

Document: EB 2020/129/R.7
Agenda: 5(b)
Date: 16 March 2020
Distribution: Public
Original: English



Investing in rural people

Corporate Risk Dashboard

Note to Executive Board representatives

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Paul Winters

Associate Vice-President
Strategic and Knowledge Department
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2189
e-mail: p.winters@ifad.org

Marie Haga

Associate Vice-President
External Relations and Governance Department
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2142
e-mail: m.haga@ifad.org

Guoqi Wu

Associate Vice-President
Corporate Services Department
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2880
e-mail: g.wu@ifad.org

Donal Brown

Associate Vice-President,
Programme Management Department
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2448
e-mail: d.brown@ifad.org

Alvaro Lario

Associate Vice-President, Chief Financial Officer
and Chief Controller
Financial Operations Department
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2403
e-mail: a.lario@ifad.org

Dispatch of documentation:

Deirdre Mc Grenra

Chief
Institutional Governance and
Member Relations
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2374
e-mail: gb@ifad.org

Executive Board — 129th Session
Rome, 20-21 April 2020

For: **Review**

Corporate Risk Dashboard

I. Overview

1. The objective of the Corporate Risk Dashboard (CRD) is to enable risk dialogue between Management and IFAD's governing bodies by providing concise and comprehensive information on IFAD's top risks within a given period of time.
2. The CRD was developed together with the Audit Committee to enhance risk reporting to the governing bodies. It has been evolving over the last 18 months, and it includes improvements recommended by Marsh Risk Consulting (MRC).
3. Management is currently pursuing an extensive set of actions to enhance the Enterprise Risk Management Framework (ERMF). The attached CRD takes into account the feedback provided by the Audit Committee and the Executive Board at the end of 2019 to the extent that IFAD's risk maturity and available information allows. In addition, Management has begun incorporating preliminary recommendations made by Ernst & Young (EY), including (i) the development of a risk snapshot of Management's risk intelligence in the form of a high-level summary of the top risks to be discussed with the Audit Committee (in progress); and (ii) alignment with IFAD's enterprise risk taxonomy and definitions, where possible.
4. The CRD incorporates the preliminary top risks and existing key risk indicators identified by MRC. It does not fully reflect thresholds, tolerances and trends. For the time being, the CRD is intended as a preview of what will eventually be the enhanced CRD. Accordingly, to illustrate the linkage between the CRD and the recently completed IFAD enterprise risk taxonomy, Management has mapped, where applicable, key level 2 risk sub-domains (with existing key risk indicators [KRIs]) from the new taxonomy into each CRD risk category. As the work on metrics evolves, some risks and KRIs within the current CRD are likely to be replaced with new ones.
5. The CRD is a dynamic tool that will be regularly improved as IFAD's risk culture and maturity evolves. Developing an enterprise risk taxonomy across IFAD's enterprise risk domains was an important first step towards an enhanced CRD. Having relevant and informative metrics for each risk domain will be key in enhancing it moving forward.
6. With the support of the Enterprise Risk Management Working Group and EY, Management will continue to apply an integrated cross-departmental process to evaluate the quality of currently reported CRD risk metrics, identify opportunities for enhancement, and propose and develop new metrics for monitoring and reporting. Further, Management has started the review and development of quantitative risk appetite statements, which will include threshold levels for associated metrics. Once these are established, the CRD will be further enhanced to track adherence across level 1 and key level 2 risks in each domain. As indicated in the sequence plan presented to the Audit Committee in November 2019, Management expects to submit the enhanced CRD to the Audit Committee at the end of 2020.

II. Risk snapshot

7. Once KRIs have been identified and/or enhanced for each risk domain in the revised enterprise risk taxonomy, IFAD will undergo an organization-wide prioritization exercise of the risks and KRIs to be reported in the CRD.
8. The top risks will be highlighted in this section, including trends and action plans from the associated risk owner. The key areas of focus across IFAD identified by Management are also discussed.

A. Leverage and capitalization/sustainability and adaptability

9. This refers to the risk that income (particularly replenishment contributions) is not sufficiently stable to cover expenses, including Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) grants, leading to capital depletion and/or diminished capacity to conduct operations. This, combined with the risk that IFAD ceases to be relevant to its strategic partners and loses its distinctive positioning with those partners, may result in the inability of the Fund to meet its strategic objectives.
10. Given recent changes in IFAD's financial architecture (in particular the DSF reform) and the increasing number of countries in high debt distress, it is important that IFAD secures an increase in contributions for the Twelfth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD12). This will enable it to maintain or increase its level of financial support to the poorest countries in debt distress, and thereby deliver on its mandate in line with Member States' expectations. Securing such an increase will require a clear demonstration of IFAD's comparative advantage and value for money. If this increase in contributions cannot be achieved, the funding available for investment in rural and agricultural development in many of the world's poorest countries will decline, because IFAD's programme of loans and grants will be reduced, particularly in terms of allocations to the poorest countries.
11. To mitigate these risks, as part of the IFAD12 Consultation, Management and Member States are reviewing the Fund's strategic directions and priorities over the coming years in order to agree on an overall financing framework for IFAD12, including an appropriate level of donor contributions. The aim is to secure a significant increase in contributions and put IFAD on the path to doubling its impact by 2030, maintaining or increasing its support to low-income countries in debt distress, while ensuring its long-term financial sustainability.

B. Risk/talent capacity and capabilities

12. As a result of the Fund's recent reforms, and further to external studies commissioned, Management has identified the risk of IFAD not having the appropriate workforce capacity and capabilities, processes and technologies in place to achieve its ambitious development objectives.
13. To address this risk, Management has developed a targeted capacity investment (TCI) plan. The proposed plan is broken down into three cross-cutting workstreams: (i) processes, (ii) people and (iii) technology.
14. The plan outlines how IFAD would, over a two-year period, improve the overall efficiency of its business processes and technological solutions, and ensure that it has the appropriate human resources foundation to support its diversified work programme.
15. In relation to talent capacity and capabilities, the TCI plan addresses IFAD's workforce risks and, through a technology-enabled talent management system, would allow IFAD to develop a holistic and coherent approach to talent management and human resources for its current and future workforce beyond 2024.

C. Global reputational risks

16. As is the case with other United Nations and multilateral organizations, IFAD is exposed to significant reputational risks in all of its business operations. Key reputational risks are linked to gender-based violence (GBV) in IFAD-funded projects and to sexual harassment and sexual exploitation and abuse (SH/SEA) involving IFAD's workforce or its partners - especially with the expected increase in private sector engagement.
17. With regard to increased private sector engagement and partnerships in general, failures in a partner's activities, whether related to a project or not - can create

significant reputational risk for IFAD and jeopardize not only specific programmes or the country portfolio, but also IFAD's reputation with other partners, Member States, recipients and the development community in general. IFAD expects to increase efforts to mitigate these risks through sound due diligence screening, strong governance, robust legal instruments and close monitoring.

18. In relation to GBV, the updated Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP)¹ will strengthen the safeguard policies applied to IFAD-financed projects. Borrowers/grant recipients will be required to assess the risks of project-related GBV, and the risks of SH/SEA, trafficking and abuse for individuals and communities affected by projects. Where appropriate, borrowers/grant recipients will adopt specific measures to prevent and address these risks, including the provision of confidential channels for reporting incidents and providing support.
19. SH/SEA complaints received through the SECAP complaint mechanism and in relation to IFAD-funded projects are forwarded to IFAD's Ethics Office for further action. These complaints are dealt with under the IFAD Policy on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Harassment, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SH/SEA Policy).² Further, since the release of the SH/SEA Policy in April 2018, policies and procedures have been strengthened, and awareness-raising and training sessions have been conducted in all regions where IFAD operates.
20. Finally, Management will continue to update the Executive Board at each of its sessions³ on IFAD's comprehensive approach to combat SH/SEA in its operations and funded activities (which is aligned with the United Nations Secretary-General's strategy for a system-wide approach and strategy to strengthen prevention and response measures).

III. Risk domains

21. In each CRD risk domain, Management highlights which risks were identified in the 2019 risk assessment and for which KRI data are available on a quarterly basis. An explanation is provided of how the revised level 2 risk categories (with existing KRI data) relate to the prior CRD template.

¹ Updated SECAP to be released over the course of this year.

² <https://www.ifad.org/en/document-detail/asset/40738506>.

³ See EB 2018/123/R.39, EB 2018/124/R.41, EB 2018/125/R.14, EB 2019/126/R.39, EB 2019/127/R.42 and EB 2019/128/R.51.

I. STRATEGIC RISKS

1. Strategic risk is defined as the risk that IFAD is unable to achieve its mission, implement its strategies, and be agile and responsive in meeting its evolving strategic objectives, resulting in a potential negative impact on IFAD’s relevance and unique position in the agricultural development landscape.

Explanation of risk mapping to prior CRD template

- Risk 1: The new level 2 risk category “strategic funder and partner relationships” replaces the previously reported risk “received replenishment contributions and sovereign borrowing are insufficient for the planned programme of loans and grants (PoLG)”.
 - Risk 2: This risk is not formally aligned with IFAD’s risk taxonomy and is unlikely to appear under the strategic risk category in future iterations of the CRD. However, it risk may be considered under the programme delivery category once the development of metrics is completed and IFAD has undergone the organization-wide prioritization exercise.
2. In the previous iteration of the CRD, the risk “difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified staff to match the changing needs of the organization” (former risk 3) was reported under the strategic risk category. However, because risks related human resources are operational in nature and categorized under operational risk in the revised enterprise risk taxonomy, risk 3 has been moved to the operational risk category and will be monitored and reported as such going forward.

Risk 1: REVISED							
Strategic funder and partner relationships: <i>The risk that partnerships and collaborative relationships, such as funders and private-sector partners, are not engaged appropriately to carry out resource mobilization activities or contribute to IFAD’s programme delivery management, resulting in potential funding gaps, reputational impacts and an inability to meet the Fund’s strategic objectives.</i>							
Risk owner	External Relations and Governance Department						
Key risk indicator		Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
1.1 Amount received as a percentage of the Eleventh Replenishment of IFAD’s Resources (IFAD11) target		To be defined (TBD)	82	83	84	84	n/a
1.2 US\$ million secured in borrowing for use in IFAD11 PoLG (cumulative)		TBD	US\$134 million	US\$134 million	US\$134 million	US\$247 million	n/a
Risk 2: Failure to meet outcome targets due to implementation challenges (likely to no longer appear)							
Risk owner	Programme Management Department (PMD)						
Key risk indicator		Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
2.1 Percentage of projects rated moderately unsatisfactory or lower for likelihood of achieving development objective		TBD	8.2	8.9	9	9.2	n/a
Risk 3: Difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified staff to match the changing needs of the organization (see operational risks)							

II. PROGRAMME DELIVERY RISKS

1. Programme delivery risks are defined as risks to IFAD's ability to achieve the expected results in its projects, programmes or strategies, and the risk of unintended consequences.

Explanation of risk mapping to prior CRD template

- Risk 4: The new level 2 risk category "project scope" replaces the previously reported risk "failure to ensure quality project design"
Note: Project scope includes risks related to technical soundness, defined as the risk that technical design factors – such as over-complexity, over/insufficient ambition or innovativeness, inadequate incorporation of lessons learned and best practices, weak economic rationale, weak analytic underpinnings (including because such may not be available) or overly rigid design – may undermine project implementation and achievement of project development objectives.
- Risk 5: This risk is not formally aligned with the enterprise risk taxonomy and may not appear in future iterations of the CRD once the development of metrics is complete and IFAD has undergone the organization-wide prioritization exercise.
- Risk 6: The new level 2 risk categories "financial management" and "project procurement" replace the previously reported risk "failure to ensure that funds are used for intended purposes".
- Risk 7: The new level 2 risk categories "environmental, social, and climate impact" replaces the previously reported risk "failure to effectively apply social and environmental safeguards".

Risk 4: [REVISED]							
Project scope: <i>The risks to the achievement of project development objective(s) stemming from factors related to the scope of the project</i>							
Risk owner	PMD, Strategy and Knowledge Department, Financial Management Services Department						
Key risk indicator	Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend	
4.1 Percentage of projects rated moderately unsatisfactory or lower for overall quality of project design	10	n/a	0	0	6.45	n/a	
Risk 5: Failure of project implementation to deliver results							
Risk owner	PMD						
Key risk indicator	Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend	
5.1 Percentage of IFAD financing invested in projects at risk	TBD	13	15.1	14.1	15.1	n/a	
5.2 Percentage of projects rated moderately unsatisfactory or lower for implementation performance	TBD	11.2	12.6	13	11.7	n/a	
Risk 6: [REVISED]							
Financial management: <i>The risk that project activities are not carried out in accordance with the provisions of IFAD's financial regulations and that funding is not used for the intended purpose with due regard for economy, efficiency and effectiveness.</i>							
Project procurement: <i>The risk that project procurement activities are not carried out in accordance with the provisions of the borrower/recipient's procurement regulations, to the extent such are consistent with the IFAD Procurement Guidelines.</i>							
Risk owner	PMD and Financial Operations Department (FOD)						

Key risk indicator	Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
6.1 Percentage of projects rated with moderately unsatisfactory or lower compliance with procurement guidelines	TBD	29.3	31.9	29.7	30.1	n/a
6.2 Percentage of projects assessed high risk for financial management	TBD	23	24	22	21	n/a
Risk 7: [REVISED]						
Environmental, social and climate impact: The risk that the project may cause significant environmental or social harm or increased vulnerability to climate change impacts of temporary, cumulative, irreversible or unprecedented nature, affecting the immediate project target area and/or areas beyond it.						
Risk owner	PMD					
Key risk indicator	Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
7.1 Percentage of project supervision reports with moderately unsatisfactory or lower SECAP rating	TBD	11.8	10.4	11.7	12	n/a

III. FINANCIAL RISKS

- Financial risk is defined as the risk of financial loss resulting from the Fund's ability to efficiently and economically manage financial resources and satisfy financial commitments.

Explanation of risk mapping to prior CRD

- Leverage and capitalization (risk 8), liquidity (risk 9), and credit (risk 10) were reported in past iterations of the dashboard. Definitions have been updated to reflect the revised financial risk taxonomy.

Risk 8: [REVISED]							
Leverage and capitalization risk: <i>The risk that the Fund's capitalization or capital position is not adequate to safeguard its ability to continue as a going concern.</i>							
Risk owner	FOD						
Key risk indicator		Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
8.1 Debt to equity		35%	6.2%	7.2%	7.6%	8.1%	n/a
8.2 Deployable available capital		TBD	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Risk 9: [REVISED]							
Liquidity risk: <i>The risk of losses resulting from raising funds through sales of securities or funding at adverse prices, or the risk of inability to raise funds through such channels.</i>							
Risk owner	FOD						
Key risk indicator		Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
9.1 Liquidity ratio as per Sovereign Borrowing Framework		Minium 5%	12.1%	12.1%	11.6%	10.7%	n/a
9.2 Minimum liquidity ratio		60%	207%	219%	205%	97.5% ⁴	n/a
Risk 10: [REVISED]							
Credit risk: <i>The risk of loss of the loan principal or loss of a financial reward stemming from a borrower or counterparty's failure to repay a loan or otherwise meet a financial contractual obligation.</i>							
Risk owner	FOD						
Key risk indicator		Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
10.1 Percentage of non-performing loans		5	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.6	n/a

⁴ From this quarter on, the ratio will be reported as liquidity/gross outflows, where the minimum liquidity requirement is 60 per cent of gross outflows (before it was expressed as liquidity/60 per cent of gross outflows). The updated ratio is now directly comparable to the minimum requirement as they are both ratios measured on the same base – total gross annual outflows.

IV. OPERATIONAL RISKS

- Operational risks are defined as risks resulting from inadequate or failed internal processes, inadequate human resources or systems or from external events that may result in financial loss or damage to the Fund's reputation.

Explanation of risk mapping to prior CRD template

- Risk 11: The new level 2 risk category "unsatisfactory conduct and misconduct" replaces the previously reported risk "potential misconduct committed by staff in breach of the IFAD Code of Conduct".
- Risk 12: The new level 2 risk category "security risk" replaces the previously reported risk "major event or crisis seriously impacting staff safety and security".
 - Note: The risk drivers under "security risk" are aligned with the United Nations Security Management System Security Policy framework. Indicator 12.2 will be revised and might be replaced with a measurement that allows monitoring of IFAD's operations in security areas from level 4 (substantial) to 6 (extreme).
- Risk 13: The new level 2 risk category "talent capabilities and capacity" is new under operational risk and replaces the previously reported risk "difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified staff to match the changing needs of the organization".
 - Note: This risk was previously reported under "strategic risks". Following Management's decision and as reflected in the enterprise risk taxonomy, risks related to human resources may be monitored and reported under the "operational risk" domain.

Risk 11: [REVISED]						
Unsatisfactory conduct and misconduct: <i>The risk of potential unsatisfactory conduct and misconduct arising as a consequence of any act or omission, whether deliberate or resulting from negligence, committed by an IFAD staff member or an individual hired by IFAD under the provisions of the Handbook on consultants, or any other applicable internal IFAD policy, rule or procedure – including but not limited to the Code of Conduct – which may result in reputational or actual damage to IFAD or litigation.</i>						
Risk owner	Ethics Office (ETH)					
Key risk indicator	Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
11.1 Number of credible allegations of unsatisfactory conduct, misconduct and/or SEA/SH received by ETH (quarterly)	zero	8	11	9	2	n/a
11.2 Number of referrals to the Office of Audit and Oversight (AUO) for investigation after ETH prior review	zero	0	3	4	2	n/a
Risk 12: [REVISED]						
Security: <i>The risk that IFAD is unable to ensure the safety and security of personnel, assets, and operations, which can lead to potential financial loss, reputational damage and/or the injury or death of personnel operating on behalf of or in partnership with the Fund.</i>						
Risk owner	Corporate Services Department (CSD)					
Key risk indicator	Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
12.1 Number of reported security incidents involving IFAD personnel, premises and assets that result in serious injury or death or impact severely on the continuation of programme operations	TBD	1	1	1	0	n/a

12.2 Percentage of ICOs in locations with reported United Nations Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) security levels =>3 (moderate)	n/a	38	38	38	38	n/a
Risk 13: [NEW]						
Talent capabilities and capacity						
<i>The risk arising from workforce and people-management issues, including inadequate staffing resources, skills, and volume of change/new initiatives that could impact IFAD's ability to deliver on its strategic framework.</i>						
Risk owner	CSD					
Key risk indicator	Risk tolerance level	2019 Q1	2019 Q2	2019 Q3	2019 Q4	Trend
3.1 Vacancy rate (positions)	TBD (3-year average: 13%)	16.5%	17.3%	13.3%	9.6%	n/a
3.2 Retention rate (staff)	TBD (3-year average: 97%)	96.3%	95.7%	96.0%	96.8%	n/a

V. APPENDIX

This appendix provides definitions for each KRI, together with linkages to relevant objectives in the IFAD Strategic Framework 2016-2025.

Note: Once KRIs have been identified and/or enhanced for each risk domain in the revised enterprise risk taxonomy, IFAD will undergo a prioritization exercise of the risks and KRIs to be reported in the Corporate Risk Dashboard. This table is therefore likely to change in future iterations.

Key risk indicator	Most direct link to objectives in Strategic Framework	Definition of KRI
Risk 1 1.1 Percentage of IFAD11 pledges received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 1 "country programme delivery" Results pillar 3 "financial capacity and instruments" 	The value of pledges received divided by the target for IFAD11.
Risk 1 1.2 US\$ million secured in borrowing for use in IFAD11 PoLG (cumulative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 1 "country programme delivery" Results pillar 3 "financial capacity and instruments" 	The US\$ value secured in sovereign borrowing and concessional partner loans received for use in IFAD11 PoLG.
Risk 2 2.1 Percentage of projects rated moderately unsatisfactory or lower for likelihood of achieving development objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 1 "country programme delivery" 	This rating is an aggregation derived from individual ratings for effectiveness, developmental focus, sustainability and scaling up.
Risk 3 [see operational risk 13]		
Risk 4 4.1 Percentage of projects rated moderately unsatisfactory or lower for overall quality of project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 1 "country programme delivery" 	Percentile of the total number of projects approved by the Executive Board on a 24-month average basis that were rated 3 or below under the Overall quality of Project design category.
Risk 5 5.1 Percentage of IFAD financing invested in projects at risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 1 "country programme delivery" 	The US\$ value of IFAD financing currently invested in projects at risk divided by total IFAD financing in the current portfolio.
Risk 5 5.2 Percentage of projects rated moderately unsatisfactory or lower for implementation performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 1 "country programme delivery" 	This rating is an aggregation derived from individual ratings from project management and financial management.
Risk 6 6.1 Percentage of projects rated with moderately unsatisfactory or lower compliance with procurement guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 1 "country programme delivery" 	A ratings-based indicator that draws on an informed assessment of the borrower/implementing agency's performance in carrying out procurement processes in terms of compliance with relevant policies, procedures and the procurement plan; efficiency, transparency, quality of documentation, and number and severity of substantiated complaints. The indicator is assessed annually during supervision.
Risk 6 6.2 Percentage of projects assessed high risk for financial management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 1 "country programme delivery" 	This rating refers to the risk associated with financial management systems used by the project and internal control environment of the project that provide assurance that funds are used for intended purposes. Expenditures from the IFAD loan/grant proceeds as well as those of other financiers (including government and cofinanciers) should be readily identifiable and traceable in the accounting system and reported periodically. The findings of (most recent) annual audits, interim financial reporting, disbursement experience and results of financial management reviews during supervision missions are taken into account, as is the inherent risk associated with the

		country environment (corruption, capacity of accounting profession, country systems) and implementing agency.
Risk 7 <i>7.1 Percentage of project supervision reports with moderately unsatisfactory or lower SECAP rating</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic objective 3 (resilience) 	A ratings-based indicator that measures how SECAP requirements identified during the project design and subsequent loan negotiations are being applied during project implementation and the extent to which the investment has benefited from SECAP in enhancing social, environmental and climate aspects and reducing any potential adverse impacts on local communities. The rating does not depend on the project categorization but rather on progress made on implementing SECAP measures established for the project. This rating is mandatory and must be done on an annual basis.
Risk 8 <i>8.1 Debt to equity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 3 "financial capacity and instruments" 	Percentage of outstanding debt to equity. Leverage above the threshold could result in an increase in financial risk.
Risk 8 <i>8.2 Deployable available capital</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 3 "financial capacity and instruments" 	Equity available to support operations based on the risk profile. Exceeding the threshold could result in the need to adjust the PoLG and/or an increase in financial risk.
Risk 9 <i>9.1 Liquidity ratio as per Sovereign Borrowing Framework</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 3 "financial capacity and instruments" 	(Cash in hand and in banks + investments)/total assets. A result below the threshold could result in an increase in financial risk.
Risk 9 <i>9.2 Minimum liquidity ratio</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 3 "financial capacity and instruments" 	Minimum liquidity ratio to support operations. A result below the threshold could result in an increase in financial risk.
Risk 10 <i>10.1 Percentage of non-performing loans</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 3 "financial capacity and instruments" 	Percentage of outstanding non-performing loans to total loans. A high level will lead to higher provisions and erosion of equity.
Risk 11 <i>11.1 Number of allegations of misconduct concerning a staff member or consultant received by ETH (quarterly)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 4 "institutional functions, services and systems" 	Number of allegations of misconduct concerning a staff member or consultant who violates the Code of Conduct received by ETH through its reporting channels. The number is reported on a quarterly basis (not cumulative).
Risk 11 <i>11.2 Number of referrals to AUO for investigation after ETH prior review</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 4 "institutional functions, services and systems" 	As per applicable procedures, ETH conducts a prior review of the allegations and refers the matter to AUO if it determines that there are prima facie elements in support of the allegations. Reaching the investigation threshold increases the potential reputational risks for the organization.
Risk 12 <i>12.1 Number of reported security incidents involving staff or consultants (quarterly)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 4 "institutional functions, services and systems" 	Number of security incidents reported involving staff or consultants and reported in the Safety and Security Incident Recording System platform.
Risk 12 <i>12.2 Percentage of IFAD Country Offices (ICOs) in locations with reported UNDSS security levels =>3 (moderate)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 4 "institutional functions, services and systems" 	This external indicator quantifies the exposure of IFAD personnel to security threats in field duty stations/ICOs. A target or threshold is not applicable.
Risk 13 <i>3.1 Vacancy rate (positions)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 4 "institutional functions, services and systems" 	A vacancy is defined as a regular budgeted position in all categories and locations that is newly created, unfilled or filled by short-term staff or consultants (regular positions and administrative budget only). The vacancy rate is the number of vacancies expressed as a percentage of the sum of the total number of regular fixed-term positions filled by fixed-term staff in all categories and locations and the number of vacancies. It is reported as at the end of each quarter.
Risk 13 <i>3.2 Retention rate (staff)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results pillar 4 "institutional functions, services and systems" 	Total number of staff minus separations (excluding retirements, mutually agreed separations, voluntary separations, terminations and deaths) for staff on fixed-term and indefinite appointments over average number of staff on fixed-term and indefinite appointments (rolling 12-month period).