

Intervention on behalf of List C to be made by India

IFAD10/3/R.3 : Results Management Framework 2016-2018

Thank you Chair,

India speaks on behalf of List C.

The Results Measurement Framework (RMF) is a pillar of IFAD's results management system. The RMF targets are not just a basis for reporting, they are the points of orientation for the management of IFAD.

List C therefore welcomes the Result Management Framework 2016-18, which has for the first time included an explicit theory of change elucidating upon the assumptions behind IFAD's operations and the linkage between those assumptions and the performance measure and targets articulated in the RMF. The theory of change represent IFAD's beliefs about what is needed by the target population and what strategies will enable it to deliver upon those needs. The theory of change has established a context for considering the connection between IFAD's mission, its intervention strategies and actual outcomes, while creating causal links between them. We are of the opinion that a clear delineation of theory of change will help IFAD provide transparent information to its partners and donors amongst others and would help increase their confidence in the organisation. List C commends the management for this initiative.

List C also welcomes the a simplification of the RMF by reducing the indicators from the IFAD 9 RMF level of 80 to 60 by dropping 27 indicators and adding 7 new indicators for climate change, marketing and processing development and grants management. We support this and note that the indicators dropped from RMF are not forgotten but will continue to be measured and reviewed during the annual portfolio review exercises. However, we feel that for a better appreciation and understanding of the Theory of Change and the RMF the Management should prepare an information note giving a list of the indicators dropped from and added to various Indicator levels, along with the reasons for them being dropped or added. The note could also respond to IOE's suggestion for inclusion / exclusion of some indicators especially those related to COSOP indicators and Project indicators.

Some indications on the reasons for why indicators have been in this regard is in para 8 and 9 of the document but a detailed note will be most welcome.

List C calls for a greater alignment between IFAD's independent evaluation systems and self-evaluation system and suggests that Management should use, to the extent possible, IOE validated ratings to report results against indicators in the RMF. This would be especially true for Level 2 indicators. Besides, as pointed out in the IOE comments, there are some important indicators of performance IOE tracks, which are not in the RMF, such as IFAD's own performance and innovation. We encourage the Management to take a fresh look on these issues.

While we would not like to go into merits and demerits of each indicator, for you can always argue for or against any indicator but we would like to voice our concern over absence of an indicator to measure IFAD's capital efficiency in terms of its equity and loan as also the decision to drop the indicator on productivity.

IFAD's self-evaluation processes, which generate essential data for reporting against RMF indicator, is becoming more robust over the years will benefit further with implementation of the action plan for strengthening of the self-evaluation system. IOE evaluations have pointed out that M&E systems at the project level, still do not regularly generate outcome level data. Similarly

baselines are not done in all cases, and even when they are done, the quality is variable or they are done 3-5 years after project implementation starts. Unless these are addressed swiftly, work analysis based on RMF will suffer. In this regard, we suggest that IOE do a Corporate Level Evaluation on IFAD's overall self-evaluation system including the RMF during the IFAD10 period. This is already included in IOE's indicative plan for 2016-2017, but we propose that this be included as an IFAD10 commitment in the final consultation report.

Further, to understand the RMF and through it IFAD's working better, we would like to understand how the 2018 targets have been set for the indicators under all levels, as we find in many instances 2018 targets mirroring the 2015 targets. Does it indicate that what IFAD wants to be held accountable for has plateaued out or is it that we have not taken a hard enough look. Here too an information note delineating how these targets have been arrived at would help.

Finally, we are happy to see that IFAD 10 is striving to maintain the IFAD9's 80 million target of people moving out of poverty and we understand the logic which has been advanced for maintaining the same target. We also note the significant expansion in the number of people reached by nearly 44%. These are ambitious targets, considering that IFAD 10 has the same POLG as IFAD9 besides having to absorb additional cost for mainstreaming the climate change. We are not asking for a reduction in this number but an assurance from the management that the quest for reaching this enhanced target does not compromise the more important objective of taking 80 million people out of poverty.
