

a

IFAD

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Executive Board – Eighty-Second Session

Rome, 8-9 September 2004

**PROGRESS REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF A
FRAMEWORK FOR A RESULTS AND IMPACT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR
IFAD-SUPPORTED COUNTRY PROGRAMMES**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Following Executive Board approval of the document entitled “Framework for a Results Management System for IFAD-Supported Country Programmes” (EB 2003/80/R.6) in December 2003, the Fund began implementing activities associated with mainstreaming results and impact management within existing projects, project design processes and headquarters reporting systems. Once the system becomes fully operational, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems for eligible IFAD-initiated projects are expected both to include applicable indicators for a results and impact management system (RIMS) and to generate yearly progress reports.

2. Since the Board’s approval of the framework, IFAD has focused on defining processes and activities required at the corporate and project levels to compile and aggregate RIMS information, and work is under way to integrate RIMS indicators into the broader framework of project M&E systems. The system as a whole is expected to evolve as experience is gained during implementation, which may call for some modification of the proposals contained in the original framework. The present progress report summarizes action taken to operationalize RIMS since December 2003.

II. IMPLEMENTATION COORDINATION TEAM

3. An IFAD inter-departmental RIMS Implementation Coordination Team (ICT) is currently assisting staff in implementing the framework at the project level. To that end, the team intends to draw up RIMS operational guidelines for both headquarters and project staff by the end of 2004, and staff and consultants will be trained in their use. The ICT will constitute an important learning centre both with regard to RIMS implementation and to the design of more responsive M&E systems at the project level, consistent with IFAD's *Guide for Project M&E* and the evaluation methodology and guidelines followed by the Office of Evaluation.

III. SEQUENCING OF RIMS

4. As noted in document EB 2003/80/R.6, implementation of the RIMS will be sequenced depending on the point the projects have reached within the project cycle. In order to improve the monitoring of RIMS implementation, ICT members have undertaken a stocktaking exercise on plans for introducing the system at the project level. This has pointed up difficulties in eliciting systematic, comparable information for projects that have passed their midterm point, and therefore it is proposed that RIMS should be applied only to those projects that have not yet reached that stage. The full system will be applied for projects under design, with integration of RIMS indicators both in project logframes and in the design of project M&E systems. For projects that have been designed but for which start-up workshops have not yet been held, indicators and processes will be discussed and adopted at the time of the workshops. Finally, for projects that are under implementation but have not yet reached the midterm point, the full system will be adopted at the time of the midterm review.

5. In view of the foregoing, it is expected that the RIMS for projects presently under design or for which start-up workshops have not yet been held (about 80 projects) will include first- and second-level results and impact indicators. Projects that are currently under implementation but have not yet reached midterm (about 90 projects), will report on first-level and, to the extent possible, second-level results. (In this connection, it should be noted that document EB 2003/80/R.6 suggested 70 and 80 projects, respectively.) In cases where baseline survey data relate to RIMS impact indicators, in particular the anchor indicators, an effort will be made to report on impact at project completion.

IV. FURTHER DEFINITION OF INDICATORS

6. As requested by the Executive Board, the ICT has also defined second-level result indicators for component clusters (see Annex) and has sought to determine the practicality for IFAD of defining a household asset index. In this connection, ICT members have reviewed several methodologies (including the asset indicator used in demographic and health surveys, participatory wealth ranking, the CASHPOR¹ House Index and the Poverty Assessment Tool of the Consultative Group to Assist the Poor), and believe there is potential for developing an asset index indicator specifically tailored to IFAD projects. The other indicators of impact (child malnutrition, women's literacy, access to safe water and adequate sanitation) are operational. The ICT plans to field test draft questionnaires by the end of 2004.

¹ Network of Grameen Bank-type microfinance institutions in Asia.

V. AGGREGATED REPORTING

7. IFAD's Project Portfolio Management System has been modified to allow for RIMS indicators to be recorded and for reporting at the project, country, region and portfolio levels. The results of first-level indicators are expected to be compared with cumulative appraisal targets and with those of annual work programme and budget targets. This information will provide governments and IFAD with more directed (and agreed) measures of project performance. Given that the reporting will be from relatively "young" projects, the first report on results and impact will focus almost exclusively on first-level results. Such results will be in the form of aggregate quantities for the number of projects for which a specific indicator has been selected.

8. As more information becomes available, second-level results and impact will be integrated into the reporting system, a much more challenging task than in the case of first-level results. Reporting on second-level results will likely be of a qualitative nature and focus on trends, particularly with respect to changes in behaviour, e.g. the number of projects reporting a positive or negative movement for the indicator. Distribution analysis for this type of reporting will be considered.

9. In later years, annual progress reports will describe IFAD's contribution to the Millennium Development Goals, using the selected project indicators as a basis. As projects will largely use household surveys for this type of reporting, which will point to trends, reports will employ a rating for aggregation. The scale will be similar to that used by the Independent External Evaluation of IFAD in assessing the impact of the organization's projects. For example, reporting on reduced prevalence of child malnutrition will show the number of projects for which the contribution is rated as (a) high; (b) substantial; (c) modest; and (d) negligible.

VI. MEASURES AT THE PROJECT LEVEL

10. Successful reporting on results and impact indicators will be largely determined by the strength and focus of project M&E systems, although the current functioning of such systems poses significant challenges in this regard. While it is anticipated that the adoption of the RIMS framework and IFAD's *Guide for Project M&E* will encourage more results-oriented M&E, it is also recognized that project staff require more direct assistance. This should include hands-on training for implementing partners, which may be funded through country and regional grants. Regional technical assistance programmes, such as the Programme for Strengthening the Regional Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation of Rural Poverty-Alleviation Projects in Latin America and the Caribbean and the Regional Unit for Technical Assistance, are in the process of incorporating into their respective programmes mechanisms to support project management teams and other partners in linking RIMS indicators to existing M&E systems.

VII. OUTREACH TO COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER PARTNERS

11. Implementation of the RIMS was introduced at the April 2004 annual meeting between IFAD and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) and at a number of IFAD/UNOPS regional meetings. Discussions have also taken place between line staff of IFAD and cooperating institutions (CIs) to introduce RIMS requirements and determine how best the CIs can provide support. IFAD participated in the Second International Roundtable on Managing for Development Results, held in Marrakech, Morocco, in February 2004, at which five core principles were adopted. IFAD's approach to results management is fully consistent with these principles. In addition, the ICT has met with a representative of the Technical Working Group on Managing for Development Results of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The team plans to participate, to the extent possible, in future DAC processes related to results and impact.

ANNEX

SYSTEM OF RESULTS AND IMPACT INDICATORS
(all indicators to be disaggregated by gender, where relevant)

Activity Clusters	First-Level Results	Second-Level Results
All clusters	Number of persons receiving project services (direct, total project)	Number of households (HHs) that have improved food security (e.g. reduction in length of lean/hungry season, increased number of meals a day)
Smallholder agriculture development	Number of persons trained, by gender and sector Number of farmers using purchased inputs	Ha of incremental crops grown (cereals, forage, fruit, legumes, vegetables, roots and tubers) Number of farmers adopting technology recommended by project (by gender) Number of farmers reporting production/yield increases
Rural financial services	Number of active savers (disaggregated by gender) Value of savings mobilized (by gender) Number of active borrowers (disaggregated by gender) Value of gross loan portfolio (loans outstanding – loans written off) (disaggregated by gender)	% of portfolio at risk (outstanding balance of overdue loans) % of operational self-sufficiency % of operating cost/loan portfolio % of outstanding loans/agents (staff productivity)
Small-scale fisheries development	Number of fishermen using purchased inputs Number of fishermen trained in new technologies Number of fishing ponds established/improved	Number of fishermen with secure access to resource base Number of fishermen adopting technology recommended by project (by gender) Number of fishing ponds operational after three years
Rural infrastructure development	Ha of irrigation schemes rehabilitated/constructed Number of farmers working on rehabilitated/new schemes Number of user groups/water users' associations (WUAs, etc.) formed Km of roads constructed/rehabilitated	% of days of water delivery/required Number of HHs served by wells Number of functioning infrastructure, schools, health centres Number of farmers with secure access to water
Smallholder livestock development	Number of animals distributed – restocking Number of animals vaccinated (by type) Number of dipping facilities constructed/rehabilitated Number of water points improved/constructed	Number of small farmers reporting increased herd sizes Number of small farmers reporting production/yield increases
Marketing, storage and processing	Number of on-farm (household) storage facilities constructed/improved Number of marketing facilities constructed/rehabilitated Number of processing facilities established	Number of functioning marketing, storage and/or processing facilities
Institutional development (policy change, organizational change)	Number of interest groups formed by type Number of enabling policies promulgated, by sector Number of projects supporting decentralized processes	Number of groups with women leaders Number of projects where new/changed pro-poor legislation or regulations are enforced at the local or national levels
Research, extension and training for agricultural production	Number of farmers participating in research trials Number of demonstrations held on farmers' land Number of people accessing technical advisory services facilitated by project Number of research-for-development extension/dissemination events attended by target HHs	Number of farmers adopting technology recommended by project (by gender)
Rural community development	Number of community management groups formed/strengthened Number of people belonging to groups, by types of groups Number of groups with women in leadership positions Number of village/community action plans (CAPs) prepared Number of community projects implemented (by type)	Number of groups operational/functional, by type Number of women on management committees Number of CAPs included in local government plans Number of community projects functional, by type

ANNEX

Activity Clusters	First-Level Results	Second-Level Results
Rural enterprises development	Number of people trained in productive skills Number of enterprises established/strengthened	Number of enterprises operating after three years Number of jobs generated by small and medium enterprises
Human capital development for rural households	Number of community workers, volunteers trained Number of people attending literacy classes (disaggregated by gender) Number of people trained in health, sanitation, nutrition Number of schools/clinics built/rehabilitated Number of wells drilled/dug for drinking water	Number of community workers still operational (for literacy, health, water, sanitation and education, see impact indicators)
Natural resources management	Number of trainers trained by gender and type Number of people trained by gender and type Number of cisterns/water harvesting structures constructed Ha land improved through soil and water conservation measures Number of resource management plans enacted	Number of HHs provided with long-term security of tenure of natural resources, including land and water Ha of common property resources (under improved management practices)
Management and coordination	% disbursement of IFAD loan	

