



The IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework: IOE Comments

3rd Consultation Session on IFAD10

7-8 October, 2014



Investing in rural people

Areas of challenge

- Results system is complex, with many layers and indicators, and is not supported by an explicit theory of change
- Baseline surveys not always available/done in time, and are of variable quality. PCR quality is also variable.
- Project level M&E systems focus mostly on outputs, and COSOP level M&E weak
- RMF used largely for reporting, and not sufficiently to manage for results

Key Findings: Past Evaluations



Areas of strength

- IFAD has established a comprehensive corporate RMF
- COSOPs and project designs show an improving results orientation
- Measurement, reporting and transparency have improved
- Self-evaluation system is becoming increasingly robust

The IFAD10 RMF: IOE Comments



Areas of strength

- Generally, robust RMF for IFAD10 (2016-2018), with overall target of people lifted out of poverty
- A more explicit theory of change now articulated
- Net reduction in number of indicators, which will facilitate data collection, aggregation and reporting
- Use of three year moving averages for analysis and reporting

Areas of strength

- Proposal for rigorous measurement of people lifted out of poverty, through further impact evaluations
- Articulation of a clear Self Evaluation Action Plan
- Commitment to use RMF as a management as well as reporting tool
- Use of multiple data sources to track progress and reporting

Areas for reflection

1. **Poverty targets:** What are the implications of the expansion in the number of persons reached (130m) on the 80 million target of people to be lifted out of poverty, with broadly similar level of resources
2. **Link results to budget and resource allocation:** Use actual and anticipated results for determining priorities, and allocation of resources and budgets
3. **Number of levels:** Are there opportunities for streamlining the number of levels in the RMF? (Comparators use 4 levels/tiers)

Areas for reflection

4. **Data and targets:** Use IOE ratings only, where available, for setting targets and reporting against achievements

5. **Nature of indicators**

- The 5 *ex-ante* QA indicators (level 4) are important, mainly for internal management purposes
- Efficiency indicators recommended by CLEE could also be considered in level 5

Areas for reflection

5. Nature of indicators (Cont.)

- **COSOP indicators:** Add indicators to assess country strategies: (i) *COSOP relevance* ; (ii) *COSOP effectiveness*; and (iii) *knowledge management*
- **Project indicators:** Add: (i) *IFAD's performance*, and (ii) *innovation* indicators. These additions would better align the RMF with the independent evaluation system

IOE's role in supporting the RMF



- Contribute to strengthening self evaluation function (e.g., PCRV, CCRVs, and comments on RIDE, PRISMA, evaluation synthesis report on IFAD's self evaluation, etc.)
- Assess functioning of M&E systems at project and country levels in PEs and CPEs
- Methodology development for IOE impact evaluations in the context of the development of 2nd Evaluation Manual
- Generate independent evaluation ratings for reporting on selected indicators in RMF