relevant, demonstrably fair and as accurate as possible. Moreover, because it is forward looking (formative) as well as retrospective (summative) it is essential to ensure that as evidence is assembled it provides an adequate basis for both forms of evaluation. These two forms are tightly connected. The forward looking aspects depend crucially on sound evidence from the retrospective aspects. In other words the road ahead depends in part on the road just traveled.

34. Equally, because resources are limited the sources of, and ways in which, data are collected must be circumscribed. For example, not all documents can be examined, not all countries can be visited and not all knowledgeable people can be interviewed. Thus choices must be made about what will be covered and what will not. Informing these choices is the need to get as much relevant and reliable evidence as possible given the time and resources available.

35. Using a range of instruments¹³ evidence will be drawn from three sources: i) internal and external databases and documents, ii) knowledgeable persons and iii) by direct observation of the institutions' programmes and projects in borrower countries. Although direct observation is a much more expensive source of evidence than the others it is indispensable. There is no other way of forming an independent and credible view of IFAD's and the AfDB's work in their client countries than to take the time to visit their projects and to speak to their partners and the people they seek to help.

36. This observation is doubly true in this evaluation as there is a substantial evaluation gap. Hence, about half of completed operations in the AfDB lack Project Completion Reports (PCR's) and there are few Project Performance Evaluation Reports (PPER's). In IFAD the situation in Africa is very similar.¹⁴ Moreover, in IFAD there is also evidence that parts of Africa are measurably under-evaluated compared with other parts and with other world regions. While there are a number of country agricultural sector evaluations in AfDB and a number of recent country programme evaluations in IFAD these do not fill the gap, partly because they cover only a few countries and in the AfDB refer only to older closed projects. Because of the formative nature of the evaluation it is essential to take account of the most recent evidence, that is, to examine ongoing operations that have not been subjected to independent assessment. This requirement further widens the evaluation gap.

37. Nevertheless, independent evaluative evidence does exist and will be used to the maximum extent possible so as to keep the extent and depth of country work to an irreducible minimum. Thus, all available evaluations produced by IFAD and the AfDB in recent years and which pertain to this evaluation will be used as primary sources, and supplemented by additional field investigation only where essential. Similarly, the 2007 work programmes of both evaluation units are expected to yield additional evidence that will complement or supplement (and even substitute for) this continent wide evaluation. For example, evaluations in the 2006-7 work programmes that relate to countries eventually studied in the joint evaluation will be used to reduce the level of effort on those countries, while evaluations in the 2007 work programmes that relate to countries in Africa that are not, in the end, visited as part of the joint evaluation will be used as complementary sources.

¹³ Documents will be systematically interrogated, performance criteria and ratings applied and data quantitatively analyzed. Formal and informal field interviews techniques with beneficiaries, rapid rural appraisal and focus groups will be used where appropriate. Where possible electronic and telephone surveys/interviews will also be used.

¹⁴ In both organizations PCR's are often prepared long after project completion.

Table 2: Evaluation Framework, Key Questions and Sources of Information

Evaluation Framework	Key Questions	Sources of Information
I. EVALUATION OF AfDB's AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY AND IFAD's STRATEGIES		
<p>1. <i>Relevance and synergies of AfDB's ARD policy and IFAD's regional strategies.</i></p> <p>1.1 Overall approach and effectiveness of process of policy/strategy formulation</p> <p>1.2 Relevance of strategic choices and priorities, and quality and depth of sub-sector policies</p> <p>1.3 Consistency of regional strategies with institutional goals and related sub-sector policies</p> <p>1.4 Alignment of AfDB's policy and IFAD's strategies</p> <p>1.5 Coherence between country strategies and corporate strategies for Africa</p> <p>1.6 Complementarity with bilateral, regional and other multilateral organizations policies</p> <p>1.7 Consistency with state of the art policy knowledge and extent of policy innovation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have policy and strategies evolved to meet changing regional aspirations and circumstances? Have they been flexible enough to meet diverse country needs? • Is the policy/strategy relevant to the current development context? Is it consistent with current corporate goals? • To what extent does the policy/strategy reflect relative institutional comparative advantage? How well aligned are the two agencies approaches? • What analytic work was undertaken to inform the preparation of the policy/strategy and what was the consultative process followed? • To what extent are the policy/strategies complementary to that of the World Bank and major bi-laterals? • How enabling are the policy/strategic frameworks at the country level? • How well do the agencies current policies (sector-wide and sub-sectoral) reflect state of the art thinking about rural development policy? • Are the policies/strategies in them selves innovative? • Has policy/strategy contributed to regional integration? • Did the strategies clear articulate the need for retrofitting, and were ongoing programmes retrofitted to new relevant policies and strategies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of internal agriculture/rural development policy/strategy documents • Assess strategy formulation process and resources used by PI for the purpose • Review of agriculture/rural development strategy documents of other bi- and multi-lateral organizations • Review of PRSPs and other relevant strategy documents of national governments • Literature reviews of agricultural and rural development policy • Discussions with borrower and other agencies

<p>2. Resource Allocation (loans and grants)</p> <p>2.1 Effectiveness of resource allocation frameworks, e.g. PBAS</p> <p>2.2 Allocation among sub-regions, countries and sub-sectors</p> <p>2.3 Allocation against the main strategic objectives and choices</p> <p>2.4 Relevance of loan size and allocation within countries</p> <p>2.5 Co-financing levels and effectiveness</p> <p>2.6 Role of public/private partnerships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the patterns of resource allocation within and across countries? • Is resource allocation (at regional, country and project levels) consistent with strategic objectives? • How effective are current resource allocation systems, to what extent have they improved during the evaluation period? • What has been the scale and trend of co-financing? Who are the main co-financiers and is there specific management guidance for mobilization of such resources? Do staff have incentives to mobilize co-financing? • How effective has co-financing been in supplementing agency and borrower resources? • What is the effect of co-financing on project design and size? • How well have grants been used to pursue strategic objectives, and are they adequately linked to the lending programme? • What has been the value and effectiveness of public/private partnerships? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal budget and programme data • Review of PBA frameworks • Review and trends in co-financing data • Comparative data from World Bank • Perspectives of main co-financiers • Data of on actual allocation of counterpart funding within countries. • Borrower views on co-financing
<p>II. EVALUATION OF KEY BUSINESS PROCESSES</p>		
<p>3. Management and organizational dimensions</p> <p>3.1. Organizational structure</p> <p>3.2. Decision-making and delegation</p> <p>3.3. Human resources management</p> <p>3.4. Financial management, including administrative budget allocation and utilization</p> <p>3.5. Internal monitoring systems</p> <p>3.6. Country presence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the current organizational structure including reporting arrangements? Is the present structure appropriate for achieving the overall objectives of AfDB and IFAD? • What is the level of human resources in each organization? What is the level of female staff recruitment? What is the nationality mix?. Is the skill mix consistent with strategic goals and has the recruitment of new staff taken into account evolving requirements? To what extent is there emphasis on learning, training and human capital renewal? Are staff evaluations systematic? What is the relationship between staff performance ratings and results. • Is the allocation of administrative budgets (including grants and trust funds available) consistent with agency strategic priorities? What are the utilization levels? • What and how effective are the internal monitoring systems used to track the implementation of annual work programmes and budgets? • What are the country presence arrangements and how do they contribute to advancing institutional objectives? What is their role in relation to HQ, and do they have the required resources and delegated authority? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews and discussion with operational units • Review of internal POWB documents • Data on organizational structure, staff levels, skills mix, staff job descriptions and performance evaluations • HR data on consultants • Financial/budget data from Strategic Planning and Budget Division and Controllers Office • Observation and discussion at country level

<p>4. Knowledge management, innovations and learning processes</p> <p>4.1. Scope and quality of self evaluation activities</p> <p>4.2. Extent and effectiveness of knowledge capturing, storage and sharing</p> <p>4.3. Use of evaluation results and follow-up</p> <p>4.4. Extent and relevance of knowledge links to other organizations</p> <p>4.5. Allocation of time and resources for knowledge management</p> <p>4.6. Use of knowledge management for promotion of innovations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the current level and quality of self-evaluation? Are there obstacles to improvement? • How is self-evaluation used? How is resulting knowledge captured? • What are the key instruments for knowledge management and are adequate resources allocated for the purpose? • Do staff have time and incentives to participate in knowledge management processes? • Is knowledge systematically collected from external sources? • Is there an institutional and accessible knowledge data base? • What access do staff and consultants have to institutional lessons learned? • What mechanisms are used to ensure new operations benefit from past experience? How is learning from OE/OPEV evaluations undertaken? How is knowledge management used to replicate and upscale innovations? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with staff • Interviews with project management staff and others during country visits • Review of internal reports related to knowledge management. • Review of agency web-sites and publications, as well as budget allocations • Evidence on best practice from other knowledge based organizations
<p>5. Effectiveness of programme and project cycle management</p> <p>5.1. Project design processes and quality at entry</p> <p>5.2. Loan negotiation, approval, and effectiveness</p> <p>5.3. Monitoring and evaluation systems</p> <p>5.4. Supervision and implementation support including mid-term review, and project completion processes</p> <p>5.5. Programme management and portfolio reviews</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How, innovative, flexible, and participatory is project design? • What is the role of country stakeholders in design and implementation? • Are log frames well used? How much attention is given to M&E? • Are there long gaps between negotiations, approval and effectiveness? If so why? • Are project supervision and completion processes sound and effective in improving project performance? • Has adequate attention been given to MTRs and PCRs. Are specific guidelines available for their conduct? • Is there an additive process to convey results from project to President? • How effective are operational portfolio reviews? • What policies and instruments are in place for promoting transparency and accountability, and combating corruption in AfDB and IFAD projects? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematic examination of project quality at entry • Review of project design documents • Interviews with CPMs • Discussion with and project management at the country level, as well as with government and other partners

<p>6. Policy and sector work, policy dialogue and partnership building</p> <p>6.1. Relevance, technical quality and quantity of policy and sector work</p> <p>6.2. Degree, quality and effectiveness of policy dialogue initiatives with partners</p> <p>6.3. Effectiveness of strategic partnership</p> <p>6.4. Participation in donor co-ordination mechanisms</p> <p>6.5. Resource allocation and skills for policy dialogue and partnership strengthening</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the quantum and quality of policy and sector work consistent with agency strategic objectives and emphasis on policy dialogue? • Is the skills and resource base adequate for this task? • What have been the results of policy dialogue with borrowers? with regional organizations? With other partners? • What partnerships have been built and for what purposes at the regional, sub-regional and country levels? • What have been the use and results of the strategic partnerships developed? • How active are the organizations in donor co-ordination processes and what results have been achieved? • Are adequate guidance and resources allocated to staff to conduct policy dialogue and partnership building, and do staff have the requisite skills? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of country strategies and project design documents • Discussions with key policy makers at the country level and in other organizations • Evidence from comparator organizations • Interviews with staff in major regional partners and in operations
--	--	---

III. EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS		
<p>7. <i>Performance and Impact of the Portfolio (Projects and Programmes (including grants))</i></p> <p>7.1. Relevance 7.2. Effectiveness 7.3. Efficiency 7.4. Impact – decomposed into impact on incomes, physical and financial assets, human assets, social capital and empowerment, jobs, food security, environmental resources, institutions and policy frameworks and gender equity 7.5. Sustainability 7.6. Innovations, replication and up-scaling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard questions from OPEV’s and OE’s methodological frameworks and guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant project documents and evaluation reports; relevant national reports; field observations and discussion with stakeholders
<p>8. <i>Performance of Partners</i></p> <p>8.1. Government and its agencies 8.2. Co-financiers and co-operating institutions 8.3. NGOs and community-based organizations 8.4. Regional institutions 8.5. AfDB and IFAD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard questions from OPEV’s and OE’s methodological frameworks and guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant project documents and evaluation reports; relevant national reports; field observations and discussion with beneficiaries and other stakeholders

VI. THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

38. ***Evaluation Framework:*** The initial evaluation framework outlined in Table 2 was constructed drawing on the objectives of the evaluation and the strategic policy objectives of the two agencies. It takes the main objectives and overarching questions of the evaluation and breaks them into smaller more manageable pieces, identifies corresponding key areas of investigation, further questions to be asked (and answered) and the main sources of information and evidence. Thus this evaluation will necessarily take a pragmatic approach to the availability of evidence¹⁵ and regard all actions, especially all projects, as evaluable. This means that the highest standards of proof and causality cannot be applied.¹⁶ Instead, there must be much greater dependence on judgments based on partial evidence, the views of informed parties including beneficiaries and the experience and diligence of the evaluators.

39. Evaluations frequently compare the performance of organizations in order to reach conclusions about relative achievement and allow the need for change to be assessed by learning from the best. Thus the evaluation framework includes such “benchmarking” taking the Africa Region of the World Bank (plus the relevant countries in its Middle East and North Africa Region) as its principal comparator, together with BOAD, the DBSA and other appropriate institutions wherever relevant.¹⁷

VII. SCOPE OF WORK AND COUNTRY CHOICE

40. ***Overall Scope:*** In IFAD, the boundaries for the evaluation are entirely geographical while in the AfDB they are organizational. In IFAD any activity in the continent of Africa is a legitimate part of the evaluation. In the AfDB any operation or non-project activity that falls within the purview of the operating divisions and departments designated to deal with ARD are legitimate subjects. Thus, an ARD rural project dealing with rural roads or with a rural roads component will be included, but a roads or infrastructure project with a rural roads component would not.

41. Boundaries in time are also needed. The AfDB’s crisis of 1994/1995 and the many organizational, management and process changes introduced in 1995 created a sharp break with the past. In IFAD change has been less dramatic, slower and more cumulative. Overall, however, the past decade has seen substantial adjustment and several new initiatives and processes have come to IFAD, including a 1995 broadening of objectives and a bold claim to become a leader in methods of poverty reduction, and the new Strategic Framework for 1998-2000 and its successor for 2002-06. Thus, the evaluation will take January 1996 as its starting

¹⁵ An obvious problem is the dislocation of the AfDB’s records caused by the move from Abidjan to Tunis. This resulted in some documentary records being left behind in Abidjan - an environment where paper records could have a short life. There was also some data loss during the computerisation of many paper records relating to project implementation. However, it is said that most such written records may be recoverable from staff offices in Tunis. Data availability in IFAD is not plagued by such problems and is generally said to be adequate.

¹⁶ Resources are inadequate as well as methods.

¹⁷ The FAO is also an international organization engaged in agriculture, but it is not an international financial institution making loans and implementing large scale projects. Thus it is not an appropriate comparator. However, it is possible that FAO can offer relevant lessons concerning the management of grant and related technical assistance projects. To that extent at least its records and experience will be utilized.

point and December 2005 as its end point.¹⁸ There is good evidence from recent past evaluations that a ten year time-slice tends to yield evidence that is nicely balanced between the twin needs of accountability and learning.

42. Lastly, even within these boundaries some aspects of the evaluation will require more or less separate investigation (e.g. internal business processes) although they will be assessed against common criteria, while other aspects will require totally integrated approaches (e.g. joint operations, common partnerships etc). Yet other areas will require joint work but yield both combined and separate results (e.g. project performance).

43. The evaluation will also take into account the enabling policy and institutional environment in which governments and donors operate as they define the limits of what is possible. The environment includes international trade relations, agricultural competitiveness in Africa, public service provision and links to private sector initiatives, the role of agriculture within NEPAD, and the work of the African Infrastructure Consortium, and the African Water Facility.

44. **Country Choice:** There are two main ways of selecting countries for field investigation – random sampling and deliberate or purposive choice. The first ensures that selection bias is eliminated but, because the sampling fraction is modest, risks an insufficiently representative outcome. The second normally ensures representitiveness but leaves open the possibility of selection bias and therefore an unknown and unknowable degree of distortion in the evidence collected.¹⁹ However, in both cases these choices can be stratified (done in stages) using objective criteria and this tends to reduce selection bias in purposive selection. On balance the limitations of using the purposive method for this evaluation are probably less problematic than random sampling.

45. The forward looking nature of this evaluation argues against devoting resources to assessments of long closed projects or outdated strategies and policies. Moreover, the AfDB and its programmes and business processes underwent cathartic change in 1995 in response to longstanding issues. These changes further reduce the likelihood that relevant data could be gleaned from AfDB projects that entirely predate those changes.²⁰ Similarly, in IFAD although change has been more gradual there has been substantial evolution such that early projects have greatly diminished value as sources of lessons that have current resonance. Conversely, even though data from AfDB and IFAD projects and programmes dating from 1996 onwards is of the greatest relevance it would be wrong to entirely exclude evidence from before that date by treating the 1995 as an impervious barrier. In practice many of the changes in both institutions in the mid-90's (and afterwards) were intended to influence, and did, then ongoing operations.

¹⁸ This decade falls entirely into the period after the 1995 reforms and fully embraces the years devoted to the development, approval and implementation of the AfDB's current agricultural and rural development policy. It also fully spans the years leading up to and following IFAD's development and introduction in 1998 if its first Strategic Framework and its Regional Strategies (2002). It also covers the more recent IEE of 2004/5 and the consequent wide ranging Action Plan in IFAD.

¹⁹ This does not mean that the method of selection is the only source of bias in evaluative studies. There are many others (e.g. evaluator bias, inter-evaluator variability, etc) but they are independent of the method of selecting observations and common to all selection methods

²⁰ As already noted there is considerable doubt about the quality and availability of many early records in the AfDB.

46. Accordingly, only those operations from both organizations with half or more of their implementation life after 1/1/96 are admitted to the evaluation.²¹ This simple decision rule limits the evaluation to a combined maximum population of 364 projects²² spread across 48 countries²³ yet admits evidence from 104 operations (29%) designed and declared effective before 1996. It is essential to use combined populations (that is projects from both the AfDB and IFAD) so that country work is done in countries where both organizations are comparably operational (thus reducing travel) and, for comparative purposes, to minimize variation in within country conditions.

47. The next stage, to be undertaken as part of the Inception Report, will be to reduce the 48 countries to a number that is logistically manageable and consistent with the resources available. This suggests that about one fifth to one - quarter of the 48 countries could be selected.

VIII. METHODS

48. In addition to being both formative and summative, the evaluation is theory based. That is, predicated on the assumption of causality; that results follow from actions in a manner that can usually be predicted. But, it also recognizes and takes into account side-effects – both intended and unintended. Thus the evaluation is also strongly results based.

²¹ This means for example that a project declared effective in 1990 and closed in 1999 would not be included in the evaluation population, but one declared effective in 1994 and closed in 2004 would be included. *Inter alia*, this criterion allows all ongoing projects to enter the evaluation population. Elapsed implementation time is preferred to a disbursement related criterion because disbursement is usually low during the first few years of a project and would result in including a disproportionate number of projects declared effective before 31/12/95 in the evaluation population.

²² This number excludes regional grants and multi-national projects. The evaluation of these two categories of operation will be treated separately.

²³ Five countries had no projects that satisfied this criterion.

49. The evaluation will use the well-established evaluation criteria of relevance, efficacy or effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact²⁴ (including decomposition of the latter into a number of key determinants) as set out in OE's and OPEV's manuals and other guidelines or as is generally accepted by the OECD-DAC and evaluators in other IFI's. In applying such criteria many evaluations take care to avoid the benefits of hindsight. That is, they judge yesterday's development interventions or actions by yesterday's standards. However, in an evaluation with a strongly formative (forward looking) agenda such punctiliousness is misplaced as it fails to reveal the performance gap between what has been achieved and what is now expected. It follows that in this evaluation performance will be judged, for the most part, against a template comprising current performance standards.

50. Country level investigations will involve intensive discussion with all stakeholders. For policy evaluation this will require close contact with government and non-government organizations to elicit information on issues such as relevance and efficacy, while project focused enquiries will seek out project officials, implementers, beneficiaries and other key observers. It is unlikely that formal sample survey techniques will be employed to study beneficiaries, except perhaps in a few selected situations. On the other hand sufficient, systematic exposure to project activity and project stakeholders will be essential to render findings credible and amenable to aggregation.

51. Assessing impact by measuring changes in the lives of the rural poor is a challenging task with several levels of complexity. The nature of the change itself can be hard to measure. For example, income is a difficult concept to define and to measure as it can include items in cash and kind. Statisticians have found that surveys of expenditure and consumption provide a more reliable estimate by proxy than direct questions about income. But to be accurate such estimates require repeated enumerations over quite long periods of time. Moreover, income may not be the best indicator of poverty. Indicators used by the poor themselves may be better, but to the extent that they are not measured by continuous variables have reduced analytical value. Characteristics such as social capital and empowerment are fraught with problems of how to measure them and even how to define objectively verifiable indicators. In sum, measurement

²⁴ The standard definitions of these terms follow.

Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies. Note: Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question as to whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given changed circumstances.

Efficacy (Effectiveness): The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Also used as an aggregate measure of (or judgment about) the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives efficiently in a sustainable fashion and with a positive institutional development impact.

Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.

Outcome: The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs.

Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

Impact: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Often applied to changes in the welfare of people (cf poverty reduction).

See: Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation, May 2002, OECD, Paris.

may depend on the extent to which indicators can be quantified and whether are available for independent inspection, or whether such data can only be accessed through the memory of respondents.

52. Assessing the magnitude of change is also difficult. Measurement before and after an event is desirable but, unless those people who are to participate in a project are known beforehand, the best estimate will have to come either from a statistical average of circumstances before the event or by memory recollection afterwards. Typically knowledge of before project (or other without project) conditions is scanty making estimates of the counter-factual very uncertain. And, there may be problems resulting from autonomous economic and social changes, as well as the confounding effects of separate development action by government and other donors. All present serious unfathomables.

53. Thus the formal comprehensive measurement of impact is judged to be beyond the scope of this evaluation, partly for reasons of resources, but more importantly because of the measurement and methodological obstacles noted above. Instead, wide ranging and triangulated evaluative evidence²⁵ plus evidence from prior evaluations will be used to reach judgments about the likelihood or otherwise of positive impact on the reduction of poverty.

54. As far as possible the evaluation will be based on documentary evidence mainly, but not necessarily exclusively, from within the two organizations. This is quite logical given that the focus is on evaluating the institutions policies, strategies, processes and project performance. However, documents and information from elsewhere will form an essential part in order to provide evidence about the role and performance of comparators and the state of international policy thinking about agriculture and rural development in Africa.

55. Naturally, the examination of documentary evidence and interviews and discussions with IFAD and AfDB staff will constitute a very large part of the total evaluative effort. For the most part interviews will be face-to face meetings. However, there may be situations or information needs where remote collection techniques (e.g. electronic surveys, telephone interviews) will have special value either as a means of ensuring anonymity or to reach respondents in distant locations.

56. Throughout a consistent approach by all members of the evaluation team and across all documents will be sought, together with detailed cross-referencing of sources of information to underpin subsequent analysis and to provide a trail of evidence. The team will keep records from all interviews and meetings where notes are taken. Structured report documentation and use of databases to store data will enable subsequent verification of analysis and findings.

²⁵ That is evidence from one source that is consistent with and supported by evidence from two other independent sources.

IX. GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

57. The evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with OE's Evaluation Policy, 2003 and the AfDB's Board resolution B/BD/2006/09 on modalities for appointment of the Head of Evaluation, as well as the AfDB's draft evaluation policy. These directives mandate that;

- the evaluation be free and independent of the management and the Governing Bodies including the Boards in both institutions;
- responsibility for the evaluation rests with OE and OPEV alone;
- explicit rules for the management of comments on the final report be followed; and that
- both institutions make all data and information available to the evaluation, as well as extend their full cooperation during the conduct of the evaluation.

58. The governance and management arrangements for the evaluation must ensure that these requirements are met and that there is an adequate oversight of the evaluation as it proceeds. The arrangements must also ensure efficient implementation without micro-managing and deliver adequate quality control and fair dispute resolution should that prove necessary.

59. Accordingly, and consistent with the DAC guidelines on two party joint evaluations there would be a two level governance structure. At the top would be an Oversight Committee consisting of the Director of the Operations Evaluation Department (OPEV) in the AfDB and the Director of the Office of Evaluation (OE) in IFAD, assisted by such as other persons as they may nominate. The Committee would have the overall responsibility for the supervision of the evaluation, including the endorsement of the evaluation team, approval of the Inception Report, review of all deliverables and issue of the Final Report. In undertaking its duties the Committee would draw upon two or three senior independent advisors of international standing who would, *inter alia*, assess, and attest to, the independence and quality of the evaluation in part in the form of a report at the end of the evaluation.

60. At the second level, there would be a task manager and an alternate task manager representing the two agencies who would provide day-to-day management and be the principal links to the evaluation team. Within a unitary framework they would provide a vital facilitation function, handle all contractual, travel and administrative matters and participate fully in the planning and conduct of the evaluation whenever practical.

61. The Oversight Committee would also draw up and agree on a Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies that would define:

- a timetable for periodic reviews of progress,
- a simple communications protocol,
- the language (s) in which the reports will be issued,
- how management comments on the Draft Final Report (DFR) would be handled including the formal management response,

- how other comments would be handled in the DFR,²⁶
- procedures governing submission of the Final Report to the two Executive Boards and their sub-committees,
- periodic review of progress
- procedures for dispute resolution,
- budgetary and procurement arrangements,
- administrative arrangements,
- day to day management arrangements, and
- such other items as may be required.

X. OVERVIEW OF TASKS AND INDICATIVE COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

62. The evaluation team will meet the highest quality standards commensurate with the tasks to be accomplished, the timetable and availability and diversity considerations. It will consist of a core team of five. A brief overview of the tasks that the core team will undertake and the skills they must have follows.

a) Team Leader: He/she will be responsible for the technical quality of the evaluation, supervising and guiding other team members, timely delivery of all intermediate reports and writing the draft final report. To the extent possible he/she will participate in selected country work. The team leader will maintain very close contact with the evaluation managers in OE and OPEV and be a highly experienced evaluator with at least 20 years experience of managing and delivering complex studies and evaluations especially in ARD. Demonstrated management skills of a high order, extensive knowledge of IFI work, especially evaluation, gained from first hand experience are essential. He/she must have a good knowledge of Africa, IFAD, and AfDB and outstanding writing and communication skills.

b) Two Deputy Team Leaders: The two deputies will support the team leader. One will be responsible for work in Anglophone and Lusophone countries and the other for work in Francophone and Arabic speaking countries. They will be responsible for oversight and detailed guidance of the country level studies, including the overall organisation of work, quality of the evaluation effort, review of each country report as it is completed and the production of a synthesis report on country level investigations. They will participate in each country study either at inception to help ensure that evaluation methods and procedures are as coordinated and consistent between countries as possible. They will be evaluators with at least 15 years experience of diverse work in ARD including project preparation, appraisal and supervision in IFIs or similar agencies and country programme and project evaluations in Africa. They must also have a solid evaluation track record in project and country programme evaluation, first class team leader skills and excellent analytical, writing and synthesizing skills. They must also have appropriate language skills.

²⁶ The standard procedure in many evaluations is for the evaluation team to review all comments and to incorporate any dealing with factual correction and to add notes of dissent where the judgment of commentators differs from that of the evaluation team.

c) Senior Specialist ARD Policies to evaluate the relevance and efficacy of existing policies and strategic objectives. This will include a review of existing literature on ARD policy matters in Africa, examination of the process by which policies are framed in the two organisations and their performance in providing policy advice to borrowers. He/she will guide and supervise the work of short-term consultants engaged to examine key sub-sector policy matters and the quality and quantity of ARD sector work in the AfDB. He/she will be responsible for the preparation of an integrated report covering all aspects of policy and strategic objectives in the evaluation. The incumbent will be a distinguished, internationally recognized, ARD policy analyst with special knowledge of ARD in Africa: outstanding conceptual and analytical skills. He or she will have good knowledge of role, process and standards of analytical sector work in IFIs and the challenges of offering policy advice to borrowers. Familiarity with the policy making process in IFI's and similar agencies, and realism about giving policy advice to governments would also be essential

d) Senior Business Processes Expert: To examine and report on the quality and efficiency of key business tasks and project cycle management. An experienced evaluator with extensive hands on experience of programme and project cycle management in IFIs including knowledge of how to assess agency project portfolios, analyse project quality at entry and project supervision and completion processes. He/she must have good interpersonal skills, be strongly analytical and be able to relate process to strategy.

e) Other Senior Evaluators: **i)** Evaluators to undertake specialist assessments, e.g of resource allocation issues, functional organization and HR management. Essential skills will include strong knowledge of such matters in IFI's. **ii)** Evaluators to work in teams of two and for each team to undertake thorough evaluations of the institutions' project and non-project work in up to four countries and prepare short, evidence based and tightly argued report on each country. Essential skills will include proven competence in undertaking country and project level evaluations in Africa. Strong team leader skills in some cases. Ability to draft incisive and evidence based, but short reports. Willingness to travel extensively. Demonstrated language skills essential. **iii)** Specialists in assessing sub-sector policies and thematic issues.

f) Other evaluators and/or research assistants to provide evaluative support and research assistance in Rome and Tunis and elsewhere if needed.

XI. DELIVERABLES, TIMETABLE AND RESOURCES

63. **Deliverables:** The first deliverable of the evaluation will be an Inception Report. It will contain a final description of the evaluation methodology and framework, the specific projects and countries to be covered, articulate the instruments for data collection, as well as provide a detailed roadmap and timetable for the evaluation. The last deliverable will be a Final Report, initially provided as a draft. In between will come a number of intermediate deliverables.

These reports will mainly be desk reports. Nevertheless, they contain a full account of findings and evidence as well as preliminary conclusions and recommendations. Importantly they will each inform the other to the maximum extent possible so as to minimize inconsistencies and to enhance cross-validation.

64. The following is a provisional list of deliverables expected from the evaluation.

1. Inception Report.
2. Desk Reports on Policy and Strategy, Resource Allocation and Programme and Project Cycle Management, Management and Organizational Effectiveness, Sector Work and Policy Dialogue to serve as building blocks for the DFR.
3. Desk Reports for each country evaluation. This is an essential first step and will involve a complete review of all portfolio and evaluation reports and data available and the writing and submission of a draft report before fieldwork commences. Fieldwork will then mainly focus on the endorsement or revision of these preliminary conclusions and preparation of “final” country reports.
4. Draft Final Report.

65. **Timetable:** The delivery of these deliverables is built into the expected timetable outlined in Annex 1. One idea under consideration is get work on development results (Part III of the evaluation framework) started in advance of other aspects, so as to allow those parts of the evaluation based mainly on documentary sources and deskwork to benefit from field findings.

66. Overall, the sequence of work during the evaluation has been planned logically to build to a final analysis and draft final report (DFR). The intermediate stages are intended to establish a clear trail of evidence from documents, interviews and field investigations to support the final conclusions.

67. **Budget:** The budget in Table 3 is based on a detailed but preliminary analysis of the main tasks to be undertaken and the skills to be deployed. The overall total of \$1.3M is regarded as firm but the individual costs of particular tasks may vary substantially as the evaluation framework, methods and timing are refined during the inception phase.

Table 3: Estimated Budget (USD)

Planning, Administration and Reconnaissance	80,000
Stakeholder Workshop at Inception	90,500
Inception Report	27,000
I. Evaluation of Policy and Strategy	190,500
II. Evaluation of Business Processes	194,000
III. Evaluation of Development Results	658,000
Draft Final Report	47,000
Total	1,287,000
International Workshop at Completion	To be determined

68. Overall the budget estimates in Table 3 tend toward the minimum for high profile and complex evaluations of this type. In particular the amounts allowed for country level work are likely to be modest, in the region of \$40 – 55,000 per country. This carries the attendant risks of obtaining inadequate data and having to tolerate excessive variation in assessments and evaluator judgments. This tendency can be reduced considerably by placing a high premium on recruiting evaluators with high reputations for quality and extensive and proven experience. This is also likely to reduce time overruns and to yield reports that do not need time-consuming editing, supplementation and correction.

XII. COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH

69. Of prime importance are free, continuous and uninhibited links between the evaluation units in the two organizations. For this purpose, a communications plan will be prepared early in the evaluation process and included in the Inception Report. Fortunately the time and physical distances between Tunis and Rome are small and together with efficient electronic communications should enable easy and frequent contact.

70. The advent of the evaluation would be preceded by an identical and simultaneous announcement, by both organizations that would briefly explain the purpose, methods and expected benefits of the evaluation.

71. From the outset, the evaluation would be as open and transparent as possible, with all key documents being published on the two agencies websites. And, early in the overall timetable, and before the Inception Report is finalized, a stakeholder workshop would be held to elicit comment and suggestions on the substance of the evaluation as well as to assist in spreading information about its goals and methods.

72. A Core Learning Partnership (see IFAD Evaluation Policy) will be constituted for the evaluation, which will provide their inputs at key stages during the evaluation, and serve as a key instrument for enhancing communication. The composition of the Core Learning Partnership (selected key internal and external stakeholders) will be defined during the inception phase of the evaluation.

73. Finally, at a suitable time after the draft final report has been tabled an international workshop would be convened to discuss the evaluation's findings and recommendations. It is hoped that this gathering may prove to be a convenient moment for IFAD and the AFDB to engage others in a discussion of a long run strategy for African agriculture and rural development.

Draft Timetable for the AfDB/IFAD Joint Evaluation

- 1) 24 Oct. 06 Finalization of joint Approach Paper (JAP)
- 2) 25 Oct. 06 Simultaneous Distribution of JAP to subcommittees of the Board of AfDB and IFAD
- 3) 26 Oct. 06 Simultaneous Distribution of JAP to IFAD and AfDB operations for comments
- 4) Oct. Write up TORs for Evaluation Team
- 5) Nov. Recruitment of SIAs
- 6) Nov. Review the JAP by Senior Independent Advisors (SIAs)
- 7) Nov. Identification of potential candidates for the evaluation team
- 8) Nov. Evaluation of Curricula Vitae
- 9) Nov. Establishment of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP)
- 10) Nov./Dec. Formulation and signature of MoU between OPEV and OE
- 11) Nov./Dec. Interviews of Team Leader (TL), plus Deputy TL 1 and Deputy TL 2
- 12) Dec. Final Proposal for the Evaluation Team
- 13) Mid Dec. Final Boards' Approval of joint Evaluation Budget
- 14) Dec. Endorsement of Evaluation Team by Directors OE and OPEV
- 15) Before Xmas International Communication Announcing Commencement of Evaluation
- 16) Dec./Jan.07 Negotiation and Contracting
- 17) Jan. 07 Commencement of Work by Evaluation Team (meeting of the entire evaluation team and other stakeholders).
- 18) Jan.07 Interaction with CLP on the Approach Paper

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 19) Jan.-Feb.07 | Work on Inception Report |
| 20) Mar.-Sep.07 | Work on Desk Reports |
| 21) Jun.-Nov.07 | Work on Field Reports |
| 22) Dec.07 | Work on synthesis of Field Reports |
| 23) Dec.07 | Powerpoint Presentation on “preliminary” findings |
| 24) Jan./Feb.08 | Work on Draft Final Report (DFR) 1 |
| 25) Mar. 08 | Distribution of DFR 1 |
| 26) Apr. 08 | Work on Draft Final Report (DFR) 2 |
| 27) May 08 | Distribution of DFR 2 |
| 28) Jun. 08 | Work on Draft Final Report (DFR) 3 |
| 29) Jul. 08 | Distribution of DFR 3 |
| 30) Sep. 08 | Issuance of Final Report |
| 31) Nov. 08 | International Workshop at end of Process |