

Document: EB 2016/119/R.13/Rev.1
Agenda: 10
Date: 14 December 2016
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Investing in rural people

Proposed refinements to the IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework

Note to Executive Board representatives

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Ashwani Muthoo
Director
Global Engagement, Knowledge and Strategy Division
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2053
e-mail: a.muthoo@ifad.org

Lisandro Martin
Chief
Operational Programming and Effectiveness Unit
Programme Management Department
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2388
e-mail: lisandro.martin@ifad.org

Dispatch of documentation:

William Skinner
Chief
Governing Bodies Office
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2974
e-mail: gb_office@ifad.org

Executive Board — 119th Session
Rome, 14-15 December 2016

For: Approval

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	i
I. Introduction	1
II. Overall rationale for the changes proposed	1
III. Revision to Level 1 indicators	2
IV. Revision to Level 2 indicators	4
V. Revision to Level 4 indicators	5
VI. Revision to Level 5 indicators	6
VII. Other changes	7
 Annexes	
I. Revised IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework	8
II. Revised definitions and data sources for IFAD10 RMF indicators	13

Abbreviations and acronyms

IAEG-SDGs	Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators
IIA	IFAD Impact Assessments
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
RIDE	Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness
RIMS	Results and Impact Management System
RMF	Results Measurement Framework
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SO	strategic objective
UNSC	United Nations Statistical Commission
UNSD	United Nations Statistical Division

Recommendation for approval

The Executive Board is invited to approve the proposed refinements to the IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework, as contained herein.

Proposed refinements to the IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework

I. Introduction

1. The IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework (RMF) was included as an integral part of the Report of the Consultation on the Tenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD10) adopted by the Governing Council in February 2015. In doing so, the Governing Council envisaged that the RMF might need to be refined during the IFAD10 period (2016-2018).
2. In particular, the IFAD10 Commitments Matrix noted that Management would "Agree with the Executive Board on any updates to RMF, based on emerging results from IFAD9, the gender midterm review, other evaluation findings, and the approved SDG [Sustainable Development Goal] Framework".
3. Since the adoption of the IFAD10 RMF, IFAD Management has completed the gender mid-term review and issued the synthesis report on IFAD9 impact assessments. Moreover, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015. Therefore, as we approach the end of the first year of the three-year IFAD10 period, it is appropriate to propose refinements to the IFAD10 RMF for consideration by the Executive Board.

II. Overall rationale for the changes proposed

4. The proposed refinements to the RMF are guided by three broad considerations. First, the IFAD Strategic Framework 2016-2025, approved by the Executive Board in February 2016, was not in place at the time when the RMF was adopted. Ideally, the RMF would have been developed following the adoption of the Strategic Framework, to properly reflect the objectives and priorities set forth therein. One of the implications of the new Strategic Framework, for example, is the ongoing work of strategic planning by results pillars, rather than by clusters.
5. Secondly, the IFAD9 impact assessment report underlined the need for IFAD to reconsider the key Level 2 indicator in the IFAD10 RMF – "people moved out of poverty" – and the corresponding target of 80 million people. The experience gained under IFAD9 showed that the "people moved out of poverty" indicator does not adequately capture substantial key benefits to poor people from IFAD's investments and is therefore not an appropriate measure of IFAD's success.
6. The third consideration is that several important enhancements to IFAD's broader results measurement architecture are still a work in progress, such as the introduction of the forthcoming Development Effectiveness Framework and revisions to the Results and Impact Management System (RIMS). It would therefore be premature to make extensive revisions to the IFAD10 RMF indicators, baselines or targets at this stage, until such time as the underlying data collection and analysis systems and processes are fully in place and have been tested.
7. Having said that, Management proposes that the IFAD10 RMF be fine-tuned in key priority areas, with the understanding that a more thorough revision of the RMF could be considered in the context of the Consultation on the Eleventh

Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD11) in 2017. Therefore, the priority changes proposed for the IFAD10 RMF are as follows:

- (a) Update Level 1 indicators with relevant SDG indicators for which data are available.
- (b) Replace four Level 2 impact indicators (i.e. indicators 2.1.1 to 2.2.3),¹ with indicators relating to the three strategic objectives (SOs) included in the Strategic Framework and the overarching goal stated in the framework.
- (c) Adjust the targets of two Level 4 indicators (i.e. indicator 4.3.2 and 4.3.3)² relating to the disbursement ratio of the global portfolio and projects in fragile situations. The current targets are deemed too ambitious given the average life cycle of IFAD projects and the rising volume of new loan and grant commitments in recent years.
- (d) Modify a Level 5 indicator (i.e. indicator 5.3.1),³ given the limited value of the cluster budget targets, and the introduction of results pillars by the Strategic Framework and corresponding decision to discontinue clusters-based annual budgeting from 2018 onwards.

III. Revision to Level 1 indicators

8. The current IFAD10 RMF includes five indicators to measure global poverty, food security and agricultural investment outcomes (table 1). It is proposed that these be updated with six SDG indicators that cover the same areas (table 2).

Table 1

Existing IFAD10 RMF Level 1 indicators

1.1.1	Population living on less than US\$1.25 a day
1.1.2	Prevalence of undernourishment in population
1.1.3	Children under 5 underweight
1.2.1	Level of official development assistance to agriculture (billions of United States dollars)
1.2.2	Developing countries with share of agriculture in total public expenditure of 5% or more

9. Rationale for change. Level 1 of the IFAD10 RMF tracks progress towards two sets of outcomes to which IFAD contributes: the reduction of poverty, hunger and malnutrition, as measured under the first Millennium Development Goal (MDG); and official development assistance (ODA) to, and public investment and productivity in, the agriculture sector. When these indicators were approved by the Governing Council in February 2015, it was recognized that they might be superseded by the SDGs then under discussion.
10. As noted, the SDGs were adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015. The global indicator framework for these goals was developed by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs), and agreed to as a practical starting point, at the forty-seventh session of the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) in March 2016. This set of indicators is intended to review progress against the SDGs globally.
11. The Strategic Framework states that IFAD's work will contribute significantly to SDG1 (no poverty) and SDG2 (zero hunger), as well as to SDGs 5 (gender equality), 8 (decent work and economic growth), 10 (reduced inequalities), 13 (climate action) and 15 (life on land). While a case could be made for expanding the number of indicators currently covered in Level 1 of the RMF to cover all these SDGs, doing so would significantly increase the number of indicators tracked and dilute the focus on those indicators most important to IFAD's mandate approved by

¹ People moved out of poverty; household asset ownership index; level of child malnutrition; and length of hungry season.

² Percentage disbursement ratio (overall); and percentage disbursement ratio (fragile situations).

³ Share of budget allocated to clusters 1-4.

the Governing Council in 2015. Accordingly, it is proposed that the five existing Level 1 indicators be replaced by six SDG indicators covering the same areas. The inclusion of a possible expanded SDG indicator set could be considered for the IFAD11 RMF.

12. With regard to the most appropriate indicator to measure malnutrition, it is suggested that the SDG indicator 2.2.1 “prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years of age” be included. High levels of stunting are associated with poor socioeconomic conditions and inappropriate feeding practices, which are issues that IFAD projects can realistically help mitigate.
13. Whereas the current RMF has a single indicator to measure undernourishment (indicator 1.1.2), the introduction of two indicators is suggested – SDG indicators 2.1.1 “Prevalence of undernourishment” and 2.1.2 “Prevalence of food insecurity” – to measure progress against the SDG target 2.1 to end hunger and ensure access by all people to safe and nutritious food all year round, considering the importance of this target for IFAD’s mandate.⁴
14. Proposed new Level 1 indicators. The five SDG indicators presented in table 2 below are broadly aligned with the five existing indicators in the IFAD10 RMF. It is therefore proposed that the indicators in table 2 replace those in table 1 above.

Table 2
Proposed new Level 1 indicators

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>SDG indicator number and title</i>	
Proportion of population below the international poverty line	UNSD ⁵	1.1.1	Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural)
Prevalence of undernourishment	UNSD	2.1.1	Prevalence of undernourishment
Prevalence of food insecurity	UNSD	2.1.2	Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)
Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years of age	UNSD	2.2.1	Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 standard deviation from the median of the World Health Organization Child Growth Standards) among children under 5 years of age
Total official flows to the agriculture sector	UNSD	2.a.2	Total official flows (official development assistance plus other official flows) to the agriculture sector
Government expenditure on agriculture (index)	UNSD	2.a.1	The agriculture orientation index for government expenditures

⁴ The official list of SDG indicators does not include indicators related to nutrition-sensitive agriculture or dietary diversity, which would otherwise have been relevant to consider for this RMF. However, IFAD will be piloting the use of project-level indicators related to nutrition in the Fund’s Results and Impact Management System (RIMS), as determined in the IFAD10 Commitment Matrix (see GC 38/L.4/Rev.1 annex I) and specified in the Mainstreaming Nutrition-Sensitive Agriculture at IFAD, Action Plan 2016-2018 (EB 2015/116/INF.5).

⁵ <http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database>.

IV. Revision to Level 2 indicators

15. The existing RMF includes four impact indicators (see table 3). However, as mentioned, the IFAD10 RMF predated the Strategic Framework 2016-2025. Therefore, the idea behind proposing a new set of indicators is to be able to directly measure IFAD's progress towards the three SOs captured in the most recent Strategic Framework.

Table 3

Existing RMF Level 2 impact indicators

2.1.1	People moved out of poverty (million)
2.2.1	Household asset ownership index
2.2.2	Level of child malnutrition (3 sub-indicators – acute, chronic and underweight); male/female ratio
2.2.3	Length of hungry season (number of months)

16. Rationale for change. Indicator 2.1.1 – people moved out of poverty – and the associated target was a significant feature of IFAD9. However, as explained in the paper on the Impact Assessment Initiative presented to the Executive Board in April 2016,⁶ reporting on this has raised a number of conceptual issues. First, the indicator is a narrow and inadequate measure of IFAD's success. The narrow focus on a poverty line, especially if a money metric or assets-based measure is used, disregards the importance of other IFAD SOs. For example, an intervention that improves a household's resilience by limiting risk exposure and preventing it from succumbing to poverty would not be captured, as it does not take a household out of poverty. Thus the "out of poverty" measure fails to capture substantial key benefits to the wellbeing of poor people, and is an inadequate measure of IFAD's success.
17. Second, poverty reduction is a discrete measure based on a clearly defined, yet somewhat arbitrary, poverty line that differentiates between households above or below this line. While it can be a useful indicator for cross-country comparisons and long-term time trends and therefore tracked across countries (see Level 1 indicators), a poverty line indicator has limited value in assessing project impact. For example, a poverty reduction indicator would fail to capture extremely poor households having doubled their income if the income gain is insufficient to lift them above the poverty line.
18. The other three indicators – 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 – are also inadequate. The primary issue with all three indicators is that they are not directly aligned with IFAD's SOs as articulated in the Strategic Framework. A household asset index (2.2.1) is a reasonable proxy for poverty and reflects a capabilities approach to poverty measurement, but it is not always the case that a range of assets is affected during a project's lifetime. While individual assets, such as livestock or key agricultural complements, are likely to change in individual projects, they represent a limited component of an index. Even if a project has substantial impact, then, the index may not change substantially, understating project impact. Child malnutrition, which is best measured using anthropometric data, has similar issues in that not all projects will necessarily target nutrition in general or affect child nutrition in particular. In addition, child malnutrition is complicated to measure: it requires taking physical measurements and converting them to "z-scores" based on WHO data. An assessment of attempts to measure child anthropometrics currently available in RIMS indicated significant problems. Finally, the length of the hungry season is only relevant in very specific locations and does not apply to most countries, particularly the middle-income countries (MICS).
19. Overall, the issues with these indicators reflect IFAD's learning on the best way to measure project success. Key lessons include the need to have indicators that are

⁶ Synthesis of lessons learned from the IFAD9 Impact Assessment Initiative. EB 2016/117/R.8/Rev.1.

both broadly relevant – which suggests that they must match key SOs – and broadly defined so that they can capture benefits across a wide range of projects.

20. Proposed new Level 2 indicators. The four proposed indicators defined in table 4 below are directly linked to IFAD’s overarching goal and SOs as outlined in the Strategic Framework.

Table 4

Proposed new Level 2 indicators

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Target</i>
Number of people experiencing economic mobility	IFAD impact assessments	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of rural people with changes in economic status (10% or more) including income, consumption, wealth, food diversity or nutrition	40 million
Number of people with improved production	IFAD impact assessments	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of rural people with substantial gains (20% or more) in production of agricultural or non-agricultural products	43 million
Number of people with improved market access	IFAD impact assessments	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of rural people with greater value of product sold (20% or more) in agricultural or non-agricultural markets	42 million
Number of people with greater resilience	IFAD impact assessments	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of people with improved resilience (20% or more)	22 million

21. In addition to reflecting IFAD’s overarching goal and SOs, the measures overcome the issues noted previously. First, they are broadly relevant to IFAD’s portfolio and, second, they are broadly defined to capture benefits from a wide range of projects. The measure of economic mobility mirrors that of people out of poverty but overcomes its limitations.
22. Targets. To identify targets, a systematic assessment of IFAD’s portfolio has been conducted to determine overall potential impacts at the portfolio level. Specifically, a review of all projects approved by the Executive Board between 2010 and 2015 has been undertaken to come up with targets for the indicators noted in table 4, given that these projects reflect IFAD’s approach to promoting rural development and therefore represent the best way of estimating targets. Based on this analysis, for IFAD10 40 million individuals are expected to experience significant economic mobility as a result of IFAD-financed investment projects, 43 million people are expected to significantly increase production (SO1), 42 million people are expected to significantly increase market access (SO2), and 22 million people are expected to experience greater resilience (SO3).
23. Data sources. Corporate impact reporting will be conducted using portfolio projections, as done under IFAD9. The primary differences with IFAD9 will be the quality of underlying impact assessments and a more in-depth understanding of the portfolio. IFAD will seek to expand its focus on ex ante designed impact assessment and ensure that approximately 15 per cent of projects undergo an impact assessment. While this is a long-term objective, it will take time both to identify projects for impact assessments and to implement the impact assessments in the field. During the three years of IFAD10, nine to 12 ex post impact assessments will be completed, resources permitting, to ensure sufficient reporting for this replenishment period. IFAD10 reporting will be based on these together with other ex ante impact assessments initiated as part of IFAD9. The projections will provide corporate-level impact estimates of key identified indicators. Since impact assessments focus on lessons learned, a synthesis of these lessons from the set of analyses will be provided.

V. Revision to Level 4 indicators

24. The existing RMF indicators in level 4 (see table 5) includes the following two indicators related to disbursement ratio, with their corresponding targets:

Table 5
Existing RMF Level 4 indicators related to disbursement ratio

4.3.2	Percentage disbursement ratio (overall)	Target: 22%
4.3.3	Percentage disbursement ratio (fragile situations)	Target: 20%

25. A recent in-depth review of actual trends and projections for the two disbursement ratio indicators in the IFAD10 RMF (4.3.2 for the overall portfolio and 4.3.3 for projects in fragile situations) reveals that the IFAD10 targets are too ambitious, mainly in light of the steadily rising volume of new loan and grant commitments in recent years, but also because of other more structural factors such as the duration of IFAD projects, which is on average between seven and eight years.
26. As ratios of the volume of funds in United States dollars disbursed in a given year to the volume of funds available for disbursement at the beginning of the year plus undisbursed balances of projects approved during the year, performance will tend to improve slowly, and possibly deteriorate, during periods when the United States dollar value of new loan and grant commitments rises, which has been and continues to be the case for IFAD. New loan and grant commitments grew sharply over IFAD8 compared to IFAD7, and continued to grow modestly in IFAD9 with a surge in new commitments in 2015, the final year of IFAD9. Furthermore, Management aims to deliver a larger programme of loans and grants in IFAD10 compared to IFAD9. With this expansion in the programme of loans and grants (and consequent increase in the United States dollar volume of funds available for disbursement relative to actual disbursements in the short- to medium-term), both disbursement ratios are projected to grow modestly over IFAD10 from current levels reported in the latest Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness (RIDE), i.e. 13 per cent for the overall portfolio and 12 per cent for projects in fragile situations.⁷ Once the above-noted IFAD study on disbursements is completed, in early 2017, a revised definition of the disbursement ratio will be proposed for the IFAD11 RMF.
27. Proposed new targets for disbursement ratio indicators. Based on the aforementioned review, more realistic yet still challenging targets for the disbursement ratio indicators are being proposed in table 6 as follows:

Table 6
Proposed new targets for RMF Level 4 indicators related to disbursement ratio

4.3.2	Percentage disbursement ratio (overall)	Target: 15%
4.3.3	Percentage disbursement ratio (fragile situations)	Target: 14%

VI. Revision to Level 5 indicators

28. One further proposed change relates to the ongoing work on the agreed move in IFAD's strategic planning and budgeting from clusters to results pillars, introduced in the Strategic Framework. The aim of the shift from clusters to results pillars is to further improve the effectiveness of the corporate planning and budgeting process. This improvement, to take effect from 2018, will allow IFAD to focus more on results and outputs and link budget directly to deliverables.
29. At the time when the IFAD10 RMF was adopted, it included a specific indicator related to the clusters approach in Level 5 (indicator 5.3.1, "share of budget allocations to cluster 1, 2, 3 and 4). However, no target was specified, noting that

⁷ It is important to note that IFAD's methodology for calculating its disbursement ratio differs from the one most commonly used by other international financial institutions (IFIs). IFAD's methodology includes undisbursed balances of projects approved during the reporting year (i.e. resulting in a greater value recorded in the denominator of the equation), which by default yields a significantly lower disbursement ratio to that of IFIs that do not use this methodology (by contrast, if IFAD were to apply the methodology used by most other IFIs, its disbursement ratio would be notably higher). This should be kept in mind when comparing IFAD's disbursement ratio to that of other IFIs.

“following a review and refinement of the cluster approach to budgeting in 2015, a target for this indicator will be proposed to the Executive Board”.

30. Based on the ongoing work on the transition from clusters to pillars, experience has shown that pre-determined percentage targets of IFAD’s annual administrative budget to clusters have not been useful. In fact, the new results pillar approach builds on the belief that a results-based planning process aimed at meeting IFAD’s strategic priorities should drive the budget, rather than having budget allocations drive the planning process. Therefore, it is proposed not to set new targets for this indicator but instead to track them.
31. Once the corporate planning and budgeting process is aligned with the new pillar structure as of 2018, and the cluster approach is discontinued, the indicator will no longer be relevant. It is understood that a new indicator related to the results pillars may be considered in the context of developing the IFAD11 RMF in 2017.

VII. Other changes

32. Any further changes to the IFAD RMF would deserve a more comprehensive reflection and consultation with IFAD governing bodies. Management is cognizant that some indicators and targets in the IFAD10 RMF may merit reconsideration. For instance, discussions continue on the need to introduce more robust indicators and assessment methods for non-lending activities (knowledge management, policy dialogue, partnership-building, and South-South and Triangular Cooperation) in country programmes, as well as indicators related to nutrition at the project and country level.
33. However, proposing far-reaching changes to the IFAD10 RMF, especially in the mid-course of a replenishment period, needs to be informed by a more thorough assessment of the RMF experience – as well as by good practices emerging at other multilateral development banks.
34. It is therefore suggested that further changes to the RMF be deferred to 2017 in the context of discussions around IFAD11. These discussions will be informed by a review of best practice on RMF structures at other IFIs and will consider, inter alia, the scope for better reflecting the SDGs to which IFAD contributes, strengthening gender reporting, taking account of the reformed RIMS and achieving full alignment with the Strategic Framework 2016-2025.

Revised IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework

RMF level 1 – Global poverty, food security and agricultural investment outcomes

Table 1

Level 1: Global poverty, food security and agricultural investment outcomes

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Baseline (year)^b</i>	<i>Results (year)</i>
1.1 Global poverty and food security outcomes			
1.1.1 Proportion of population below the international poverty line of US\$1.90 a day	UNSD ^a	TBD	-
1.1.2 Prevalence of undernourishment in population	UNSD ^a	TBD	-
1.1.3 Prevalence of food insecurity	UNSD ^a	TBD	-
1.1.4 Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years of age	UNSD ^a	TBD	-
1.2 Global agricultural investment outcomes			
1.2.1 Total official flows to the agriculture sector (billions of United States dollars)	UNSD ^a	TBD	-
1.2.2 Government expenditure on agriculture (index)	UNSD ^a	TBD	-

^a <http://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database>.

^b Baseline years and corresponding data for each indicator are still being decided by the United Nations Statistical Commission. Once released, the data will be incorporated into the revised document.

RMF level 2 – Country-level development outcomes and impact delivered by IFAD-supported projects

Table 2

Level 2: Country-level development outcomes and impact delivered by IFAD-supported projects

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Baseline 2011-2013</i>	<i>IFAD10 target 2018</i>	<i>IFAD9 target 2015</i>
2.1 Impact indicators				
2.1.1 Number of people experiencing economic mobility	IIA	NA	40	NA
2.1.2 Number of people with improved production	IIA	NA	43	NA
2.1.3 Number of people with improved market access	IIA	NA	42	NA
2.1.4 Number of people with greater resilience	IIA	NA	22	NA
2.2 Outcome indicators (percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better) at completion				
2.2.1 Effectiveness ^a	PCR	88	90	90
	IOE	75	Tracked	
2.2.2 Efficiency ^a	PCR	76	80	75
	IOE	57	Tracked	
2.2.3 Rural poverty impact ^a	PCR	88	90	90
	IOE	86	Tracked	
2.2.4 Gender equality	PCR	93	90	90
	IOE	80	Tracked	
2.2.5 Sustainability of benefits ^a	PCR	81	85	75
	IOE	65	Tracked	
2.2.6 Innovation and scaling up	PCR	91	90	90
	IOE	79	Tracked	
2.2.7 Environment and natural resource management	PCR	86	90	90
	IOE	73	Tracked	
2.2.8 Support for smallholder adaptation to climate change	PCR	NA	50	NA
2.2.9 Government performance	PCR	78	80	80
	IOE	66	Tracked	

Note: IIA – IFAD Impact Assessment; RIMS – Results and Impact Management System; PCR – project completion report; IOE – Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD.

^a A breakdown of results for states with fragile situations will be provided in the RIDE.

Table 3
Level 3: Country-level development outputs delivered by IFAD-supported projects

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Baseline 2013</i>	<i>IFAD10 projection ranges 2018</i>	<i>IFAD9 target 2015</i>
3.1 Overall outreach				
3.1.1 People receiving services from IFAD-supported projects (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	98.6 (52:48)	110 - 130	90
3.2 Natural resource management				
3.2.1 Land under improved management practices (million ha)	RIMS	4.1	3.3 - 5.0	Tracked
3.2.2 Land under irrigation schemes (ha)	RIMS	277 000	240 000 – 350 000	Tracked
3.3 Agricultural technologies				
3.3.1 People trained in crop and livestock production practices/technologies (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	6.4 (53:47)	5.5 - 7.7	Tracked
3.4 Rural financial services				
3.4.1 Voluntary savers (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	19.1 (28:72)	14 - 21	Tracked
3.4.2 Active borrowers (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	6.2 (40:60)	5.0 - 7.5	Tracked
3.5 Marketing				
3.5.1 Roads constructed/rehabilitated (km)	RIMS	20 120	18 000 - 24 000	Tracked
3.5.2 Processing facilities constructed/rehabilitated (new)	RIMS	9 391	7 500 - 11 300	Tracked
3.5.3 Marketing facilities constructed/rehabilitated (new)	RIMS	3 252	3 000 - 5 000	Tracked
3.6 Microenterprise				
3.6.1 Enterprises accessing business promotion services	RIMS	88 000	80 000 - 120 000	Tracked
3.7 Policies and institutions				
3.7.1 People trained in community management topics (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	1.8 (24:76)	1.6 - 2.3	Tracked
3.8 Climate change adaptation				
3.8.1 Poor smallholder household members supported in coping with the effects of climate change (million) (new)	RIMS	2.3	8 - 15	Tracked

RMF level 4 – Operational effectiveness of IFAD-supported country programmes and projects

Table 4

Level 4: Operational effectiveness of IFAD-supported country programmes and projects

Indicators	Source	Baseline 2014	IFAD10 target 2018	IFAD9 target 2015
4.1 Percentage of country programmes rated 4 or better during implementation for:				
4.1.1 Contribution to increased incomes, improved food security and empowerment of poor rural women and men	Client survey	89 (2013-2014)	90	90
4.1.2 Adherence to the aid effectiveness agenda	Client survey	89 (2013-2014)	100	100
4.1.3 Engagement in national policy dialogue	Client survey	81 (2013-2014)	85	70
4.1.4 Partnership-building	Client survey	92 (2013-2014)	90	90
4.2 Percentage of projects rated 4 or better at entry				
4.2.1 Overall rating for quality of design	QA	91	90	85
4.2.2 Overall rating for quality of design (fragile states only)	QA	83	85	80
4.2.3 Gender ^a	QA	81	90	90
4.2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	QA	88	90	80
4.2.5 Scaling up	QA	83	85	80
4.2.6 Environment and climate change (new)	QA	NA	80	NA
4.2.7 Loan-financed projects have a published and verifiable economic analysis ^b (new)	QA	NA	100	NA
4.3 Portfolio management				
4.3.1 Time from project approval to first disbursement (months)	GRIPS	17	14	14
4.3.2 Percentage disbursement ratio (overall)	Flexcube	15.8	15	17
4.3.3 Percentage disbursement ratio (fragile situations) ^c	Flexcube	15.3	14	18
4.3.4 Gender focus in implementation	PSR/GRIPS	89	90	90
4.3.5 Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better with acceptable disbursement rate (against approved annual workplan and budget) (new)	PSR	55	65	NA
4.3.6 Percentage of grants rated moderately satisfactory for overall implementation progress (new)	GSR	NA	80	NA
4.4 Cofinancing				
4.4.1 Cofinancing ratio (overall) ^d	GRIPS	1.27 (2011-2014)	1.20	1.6

Note: QA – Quality assurance; GRIPS - Grants and Investment Projects System; PSR – project status report; GSR – grant status report.

^a The current practice of breaking down results for gender transformative and gender mainstreaming projects in the Annual Report on the IFAD Policy on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment presented each year within the RIDE will continue in IFAD10.

^b The target is set based on a broad definition of economic analysis. Economic analysis is required for all IFAD projects; however, it is expected that in approximately 10 per cent of cases methods other than cost-benefit analysis will be employed, due to the fact that some benefits (e.g. environmental, capacity development and empowerment) do not lend themselves well to such approaches.

^c Data represent disbursements in IFAD's list of fragile states, which combines a harmonized list agreed on by multilateral development banks and a list compiled by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

^d A breakdown of results by source of cofinancing and country type will be provided in the RIDE.

RMF level 5 – IFAD’s institutional effectiveness and efficiency

Table 5

Level 5: IFAD’s institutional effectiveness and efficiency

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Baseline 2014 or other</i>	<i>IFAD10 target 2018</i>	<i>IFAD9 target 2015</i>
5.1 Improved resource mobilization and management				
5.1.1 Percentage of IFAD10 pledges over replenishment target	Corporate databases	95	100	100
5.2 Improved human resources management				
5.2.1 Staff engagement index: percentage of staff positively engaged in IFAD objectives	Global staff survey	76	75	75
5.2.2 Percentage of workforce from Lists B and C Member States	Corporate databases	40	Tracked	Tracked
5.2.3 Percentage of women in P-5 posts and above	Corporate databases	29	35	35
5.2.4 Time to fill professional vacancies (days)	Corporate databases	109	100	100
5.3 Improved administrative efficiency				
5.3.1 Share of budget allocations to:				
Cluster 1		N/A	Tracked	65
Cluster 2	Corporate databases	N/A	Tracked	9
Cluster 3	Corporate databases	N/A	Tracked	20
Cluster 4		N/A	Tracked	6
5.3.2 Ratio of budgeted staff positions in ICOs	Corporate databases	42.7	45	45
5.3.3 Loan and grant commitments in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	Corporate databases	7.9 (2011-2013)	8.2	8
5.3.4 Loan and grant commitments and project cofinancing in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure (new)	Corporate databases	14.9 (2011-2013)	15.2	NA
5.3.5 Disbursements in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	Corporate databases	5.1 (2011-2013)	5.5	5.3

Revised definitions and data sources for IFAD10 RMF indicators

RMF level 1: Global poverty, food security and agricultural investment outcomes

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
1.1	Global poverty and food security outcomes		
1.1.1	Proportion of population below the international poverty line	United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division	SDG indicator 1.1.1. The indicator is defined as the percentage of the population living on less than US\$1.90 a day at 2011 international prices. The “international poverty line” is currently set at \$1.90 a day at 2011 international prices.
1.1.2	Prevalence of undernourishment	United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division	SDG indicator 2.1.1 The indicator is defined as the proportion of the population whose habitual food consumption is insufficient to provide the dietary energy levels that are required to maintain a normal active and healthy life. It is expressed as a percentage.
1.1.3	Prevalence of food insecurity	United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division	SDG indicator 2.1.2. The indicator measures the percentage of individuals in the population who have experienced food insecurity at a moderate or severe level during the reference period. The severity of food insecurity, defined as a latent trait, is measured on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).
1.1.4	Prevalence of stunting among children under 5 years of age	United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division	SDG indicator 2.2.1 : Prevalence of stunting (height for age <-2 standard deviation from the median of the WHO Child Growth Standard) among children under 5 years of age.
1.2	Global agricultural investment outcomes		
1.2.1	Total official flows to the agriculture sector	United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division	SDG indicator 2.a.2. Total official flows (official development assistance [ODA] plus other official flows) to the agriculture sector is defined as gross disbursements of total ODA and other official flows from all donors to the agriculture sector. (Billions of constant 2014 United States dollars)
1.2.2	Government expenditure on agriculture (index)	United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division	SDG indicator 2.a.1. The Agriculture Orientation Index (AOI) is defined as the agriculture share of Government expenditures, divided by the agriculture share of GDP, where agriculture refers to the agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting sector. The measure in a currency-free index, calculated as the ratio of these two shares.

RMF level 2: Country-level development outcomes and impact delivered by IFAD-supported projects

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
2.1	Impact indicators		
2.1.1	Number of people experiencing economic mobility	IFAD Impact Assessment	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of rural people with changes in economic status (10% or more) including income, consumption, wealth, food diversity or nutrition. The indicator will be reported in 2018.
2.1.2	Number of people with improved production	IFAD Impact Assessment	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of rural people with substantial gains (20% or more) in production of agricultural or non-agricultural products. The indicator will be reported in 2018.
2.1.3	Number of people with improved market access	IFAD Impact Assessment	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of rural people with greater value of product sold (20% or more) in agricultural or non-agricultural markets. The indicator will be reported in 2018.
2.1.4	Number of people with greater resilience	IFAD Impact Assessment	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of people with improved resilience (20% or more). The indicator will be reported in 2018.
2.2.	Outcome indicators (percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better) at completion		
2.2.1	Effectiveness	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	<p>The extent to which the development intervention's intended effects and objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking account of their relative importance. This indicator is obtained from project completion report (PCR) ratings assessed by IFAD, as well as project completion report validation (PCRv) ratings assessed by IOE. Where feasible, actual project achievements are compared with those envisaged at appraisal and in the logical framework.</p> <p>This indicator is obtained from PCR ratings assessed by IFAD and PCRv ratings assessed by IOE. Reporting is based on average ratings of projects completed over a three-year period. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
2.2.2	Efficiency	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	<p>A measure of how economically and timely resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results. Cost/benefit ratios for key outputs provide an additional measure for assessing efficiency of resource use. Where possible, cost comparisons with other development projects operating in the same area are made. In some cases, such as infrastructure development projects or productivity-oriented interventions, an economic returns analysis is undertaken. If the economic returns cannot be estimated, project efficiency is ascertained through cost-effectiveness proxies or benchmarks.</p> <p>This indicator is obtained from PCR ratings assessed by IFAD and PCRV ratings assessed by IOE. Reporting is based on average ratings of projects completed over a three-year period. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
2.2.3	Rural poverty impact	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	<p>The changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions. It is a composite indicator that addresses five domains on which IFAD-funded projects are likely to have an impact: household income and assets, human and social capital and empowerment, food security and agricultural productivity, natural resources and the environment, and institutions and policies</p> <p>This indicator is obtained from PCR ratings assessed by IFAD and PCRV ratings assessed by IOE. Reporting is annual and is based on average ratings of projects completed over a three-year period. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
2.2.4	Gender equality	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	<p>Relevance of design in terms of promoting gender equality and women's empowerment, mainstreaming gender considerations in implementation arrangements (including M&E systems) and changes promoted by the project at the household level (workload, nutrition status, women's influence on decision-making, equitable workload balance).</p> <p>This indicator is obtained from PCR ratings assessed by IFAD and PCRV ratings assessed by IOE. Reporting is based on average ratings of projects completed over a three-year period. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
2.2.5	Sustainability of benefits	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	<p>The likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. Also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.</p> <p>This indicator is obtained from PCR ratings assessed by IFAD and PCRV ratings assessed by IOE. Reporting is based on average ratings of projects completed over a three-year period. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
2.2.6	Innovation and scaling up	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	<p>The extent to which IFAD development interventions have: (i) introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction (including engagement strategies, development approaches, technical solutions and managerial aspects); (ii) have been (or are likely to be) scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector, other agencies and by the communities themselves; and (iii) have leveraged pro-poor policy changes either through knowledge generated and/or through the empowerment of rural institutions to engage in policy dialogue.</p> <p>This indicator is obtained from PCR ratings assessed by IFAD and PCRV ratings assessed by IOE. Reporting is based on average ratings of projects completed over a three-year period. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
2.2.7	Environment and natural resource management	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	<p>The extent to which a project contributes to the rehabilitation or protection of natural resources and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This indicator is obtained from PCR ratings assessed by IFAD and PCRV ratings assessed by IOE. Reporting is based on average ratings of projects completed over a three-year period. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
2.2.8	Support for smallholder adaptation to climate change	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	<p>The extent to which a project contributes to reducing the negative impacts of climate change through dedicated adaptation or risk reduction measures.</p> <p>This indicator is obtained from PCR ratings assessed by IFAD and PCRV ratings assessed by IOE. Reporting is based on average ratings of projects completed over a three-year period. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
2.2.9	Government performance	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	<p>The contribution of partners to project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation. The performance of each partner will be assessed on an individual basis in relation to their expected roles and responsibilities in the project life cycle.</p> <p>This indicator is obtained from PCR ratings assessed by IFAD and PCRV ratings assessed by IOE. Reporting is based on average ratings of projects completed over a three-year period. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>

RMF level 3: Country-level development outputs delivered by IFAD-supported projects

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
3.1	Overall outreach		
3.1.1	People receiving services from IFAD-supported projects (million; male/female)	RIMS	<p>The indicator reports the cumulative number of people (gender-disaggregated) receiving services from all ongoing (or active) projects in a given year, i.e. it includes projects at different stages of implementation: recently approved, at or around midterm, or nearing completion.</p> <p>This indicator does not include indirect beneficiaries as such, but includes all members of a household when one or more members of the same household participated in an IFAD activity. The measurement is based on the aggregate for all project financing and extrapolated upwards to take account of projects that have not submitted RIMS reports.</p> <p>Other indicators below report on individual members of the households receiving services of IFAD-supported projects. In some cases, a beneficiary may be included more than once, e.g. received training in crop technologies and also took out a loan. IFAD project staff are aware of the potential for double-counting and adjust the total outreach estimates for indicator 3.1.1 accordingly. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
3.2	Natural resource management		
3.2.1	Land under improved management practices (million ha)	RIMS	<p>The area of land under more sustainable and resilient management practices (e.g. regarding natural resources, crop diversity, soil and erosion, livestock, agroforestry, water, diversification, weather insurance schemes) promoted by the project.</p> <p>The reported results refer to cumulative achievements over the project lifetime, for all projects that were ongoing in the calendar year. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
3.2.2	Land under irrigation schemes (ha)	RIMS	<p>The area of land under irrigation systems that have been fully rehabilitated or constructed by the project.</p> <p>The reported results refer to cumulative achievements over the project lifetime, for all projects that were ongoing in the calendar year. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
3.3	Agricultural technologies		
3.3.1	People trained in crop, livestock and fish production practices/technologies (million; male/female)	RIMS	<p>The number of men and women who have been trained in crop production and technologies (e.g. farming practices, application of seeds, fertilizers), in livestock production and technologies (e.g. milking, slaughtering, animal nutrition, disease prevention), and in fish production and technologies (e.g. catching techniques, management of fish sanctuaries).</p> <p>The reported results include the cumulative achievements over the project lifetime, for all projects that were ongoing in the calendar year. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
3.4	Rural financial services		
3.4.1	Voluntary savers (million; male/female)	RIMS	The total number of men/women who voluntarily have funds on deposit with an IFAD-supported financial institution on a specific date (e.g. 31 December).
3.4.2	Active borrowers (million; male/female)	RIMS	The total number of male and female borrowers with an outstanding balance in an IFAD-supported financial institution at a specific date in the reporting year (e.g. 31 December).
3.5	Marketing		
3.5.1	Roads constructed/rehabilitated (km)	RIMS	<p>Total kilometres (km) of all typologies of roads that have been fully constructed or rehabilitated (upgraded) by the project.</p> <p>The reported results include the cumulative achievements over the project lifetime, for all projects that were ongoing in the calendar year. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
3.5.2	Processing facilities constructed/rehabilitated	RIMS	<p>The number of processing facilities (e.g. mills, hullers, shellers, extractors) that have been fully constructed or rehabilitated by the project.</p> <p>The reported results include the cumulative achievements over the project lifetime, for all projects that were ongoing in the calendar year. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
3.5.3	Marketing facilities constructed/rehabilitated	RIMS	<p>The number of market facilities (e.g. marketplaces, shading structures, sanitary systems) that have been fully constructed or rehabilitated by the project.</p> <p>The reported results include the cumulative achievements over the project lifetime, for all projects that were ongoing in the calendar year. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
3.6	Microenterprise		
3.6.1	Enterprises accessing non-financial services facilitated by the project	RIMS	<p>The number of enterprises that have accessed non-financial services (e.g. business planning, technical advisory, supply chain management) promoted by the project.</p> <p>The reported results include the cumulative achievements over the project lifetime, for all projects that were ongoing in the calendar year. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
3.7	Policies and institutions		
3.7.1	People trained in community management topics (million; male/female)	RIMS	<p>The number of men and women who have been trained in topics related to community-level decision making and management processes (e.g. participatory methods, monitoring and evaluation, financial management and accounting).</p> <p>The reported results include the cumulative achievements over the project lifetime, for all projects that were ongoing in the calendar year. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
3.8	Climate change adaptation		
3.8.1	Poor smallholder household members supported in coping with the effects of climate change	RIMS	The number of men and women who benefit from climate change adaptation measures under IFAD's Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP). This is aggregated from the results frameworks in ASAP-supported projects on an annual basis

RMF level 4: Operational effectiveness of IFAD-supported country programmes and projects

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
4.1	Percentage of country programmes rated moderately satisfactory or better during implementation for:		
4.1.1	Contribution to increased incomes, improved food security and empowerment of poor rural women and men	Client survey	Client rating (governments, partners, civil society) of IFAD country programmes for achieving impact on income, food security and empowerment of poor rural women and men. The result is calculated on a two-year basis, based on results of two annual client surveys. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.1.2	Adherence to the development effectiveness agenda	Client survey	Client rating (governments, partners, civil society) of IFAD country programmes for its adherence to the five mutually reinforcing principles (ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, mutual accountability) of the development effectiveness agenda. The result is calculated on a two-year basis, based on results of two annual client surveys. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.1.3	Engagement in national policy dialogue	Client survey	Client rating (governments, partners, civil society) of IFAD country programmes for its contribution to national policy dialogue and for its support to enable for participation of civil society in policy dialogue. The result is calculated on a two-year basis, based on results of two annual client surveys. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.1.4	Partnership-building	Client survey	Client rating (governments, partners, civil society) of IFAD country programmes for their effectiveness in partnership building with key national and international stakeholders in the country. The result is calculated on a two-year basis, based on results of two annual client surveys. The indicator will be reported every year.

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
4.2	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better at entry		
4.2.1	Overall rating for quality of design	QA	A summary rating across several dimensions, including alignment with country context, institutional capacities, implementation readiness, likelihood of achieving development objectives and extent to which quality enhancement (QE) recommendations have been addressed. The ratings are reported on a 24-month average basis. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.2.2	Overall rating for quality of design in fragile states only	QA	Same as 4.2.1, but for IFAD's list of fragile states, which combines a harmonized list agreed on by multilateral development banks and a list compiled by OECD. The ratings are calculated on a 24-month average basis. The indicator will be reported every year.

4.2.3	Gender	QA	A summary rating across several aspects of gender mainstreaming, including analysing the project's thematic focus from a gender perspective, describing what the project will deliver from a gender perspective (economic empowerment, decision-making and workload balance), and detailing the main elements of the gender strategy and implementation arrangements. The ratings are calculated on a 24-month average basis. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.2.4	M&E	QA	A summary rating across several M&E dimensions, including provisions for sex- and age-disaggregated baseline, midterm and completion surveys, impact evaluations with defined poverty line at baseline, and arrangements for monitoring outreach and other key objectives over the life of the project. The ratings are calculated on a 24-month average basis. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.2.5	Scaling up	QA	<p>A summary rating across several scaling up dimensions, including identification of the specific models/interventions to be scaled up and provision of evidence that they are effective and efficient, and articulation of the pathway for scaling up.</p> <p>This includes the extent to which the design defines the operational dimensions to be reached and the extent to which it has assessed the main pathways and the key drivers that will provide scalability and sustainability beyond the project life. Scaling up can be horizontal (an expansion in the geographical reach of the investment from one district/region to others) and/or vertical (an expansion of the investment between organizational tiers, i.e. from one level of public administration to another, or from local to provincial to national). Additionally, the indicator captures the extent to which the project identifies the areas and approaches for innovation and accumulation of knowledge during implementation to guide future decisions on scaling up. The ratings are calculated on a 24-month average basis. The indicator will be reported every year.</p>
4.2.6	Environment and climate change	QA	A summary rating across several environment and climate change dimensions, including degree of awareness, relevance of the proposed investments, likely impact on vulnerability reduction, and capacity-building of institutions and communities to manage environmental and climate-related risks. The ratings are calculated on a 24-month average basis. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.2.7	Loan-financed projects have a published and verifiable economic analysis	QA	The share of projects with a published and verifiable economic analysis (yearly). The indicator will be reported every year.
4.3	Portfolio management		

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
4.3.1	Time from project approval to first disbursement (months)	GRIPS	The time elapsed between first disbursement date of loans (excl. supplementary) or Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) grants (excl. supplementary) and respective date of approval by the Executive Board for projects that had such first disbursement in the last 36 months. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.3.2	Percentage disbursement ratio – overall	Flexcube	Disbursements in the review period of loans/grants divided by the value of loans/grants available for disbursement to financial closure as at the end of the one-year reporting period minus cumulative disbursement to date. The indicator will be reported every year.

4.3.3	Percentage disbursement ratio – fragile situations	Flexcube	Same as 4.3.2, except only for IFAD's list of fragile states which combines a harmonized list agreed on by multilateral development banks and a list compiled by OECD. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.3.4	Gender focus in implementation	PSR/GRIPS	Relevance of design in terms of promoting gender equality and women's empowerment by mainstreaming gender considerations in implementation arrangements, including support of project management, implementing partners, and relevant operational measures, e.g. through financial and human resource allocations, and use of sex-disaggregated indicators for monitoring, analysis of data and use of findings to correct project implementation and disseminate lessons learned. The result is calculated on a one-year basis. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.3.5	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better with acceptable disbursement rate (against approved annual workplan and budget)	PSR	Projects with disbursement rates that are greater than or equal to 70 per cent of the annual workplan and budget estimates for the comparable point in time (in the year of the reporting period). The indicator will be reported every year.
4.3.6	Percentage of grants rated moderately satisfactory for overall implementation progress	GSR	Grants that are expected to achieve at least most major outputs and at least partially meet the development objectives at completion. The overall rating should be consistent with the ratings given for specific indicators, taking into account the performance and relative importance of components. The result is calculated on a one-year basis. The indicator will be reported every year.
4.4	Cofinancing		
4.4.1	Cofinancing ratio	GRIPS	The amount of current cofinancing from domestic and international sources divided by the approved amount of IFAD financing for projects approved in a given three-year period. The ratio indicates the US\$ amount of cofinancing per US\$ of IFAD financing (36-month average). The indicator will be reported every year.

RMF level 5: IFAD's institutional effectiveness and efficiency

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
5.1	Improved resource mobilization and management		
5.1.1	Percentage of pledges over IFAD10 target	PeopleSoft (contribution module)	The value of pledges received divided by the related target level for IFAD10 at time of reporting. The indicator will be reported every year.
5.2	Improved human resources management		
5.2.1	Staff engagement index: percentage of staff positively engaged in IFAD objectives	Global Staff Survey	The percentage of favourable responses of IFAD staff to six questions in the annual staff survey. The indicator will be reported every year.
5.2.2	Percentage of workforce from Lists B and C Member States	PeopleSoft (HR module)	The full-time equivalents (FTEs) of IFAD staff and consultants from List B or C Member States divided by the total number of IFAD's FTEs (only for workforce under IFAD's administrative budget). The indicator will be reported every year.
5.2.3	Percentage of women in P-5 posts and above	PeopleSoft (HR module)	The number of P5 and above posts that are held by women divided by all men and women in P-5 and above posts (excluding staff on short-term contracts and only for staff under IFAD's administrative budget). The indicator will be reported every year.
5.2.4	Average time (in days) to finalize recruitments against Professional vacancies	Office records	Average number of days from vacancy announcement closing date to the date on which the selection decision is made (i.e. Appointments and Promotions Board) for all finalized recruitment processes in a given one-year period (12-month rolling average). The indicator will be reported every year.
5.3	Improved administrative efficiency		
5.3.1	Share of budget allocations to: Cluster 1, Cluster 2, Cluster 3 and Cluster 4	IFAD's results-based programme of work and regular and capital budgets	Share of IFAD's administrative budget (excluding the corporate cost centre) allocated to each results cluster.
5.3.2	Ratio of budgeted staff positions in IFAD country offices	PeopleSoft (Budget Module)	Number of planned ICO staff divided by the total number of planned staff in regional divisions (administrative budget only). The indicator will be reported every year.
5.3.3	Loan and grant commitments in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	PeopleSoft (General Ledger)	Programme funds committed by IFAD inclusive of loans, DSF grants, grants, ASAP and other (supplementary) funds managed by IFAD, divided by actual expenditures incurred under the administrative budget and other resources under IFAD's management (excluding IOE) (36-month rolling average). The indicator will be reported every year.

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
5.3.4	Loan and grant commitments and project cofinancing in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	PeopleSoft (General Ledger)	Programme funds committed by IFAD inclusive of loans, DSF grants, grants, ASAP, other (supplementary) funds managed by IFAD, and international and domestic cofinancing, divided by actual expenditures incurred under the administrative budget and other resources under IFAD's management (excluding IOE) (36-month rolling average). The indicator will be reported every year.
5.3.5	Disbursements in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	PeopleSoft (General Ledger)/ Flexcube	Programme funds disbursed by IFAD inclusive of loans, DSF grants, grants, ASAP, and other (supplementary) funds managed by IFAD, divided by actual expenditures incurred under the administrative budget and other resources under IFAD's management (excluding IOE) (36-month rolling average). The indicator will be reported every year.