

Document: EB 2020/130/R.12
Agenda 8(a)
Date: 5 August 2020
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Investing in rural people

Setting Targets for the IFAD11 Results Management Framework: Country Programme Performance and Project Results

Note to Executive Board representatives

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Donal Brown

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

Thomas Eriksson

Director
Operational Policy and Results Division
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2425
e-mail: t.eriksson@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 — 130th Session
Rome, 8-11 September 2020

For: Approval

Recommendation for approval

The Executive Board is invited to approve the proposed targets for indicators 2.3.5, 2.3.6 and 2.3.11-2.3.16 and indicators 3.3.1 and 3.3.3-3.3.6 of the IFAD11 Results Management Framework.

I. Background

1. At the Governing Council session in February 2018, the Report on the Consultation of the Eleventh Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD11)¹ was adopted by IFAD Member States. In adopting the report, Member States agreed on a Results Management Framework (RMF) for the Fund covering 2019-2021, which included a range of indicators and associated targets. Management committed to fine-tuning the RMF in cooperation with Member States and returning to the Executive Board with proposed updates as necessary.
2. In April 2019, Management presented, and the Executive Board approved, the first update to set missing targets for IFAD11 RMF indicators in Tier III (operational and organizational performance).²
3. This document contains the second and final update, which provides targets on a selection of Tier II indicators (project-level outcomes and outputs) and some additional Tier III indicators (performance of country programmes).

II. Targets for project-level outcomes and outputs

4. The IFAD11 RMF addresses the thematic areas that IFAD committed to mainstreaming into its projects during the IFAD11 cycle. Consequently, eight new indicators were introduced, two of which were nutrition-related and six of which were climate-related. Of these, five are at the output level (core indicators [CIs] 2.3.5, 2.3.11, 2.3.12, 2.3.14 and 2.3.16) and three are outcome-level indicators (2.3.6, 2.3.13 and 2.3.15). These indicators were selected from the list of IFAD CIs, which are aligned to IFAD's Strategic Framework.
5. Because these CIs were new at the time of IFAD11 RMF adoption, baselines and targets could not be defined. As agreed with Member States, Management committed to setting targets and baselines for these indicators in 2020.³ The full list of indicators in question is presented in table 1.

Table 1
New project-level nutrition- and climate-related indicators

2.3	Project-level outcomes and outputs
2.3.5	Number of persons provided with targeted support to improve their nutrition (millions) (Sustainable Development Goal [SDG] 2.2)
2.3.6	Percentage of women reporting minimum dietary diversity ⁴ (SDG 2.2)
2.3.11	Number of groups supported to sustainably manage natural resources and climate-related risks (SDG 13.1)
2.3.12	Number of persons accessing technologies that sequester carbon or reduce greenhouse gas emissions (SDG 13.2)

¹ IFAD11/4/R.2/Rev.1.

² Specifically, these related to decentralization (3.6.1 and 3.6.3) and institutional efficiency (3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.3 and 3.7.4).

³ IFAD11/3/R.2.

⁴ This indicator substitutes the original indicator 2.3.6 percentage of women reporting improved quality of their diets. The new wording refers specifically to minimum dietary diversity for women (MDD-W), in order to associate this indicator's measurement with a high standard methodology. Projects including this indicator in their logical frameworks will be expected to use the MDD-W methodology. In terms of reporting, a consistent measurement approach means also that reported results can be aggregated and reported on corporately. The methodology does not alter the underlying nature of this indicator, which remains aligned to SDG 2.2.

2.3.13	Number of persons reporting adoption of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient technologies and practices
2.3.14	Number of hectares of land brought under climate-resilient management (SDG 13.1)
2.3.15	Number of tons of greenhouse gas emissions (CO ₂) avoided and/or sequestered
2.3.16	Number of persons whose ownership or user rights over natural resources have been registered in national cadasters and/or geographic information management systems (SDG 1.4)

A. Methodology

6. In line with the fifth pillar of IFAD's Development Effectiveness Framework (DEF),⁵ and the subsequent adoption of IFAD's CIs,⁶ results from project monitoring and evaluation systems are utilized for corporate results reporting. Results reported against CIs in project-level logical frameworks are aggregated using the Operational Results Management System in order to measure progress. Current project data were therefore utilized to set baselines and to help in the estimation of targets.
7. Baselines are defined as the values against which future performance will be compared. At the time that the IFAD11 RMF was negotiated, the baseline values were set using the latest available reported data (2017 reporting) for those indicators that were already part of the IFAD10 RMF. Consistent with this approach, and the principles of the DEF, the baseline values proposed for the eight new RMF indicators are based on the results data reported in 2019.⁷
8. As these are new indicators, the subset of ongoing projects utilizing them is still rather limited and within this set of projects, some have yet to report results given their recent approval.⁸ Nonetheless, significant efforts have been made by IFAD staff and project teams to maximize the number of projects utilizing these indicators, and to ensure data quality. This has helped to provide a sound base for setting the IFAD11 baselines using actual project data.⁹
9. For target setting, best practice shows that targets should be based on past trends¹⁰ while being also both ambitious and realistic. Hence, an assessment of data availability and quality was made to ensure targets were best estimates. This entailed careful consideration of the project sampling, i.e. (i) the cohort of projects reporting under IFAD11 that include these indicators and will be part of the reporting cohort in 2021; and (ii) projects that include these indicators and are expected to start reporting within IFAD11.¹¹ This has allowed for the largest possible project sample when developing the targets. Regional and project teams, in coordination with technical teams, were involved in this exercise.

B. Proposed RMF11 baselines and targets

10. Baselines and targets for all five output-level indicators are presented in table 2. These targets have been set with caution, taking into consideration the impact of potential implementation delays, including delays related to COVID-19, on projects in the IFAD11 reporting cohort.

⁵ EB 2016/119/R.12.

⁶ EB 2017/120/R.7/Rev.1.

⁷ Results available at the time of writing.

⁸ Projects are required to start reporting on results achieved within one year of implementation.

⁹ The number of projects on which the proposed baselines were set range from zero (for outcome-level indicators) to 42 for indicator 2.3.14.

¹⁰ Mayne, *Best practices in Results-Based Management*.

¹¹ The cohort of projects reporting under IFAD11 consists of: (i) ongoing projects included in the 2020 Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness (RIDE); (ii) projects that entered into force in 2019; and (iii) projects approved in 2019 that have not yet entered into force.

Table 2
Proposed project-level output indicators, baselines and targets

<i>RMF code</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>CI title</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Number of project-level targets</i>	<i>Proposed RMF11 target</i>
Output-level CIs					
2.3.5	1.1.8	Number of persons provided with targeted support to improve their nutrition	1 700 000	62	5 000 000
2.3.11	3.1.1	Number of groups supported to sustainably manage natural resources and climate-related risks	7 700	26	10 000
2.3.12	3.1.3	Number of persons accessing technologies that sequester carbon or reduce greenhouse gas emissions	81 000	9	120 000
2.3.14	3.1.4	Number of hectares of land brought under climate-resilient management	1 200 000*	50	1 500 000
2.3.16	1.1.1	Number of persons whose ownership or user rights over natural resources have been registered in national cadasters and/or geographic information management systems	31 000	9	50 000

* Excluding one project accounting for 30 per cent of the 2020 RIDE results reporting that reached completion in September 2019 and will not be part of the sample in 2021.

11. For the three outcome-level indicators, setting targets was dependent on the introduction during IFAD11 of a new outcome measurement methodology. This methodology – presented as an innovation in the DEF – is used at baseline, midterm and completion.¹² Management proposes to report on these outcome indicators at the end of IFAD11, in line with the methodology utilized for other outcome indicators (e.g. those that use project completion reports as their source).¹³ The proposed targets for indicators 2.3.6 and 2.3.13 were established based on the project-level targets of this limited subset of projects as presented in table 3.
12. Indicator 2.3.15 measures, in tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e), the amount of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions avoided and/or sequestered as a result of project activities. Given IFAD's historical emphasis on climate change adaptation, the coverage of GHG assessments (using the ex ante carbon balance [EX-ACT] tool developed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) in the IFAD portfolio is currently relatively low. The target for IFAD11 GHG programming at design has therefore been extrapolated on this basis.¹⁴ The baseline stems from a 2015 study estimating the GHG reduction potential of 13 projects under the Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme.¹⁵

¹² The Core Outcome Indicator Measurement Methodology Guidelines foresee the collection of data through quantitative surveys to measure and quantify the outcomes of project interventions. Sample-based surveys are intended to collect data on two differentiated groups over time: the treatment group (sample of beneficiaries) and the comparison group (sample of non-beneficiaries) three times over the course of its implementation: at the project baseline, midterm and completion stages.

¹³ Data from both midterm and completion reviews will be used, depending on the point at which the project is in its life cycle.

¹⁴ GHG assessments are typically undertaken ex ante (at design) and estimate the total GHG emission and reduction potential of a project's activities. International practice is to project GHG reduction potential over a 20-year time horizon (linked to the economic life of the project).

¹⁵ IFAD, 2015. *The Mitigation Advantage*. www.ifad.org/ar/web/knowledge/publication/asset/39180139.

Table 3

Proposed project-level outcome indicators, baselines and targets

<i>RMF code</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>CI title</i>	<i>Baselines</i>	<i>Number of project-level targets</i>	<i>Proposed RMF11 targets</i>
2.3.6	1.2.8	Percentage of women reporting improved quality of their diets	n/a	11 at midterm review (MTR); 0 at completion	20
2.3.13	3.2.2	Number of persons/households reporting adoption of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient technologies and practices	n/a	9 at MTR; 5 at completion	300 000
2.3.15	3.2.1	Number of tons of greenhouse gas emissions (CO ₂ e) avoided and/or sequestered	-30 million tons of CO ₂ e over 20 years	To date, 10 designs in 2019	-65 million tons of CO ₂ e over 20 years

III. Country programme performance

13. Management also committed to reporting on new indicators of country programme performance in IFAD11. These include indicators 3.3.1 and 3.3.3 to 3.3.6. Specifically, Management committed to revamping the client survey in order to increase its effectiveness for collecting information on IFAD's performance as perceived by in-country partners and enhance country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP) completion reviews in the context of the revision of its procedures and guidelines for COSOPs.
14. **Revamped client survey.** The client survey has been revamped to be more robust and reliable and solicit more regular feedback from country partners and stakeholders.¹⁶ It has also been benchmarked with other international development organizations. As such, the new IFAD stakeholder survey therefore adheres to the best practice standards observed by other international organizations.
15. The revamped survey collects almost 50 information sets from each respondent. Given IFAD's interest in having clear categories for analysis of "favourable" versus "unfavourable", the questionnaire now uses a consistent 4-point scale to avoid a reversion to the mean that is common with other common rating scales (i.e. 3-point and 5-point scales). The survey contains information on the relevance of IFAD's country programme (3.3.1); IFAD's performance on partnership-building (3.3.4); effectiveness of IFAD's country programme (3.3.3); IFAD's performance on country-level policy engagement (3.3.5); IFAD's performance on knowledge management (3.3.6); and IFAD's performance on promoting transparency, future engagement in the country, country context and demographics.
16. IFAD will field the revamped survey in each country in its portfolio once every two years in order to facilitate more meaningful comparisons in real-time across countries. Any country that receives some combination of technical, financial or knowledge assistance from IFAD should participate in the survey, regardless of the nature of IFAD's presence on the ground (i.e. a large or small country office, or no country office). Aggregated results have fed into the indicators in the IFAD corporate RMF and will continued to do so (3.3.1, 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5 and 3.3.6).
17. **COSOP completion reviews (CCRs).** Subsequent to the Executive Board's approval of the revised procedures for COSOPs in December 2018, internal procedures were elaborated and issued, in 2019, to guide country teams in self-assessing country performance in the areas of relevance, effectiveness, partnership-building (also in light of the new Partnership Framework), country-level policy engagement and knowledge management. The resulting CCRs also provide for alignment of the performance assessment methodology with that of the country

¹⁶ The new survey was approved as part of the IFAD Framework for Operational Feedback from Stakeholders approved by the Executive Board at its 128th session, [EB 2019/128/R.13](#).

strategy and programme evaluations carried out by the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD.

18. Given the absence of baselines against these new indicators, the small size of the cohort of CCRs undertaken in a given year and the impact of COVID-19 in impeding COSOP delivery teams to both complete CCRs and develop new COSOPs, Management proposes an aggregate three-year rolling average at the end of IFAD11. The proposed IFAD11 targets¹⁷ for these indicators are presented in table 4 below.

Table 4

Country performance indicators

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>IFAD10</i>	<i>IFAD11 target (end-2021)</i>
Relevance of IFAD country strategies (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder survey	n/a	90
	CCRs	n/a	80
Effectiveness of IFAD country strategies (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder survey	n/a	90
	CCRs	n/a	80
Strategic partnerships (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder survey	100	90
	CCRs	n/a	80
Country-level policy engagement (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder survey	100	90
	CCRs	n/a	80
Knowledge management (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder survey	n/a	90
	CCRs	n/a	80

IV. Conclusions

19. The targets and baselines established above for project-level output and outcome indicators on nutrition and climate change, as well as the country performance indicators, represent the last update required on the IFAD11 RMF. Targets and baselines have been set using well-recognized methodologies and capitalizing on best practice in comparable international institutions. They have also benefited from strong cross-departmental coordination and work with project teams on the ground to ensure that targets are ambitious as well as realistic and that baselines are reflective of current performance.

¹⁷ The targets are measured using the following data sources: the stakeholder survey, i.e. feedback from partners, and COSOP completion reviews, i.e. self-assessments. Targets are calibrated to the nature of the data source.

IFAD11 – Proposed RMF targets and baselines

Tier II – Development results

2.3	<i>Project-level outcomes and outputs</i>	<i>IFAD11 baseline 2019</i>	<i>IFAD11 target (end 2021)</i>
2.3.5	Number of persons/households provided with targeted support to improve their nutrition (Sustainable Development Goal [SDG] 2.2)	1.7 million	5 million
2.3.6	Percentage of women reporting improved quality of their diets (SDG 2.2)	n/a	20
2.3.11	Number of groups supported to sustainably manage natural resources and climate-related risks (SDG 13.1)	7 700	10 000
2.3.12	Number of persons accessing technologies that sequester carbon or reduce greenhouse gas emissions (SDG 13.2)	81 000	120 000
2.3.13	Number of persons/households reporting adoption of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient technologies and practices	n/a	300 000
2.3.14	Number of hectares of land brought under climate-resilient management (SDG 13.1)	1.2 million	1.5 million
2.3.15	Number of tons of greenhouse gas emissions (CO ₂) avoided and/or sequestered	-30 million	-65 million
2.3.16	Number of persons whose ownership or user rights over natural resources have been registered in national cadasters and/or geographic information management systems (SDG 1.4)	31 000	50 000

Tier III- Operational and organizational performance

3.3	<i>Performance of country programmes</i>		2016	IFAD11 target (end- 2021)	IFAD10 target
3.3.1	Relevance of IFAD country strategies (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder surveys	N/A	90	N/A
		Country strategic opportunities programme completion reviews (CCRs)	N/A	80	N/A
3.3.3	Effectiveness of IFAD country strategies (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder surveys	N/A	90	N/A
		CCRs	N/A	80	
3.3.4	Partnership-building (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder surveys	100	90	90
		CCRs	N/A	80	
3.3.5	Country-level policy engagement (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder surveys	100	90	85
3.3.6	Knowledge management (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Stakeholder surveys	N/A	90	N/A
		CCRs		80	