

Document: IFAD10/3/R.6/Add.2
Date: 10 November 2014
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Investing in rural people

IFAD10 Consultation Intersessional Paper

Revised IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework (2016-2018)

Note to Consultation members

Focal points:

Technical questions:

Hisham Zehni
Strategic Planning Officer
Strategic Planning Division
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2183
e-mail: h.zehni@ifad.org

Dispatch of documentation:

Deirdre McGrenra
Head, Governing Bodies Office
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2374
e-mail: gb_office@ifad.org

Consultation on the Tenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources –
Technical Seminar on the IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework
Rome, 18 November 2014

For: Review

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	i
I. Introduction	1
II. Revised IFAD10 RMF indicators and targets	2
III. Relation between indicators (and targets) on the numbers of people reached and moved out of poverty	8
Annexes	
I. Rationale for selection of indicators for the IFAD10 RMF	10
II. Definitions and data sources for IFAD10 RMF indicators	15

Abbreviations and acronyms

GRIPS	Grants and Investment Projects System
GSR	grant status report
IFAD10	Consultation on the Tenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PCR	project completion report
PSR	project status report
RIDE	Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness
RIMS	Results and Impact Management System
RMF	Results Measurement Framework

IFAD10 Consultation Intersessional Paper

Revised IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework (2016-2018)

I. Introduction

1. At the third session of the Consultation on the Tenth Replenishment of IFAD's Resources (IFAD10), held on 7 and 8 October 2014, members reviewed document IFAD10/3/R.3, IFAD10 Results Measurement Framework (2016-2018). Consultation members supported Management's effort to reduce the number of indicators in the Results Measurement Framework (RMF) for IFAD10 while introducing new ones that were strategically important. However, they also asked Management to reconsider IFAD10 RMF indicators and targets in light of specific observations and requests (listed in paragraph 2 below); provide additional information on the rationale for dropping indicators from the IFAD9 RMF; provide information on methodology and data sources for each indicator; and organize a technical session for members to better understand the measurement methodologies and targets for indicators in the proposed IFAD10 RMF.
2. Consultation members asked Management to reconsider IFAD10 RMF indicators and targets bearing in mind the following specific observations and requests:
 - (i) A number of targets are unchanged from IFAD9 and reflect an apparent lack of ambition;
 - (ii) The need to better address key issues such as climate change, nutrition, gender and land management;
 - (iii) The need to provide targets for level 3 indicators, rather than simply tracking progress;
 - (iv) The need for a more ambitious target for the cofinancing ratio, possibly disaggregated by country type and source of funds; and
 - (v) The need to clarify the link between the target for the number of people to be reached, and the target for the number of people to be moved out of poverty.
3. This intersessional paper addresses the points raised by Consultation members. In so doing, it puts forward a revised set of proposed RMF indicators and targets for the IFAD10 period. Members are invited to consider these and provide feedback via the IFAD Member States Interactive Platform by 23 November 2014 (prior and/or subsequent to the technical session scheduled on 18 November 2014). The revised IFAD10 RMF indicators and targets, along with indicator definitions and sources, will then be incorporated into the final draft of the IFAD10 Consultation Report as an annex. The draft report will be shared with members on 12 December 2014. This intersessional paper also serves as the reference document for the technical session on 18 November 2014.
4. The paper is organized as follows:
 - **Section II** addresses points (i) to (iv) of paragraph 2 above, and presents a revised set of proposed IFAD10 RMF indicators and targets, explaining the rationale for the changes. Management has undertaken a careful review of targets and proposes higher ones for seven indicators. Baseline figures have been updated for several indicators based on the most recent data provided in the 2014 Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness (RIDE) (for presentation to the Evaluation Committee in November 2014 and Executive Board in December 2014). It should be noted that the revisions to indicators and targets presented here apply only to indicators at levels 2 to 5 of the proposed IFAD10 RMF. Level 1 indicators are unchanged from document

IFAD10/3/R.3: updates on these will be proposed to the Executive Board by end-2015 based on the indicators featuring in the Sustainable Development Goals framework to be approved in September 2015.¹ Nevertheless, section II includes level 1 indicators for completeness.

- **Section III** clarifies the link between the target for the number of people to be reached, and the target for the number of people to be moved out of poverty. Thus, it addresses point (v) of paragraph 2 above;
- Annex I provides the rationale for changes made to IFAD9 RMF indicators introduced in the IFAD10 RMF; and
- Annex II provides the definitions and data sources of indicators in the proposed IFAD10 RMF.

II. Revised IFAD10 RMF indicators and targets

RMF level 1 – Global poverty, food security and agricultural investment outcomes

5. As mentioned above, the level 1 indicators in table 1 below are unchanged from document IFAD10/3/R.3.

Table 1

Level 1: Global poverty, food security and agricultural investment outcomes

Indicators	Source	Baseline (year)	Results (year)
1.1 Global poverty and food security outcomes			
1.1.1 Population living on less than US\$1.25 a day	UN ^c	46.7% (1990)	22% (2010)
1.1.2 Prevalence of undernourishment in population	UN	23.6% (1990-1992)	13.5% (2012-2014)
1.1.3 Children under 5 underweight	UN	25% (1990)	15% (2012)
1.2 Global agricultural investment outcomes			
1.2.1 Level of official development assistance to agriculture (billions of United States dollars) ^a	OECD	US\$10.4 (2011)	11.5 (2012)
1.2.2 Developing countries with share of agriculture in total public expenditure of 5% or more ^b	IFPRI	38.3 (1995)	23.2 (2011)

Note: OECD - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

^a Data are in constant 2012 prices.

^b International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), *2013 Global Food Policy Report*, food policy indicators (Washington, D.C.: 2014).

^c United Nations, *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2014* (New York, 2014).

RMF level 2 – Country-level development outcomes and impact delivered by IFAD-supported projects

6. As indicated in document IFAD10/3/R.3, the target for the indicator on the number of people moved out of poverty has been left unchanged at 80 million. The principal reason is that the difference in the total level of financing of the two project cohorts (2010-2015 for IFAD9 and 2013-2018 for IFAD10) is not considered significant in real terms. Furthermore, this target was set by the IFAD9 Consultation in full awareness of its tentative nature in the absence of conclusive or robust evidence from impact evaluations of IFAD-supported programmes, as no such evaluations had been conducted at that point. By introducing this indicator in the IFAD9 RMF, IFAD embarked on a major and complex venture – the IFAD9 impact evaluation initiative. These evaluations will measure the impact IFAD-supported programmes have on the economic mobility of poor people, against a target. It is noted that IFAD is as yet the only international financial institution to

¹ In the context of other updates to the RMF that will be proposed to the Executive Board by end-2015. See the IFAD10 Commitment Matrix, second IFAD10 commitment under the Results Measurement System for IFAD10 area of reform.

hold itself accountable in its RMF for measuring and meeting a target on the number of people moved out of poverty. By the time the IFAD9 impact evaluation initiative is completed by end-2015, IFAD will be in a position to set evidence-based targets for this indicator. Management believes that any changes to the IFAD10 target at this point would be premature, and thus strongly advises against it.

7. Document IFAD10/3/R.3 also indicated that the majority of other level 2 indicators of the IFAD9 RMF already had the highest possible targets given the nature and location of IFAD's operations. Management reiterates its view that target levels beyond the threshold of 90 are unrealistic. The only instance where a higher target has been used in IFAD's RMFs is for the indicator on relevance,² which differs substantially from other level 2 indicators as it refers to meeting an important precondition for design and approval of IFAD projects, and therefore will by default always achieve a high score. In light of its limited value as a measure of outcome performance, the relevance indicator was dropped from the IFAD10 RMF.
8. Heeding IFAD10 members' feedback on the lack of ambition apparent in some IFAD10 targets, Management proposes to raise the targets of the two indicators that currently have targets below the 90 threshold, i.e. indicators 2.3.2 Efficiency and 2.3.5 Sustainability of benefits, from 75 to 80 and 75 to 85 respectively. Latest data available for more recently completed projects shows improvement. Although the new data do not necessarily represent an established trend and may simply reflect a variation in the specific characteristics of the latest cohort of projects reviewed, it suggests that performance may be improving and that targets of 80 and 85 respectively may be reachable by 2018.

² The relevance indicator is defined as the extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, institutional priorities, and partner and donor policies. It also entails an assessment of project coherence in achieving its objectives.

Table 2

Level 2: Country-level development outcomes and impact delivered by IFAD-supported projects

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Baseline 2011-2013</i>	<i>IFAD10 target 2018</i>	<i>IFAD9 target 2015</i>
2.1 People moved out of poverty		NA	80 ^a	80 ^b
2.1.1 People moved out of poverty (million)				
2.2 Impact indicators				
2.2.1 Household asset ownership index	RIMS	NA	Tracked	Tracked
2.2.2 Level of child malnutrition (3 sub-indicators – acute, chronic and underweight); male:female ratio	RIMS	NA	Tracked	Tracked
2.2.3 Length of hungry season (number of months)	RIMS	NA	Tracked	Tracked
2.3 Outcome indicators, (percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better) at completion				
2.3.1 Effectiveness	PCR	88	90	90
	IOE	75	Tracked	
2.3.2 Efficiency	PCR	76	80	75
	IOE	57	Tracked	
2.3.3 Rural poverty impact	PCR	88	90	90
	IOE	86	Tracked	
2.3.4 Gender equality	PCR	93	90	90
	IOE	80	Tracked	
2.3.5 Sustainability of benefits	PCR	81	85	75
	IOE	65	Tracked	
2.3.6 Innovation and scaling up	PCR	91	90	90
	IOE	79	Tracked	
2.3.7 Environment and natural resource management	PCR	86	90	90
	IOE	73	Tracked	
2.3.8 Support for smallholder adaptation to climate change	PCR	NA	50	NA
2.3.9 Government performance	PCR	78	80	80
	IOE	66	Tracked	

Note: RIMS - Results and Impact Management System; PCR – project completion report; IOE – Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD.

^a Total for the six-year period 2013-2018.

^b The IFAD9 target of 80 million was set for the six-year period 2010-2015. Hence, a comparable period was set for achieving the IFAD10 target.

9. Members noted the lack of a target for indicator 2.3.8 Adaptation of smallholders to climate change. The main challenge in setting a target for this indicator is the absence of a meaningful baseline, since explicit attention to climate change adaptation within IFAD projects is a recent development that has largely been driven by IFAD's Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP). Adaptation to climate change can therefore not be expected to find a strong explicit reflection in recently completed projects. Consequently, the target for indicator 2.3.8 has to be set somewhat arbitrarily. An additional factor is that a very small number of ASAP-supported projects (representing the first generation of ASAP-financed interventions) are expected to be completed within the IFAD10 period. Management therefore proposes a conservative target of 50 for the IFAD10 period, and undertakes to raise it further for IFAD11 on the basis of more meaningful baseline data.
10. Members emphasized the need for attention to women's empowerment, agricultural productivity, nutrition and country-level policy dialogue, and queried the proposal to drop the indicator in the IFAD9 RMF on innovation and learning. As indicated at the third session of the Consultation, Management reiterates its agreement on the importance of these dimensions and assures members that they are already adequately addressed through indicators in the proposed IFAD10 RMF. Members are referred to annex II, which provides the definitions of all proposed indicators, and specifically indicators 2.2.2 Child malnutrition, 2.3.3 Rural poverty

impact, 2.3.4 Gender equality, 2.3.6 Innovation and scaling up,³ 4.1.3 Engagement in national policy dialogue, 4.2.3 Gender, 4.2.5 Scaling up and 4.3.4 Gender focus in implementation. Management confirms that the Results and Impact Measurement System (RIMS) impact survey guidelines currently being revised call for the introduction of a new indicator on dietary diversity. Once the revised guidelines are approved the indicator will be piloted and, pending the outcome, the indicator may be included in IFAD's RMF from IFAD11 onwards.

RMF level 3 – Country-level development outputs delivered by IFAD-supported projects

11. While Consultation members welcomed Management's ambition in proposing a higher target for the indicator on the number of people receiving services from IFAD-supported projects – raising it from 90 million in IFAD9 to 130 million in IFAD10 – they sought clarification on the rationale for setting the IFAD10 target at this level.
12. The IFAD10 target was set based on the steady progress on this indicator seen in recent years - from 59.1 million in 2011, to 78.7 million in 2012, to 98.6 million in 2013 – an increase of roughly 20 million per year. Indeed, the 2015 target of 90 million people has already been surpassed. This trend reflects the expansion of new operations in IFAD8 and IFAD9 relative to earlier replenishment periods, as well as shifts in composition of those operations to rural finance and value chain projects, which consistently show higher outreach levels. The number of people reached by IFAD-supported projects is projected to continue increasing each year – albeit at a declining rate – up to around 2016-2017. At that point, the number of people reached is expected to stabilize as the share of projects approved prior to IFAD8 included in the calculation of this indicator will be marginal, assuming maintenance of a similar programme of loans and grants and cofinancing ratio to that achieved in IFAD8 and IFAD9 (see paragraph 18 for details on how this indicator is measured). In light of this, the proposed target for this indicator was raised to 130 million for IFAD10.
13. Upon further reflection on discussions at the third session regarding members' desire for targets to be set for all level 3 indicators, and Management's suggestion to consider target ranges, Management proposes that for all level 3 indicators the notion of targets be reframed in terms of projection ranges. This approach would be far more attuned to the realities and challenges underlying these indicators and their evolution: for example, the difficulty of predicting clients' effective demand for certain interventions and opportunities for cofinancing or scaling up that may arise over time. Table 3 has been revised accordingly, and in this vein a projection range is also proposed for the indicator on the number of people receiving services from IFAD projects. Projection ranges for other level 3 indicators have been determined by assessing recent performance and the expected evolution of IFAD's portfolio.

³ The definition of indicator 2.3.6 Replication and scaling up (presented in document IFAD10/3/R.3) includes an assessment of the extent to which IFAD development interventions have introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction. To better reflect this focus, the indicator has been renamed Innovation and scaling up, which also aligns it with the analogous IOE indicator.

Table 3

Level 3: Country-level development outputs delivered by IFAD-supported projects

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Baseline 2013</i>	<i>IFAD10 projection ranges 2018</i>	<i>IFAD9 target 2015</i>
3.1 Overall outreach				
3.1.1 People receiving services from IFAD-supported projects (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	98.6 (52:48)	110 - 130	90
3.2 Natural resource management				
3.2.1 Land under improved management practices (million ha)	RIMS	4.1	3.3 - 5.0	Tracked
3.2.2 Land under irrigation schemes (ha)	RIMS	277 000	240 000 - 350 000	Tracked
3.3 Agricultural technologies				
3.3.1 People trained in crop and livestock production practices/technologies (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	6.4 (53:47)	5.5 - 7.7	Tracked
3.4 Rural financial services				
3.4.1 Voluntary savers (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	19.1 (28:72)	14 - 21	Tracked
3.4.2 Active borrowers (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	6.2 (40:60)	5.0 - 7.5	Tracked
3.5 Marketing				
3.5.1 Roads constructed/rehabilitated (km)	RIMS	20 120	18 000 - 24 000	Tracked
3.5.2 Processing facilities constructed/rehabilitated (new)	RIMS	9 391	7 500 - 11 300	Tracked
3.5.3 Marketing facilities constructed/rehabilitated (new)	RIMS	3 252	3 000 - 5 000	Tracked
3.6 Microenterprise				
3.6.1 Enterprises accessing business promotion services	RIMS	88 000	80 000 - 120 000	Tracked
3.7 Policies and institutions				
3.7.1 People trained in community management topics (million; male:female ratio)	RIMS	1.8 (24:76)	1.6 - 2.3	Tracked
3.8 Climate change adaptation				
3.8.1 Poor smallholder household members supported in coping with the effects of climate change (million) (new)	RIMS	2.3	8 - 15	Tracked

RMF level 4 – Operational effectiveness of IFAD-supported country programmes and projects

14. In light of members' feedback at the third Consultation session, targets for the following indicators were raised: 4.2.4 Monitoring and evaluation from 85 to 90; 4.2.5 Scaling up from 80 to 85; and 4.3.2 Percentage disbursement ratio (overall) from 17 to 22. Targets were set for indicators 4.2.6 Environment and climate change, and 4.3.6 Percentage of grants rated moderately satisfactory or better for overall implementation progress. A new indicator, 4.2.7 Percentage of loan-financed projects that have a published and verifiable economic analysis, was added. The target for indicator 4.4.1 cofinancing ratio was left at 1.20; this target level sets a reasonable margin for improved performance relative to the indicator's historical trend.

Table 4

Level 4: Operational effectiveness of IFAD-supported country programmes and projects

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Baseline 2014</i>	<i>IFAD10 target 2018</i>	<i>IFAD9 target 2015</i>
4.1 Percentage of country programmes rated 4 or better during implementation for:				
4.1.1 Contribution to increased incomes, improved food security and empowerment of poor rural women and men	Client survey	89 (2013-2014)	90	90
4.1.2 Adherence to the aid effectiveness agenda	Client survey	89 (2013-2014)	100	100
4.1.3 Engagement in national policy dialogue	Client survey	81 (2013-2014)	85	70
4.1.4 Partnership-building	Client survey	92 (2013-2014)	90	90
4.2 Percentage of projects rated 4 or better at entry				
4.2.1 Overall rating for quality of design	QA	91	90	85
4.2.2 Overall rating for quality of design (fragile states only)	QA	83	85	80
4.2.3 Gender ^a	QA	81	90	90
4.2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	QA	88	90	80
4.2.5 Scaling up	QA	83	85	80
4.2.6 Environment and climate change (new)	QA	NA	80	NA
4.2.7 Loan-financed projects have a published and verifiable economic analysis ^b (new)	Office records	NA	85	NA
4.3 Portfolio management				
4.3.1 Time from project approval to first disbursement (months)	GRIPS	17	14	14
4.3.2 Percentage disbursement ratio (overall)	GRIPS	15.8	22	17
4.3.3 Percentage disbursement ratio (fragile situations) ^c	GRIPS	15.3	20	18
4.3.4 Gender focus in implementation	PSR/GRIPS	89	90	90
4.3.5 Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better with acceptable disbursement rate (against approved annual workplan and budget) (new)	PSR	55	65	NA
4.3.6 Percentage of grants rated moderately satisfactory for overall implementation progress (new)	GSR	NA	80	NA
4.4 Cofinancing				
4.4.1 Cofinancing ratio (overall) ^d	GRIPS	1.22 (2011-2014)	1.20	1.6

Note: QA – Quality assurance; GRIPS - Grants and Investment Projects System; PSR – project status report; GSR – grant status report.

^a The current practice of breaking down results for gender transformative and gender mainstreaming projects in the Annual Report on the IFAD Policy on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment presented each year within the RIDE will continue in IFAD10.

^b Economic analysis is not a reliable method for assessing costs and benefits of some types of project interventions.

^c Data represent disbursements in IFAD's list of fragile states, which combines a harmonized list agreed on by multilateral development banks and a list compiled by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

^d A breakdown of results, e.g. by source of cofinancing and country type, will be provided in the RIDE.

RMF level 5 – IFAD’s institutional effectiveness and efficiency

15. Targets for level 5 indicators were also reconsidered and raised for the following indicators: 5.3.3 Loan and grant commitments per US\$1 of administrative expenditure and 5.3.5 Disbursements per US\$1 of administrative expenditure. These indicators are in effect virtually identical to indicators 5.3.3 and 5.3.5 in document IFAD10/3/R.3, save for the proposal that they henceforth be calculated inversely (i.e. with the level of administrative expenditures as the denominator instead of the numerator) – reflecting the apparently more intuitive logic that higher reported results represent improved performance (whereas the previous expression of these indicators implied worsening performance as reported results rose).

Table 5

Level 5: IFAD’s institutional effectiveness and efficiency

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Baseline 2014 or other</i>	<i>IFAD10 target 2018</i>	<i>IFAD9 target 2015</i>
5.1 Improved resource mobilization and management				
5.1.1 Percentage of IFAD10 pledges over replenishment target	Corporate databases	95	100	100
5.2 Improved human resources management				
5.2.1 Staff engagement index: percentage of staff positively engaged in IFAD objectives	Global staff survey	76	75	75
5.2.2 Percentage of workforce from Lists B and C Member States	Corporate databases	40	Tracked	Tracked
5.2.3 Percentage of women in P-5 posts and above	Corporate databases	29	35	35
5.2.4 Time to fill professional vacancies (days)	Corporate databases	109	100	100
5.3 Improved administrative efficiency				
5.3.1 Share of budget allocations to: Cluster 1 Cluster 2 Cluster 3 Cluster 4	Corporate databases			
5.3.2 Ratio of budgeted staff positions in ICOs	Corporate databases	42.7	45	45
5.3.3 Loan and grant commitments in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	Corporate databases	7.9 (2011-2013)	8.2	8
5.3.4 Loan and grant commitments and project cofinancing in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure (new)	Corporate databases	14.9 (2011-2013)	15.2	NA
5.3.5 Disbursements in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	Corporate databases	5.1 (2011-2013)	5.5	5.3

Following a review and refinement of the cluster approach to budgeting in 2015, a target for this indicator will be proposed to the Executive Board by end-2015 (this will be done in the context of other updates to the RMF that will be proposed to the Executive Board by end-2015: see the IFAD10 Commitment Matrix, second IFAD10 commitment under the Results Measurement System for IFAD10 area of reform).

III. Relation between indicators (and targets) on the numbers of people reached and moved out of poverty

16. The indicators on people reached and moved out of poverty are related to a certain degree; increases in the former may or may not result in increases in the latter depending on the extent to which, over time, beneficiaries below defined poverty lines are targeted/reached by IFAD-supported programmes. Measurement of these indicators involves somewhat different project cohorts, and very different methodological approaches.

17. The indicator on number of people reached reports the cumulative number of people receiving services from all ongoing (or active) projects in a given year. This means it includes projects at different stages of implementation: recently approved, at or around mid-term, or nearing completion. The data are reported by projects through the RIMS. Projects whose data are included in calculations of performance change every year because data on people reached start being included for projects that have been active for more than a year (whose data would not have been included in prior-year calculations) and data on people reached for projects that completed in the previous year are excluded from calculations (whose data on people reached would have been included in prior-year calculations). The target for the indicator is set based on: (i) recent trends in reported outreach performance; (ii) the expected evolution of IFAD's portfolio of active projects, taking into account the planned outreach of projects expected to enter the cohort of projects to be used for the purposes of calculating the indicator; and (iii) data on projects expected to be completed in the near future.
18. The indicator on number of people moved out of poverty involves a very different and more complex methodology compared to the indicator on the number of people reached. As indicated in paragraph 27 of document EB 2012/107/INF.7, Methodologies for Impact Assessments for IFAD9:
- "Contrary to the number of people reached, Project Management Units (PMU) would not generally be in a position to rigorously measure or estimate how many people have moved out of poverty. First, because not all (past) project designs specify the indicator and level of poverty to be targeted in an equally rigorous and measurable manner. Second, because PMUs are not systematically in a position (timing and capacity-wise) to measure the impact of projects on poverty levels. This requires rigorous and survey-based assessments; which are better outsourced to institutions that have recognised impact evaluation expertise."
19. The extremely high costs of conducting the rigorous impact evaluations required for the measurement of this indicator were recognized and reflected in the related commitments undertaken for the IFAD9 period. Accordingly, the measurement approach in IFAD9 consists of two main steps: (i) the impact evaluation of 24 projects completing in the 2010-2015 period; and (ii) extrapolation of the results of the impact evaluations to IFAD's 2010-2015 portfolio, comprising projects that are active or complete in the period (this is a significantly larger universe of projects than the one upon which the indicator on the number of people reached is based).⁴ It is expected that a broadly similar approach will be used to measure the indicator in IFAD10, taking lessons learned in the IFAD9 period into account and in line with agreed IFAD10 commitments in this area.
20. As mentioned in paragraph 6, the IFAD9 target for this indicator was set with the understanding that it was a rough estimate, drawing on a limited number of macro studies available at the time, and not based on conclusive or robust evidence from impact evaluations of IFAD-supported programmes. Upon completion of the IFAD9 impact evaluation initiative (by end of 2015), IFAD will be in the position to set evidence-based targets for this indicator.

⁴ See document EB 2012/107/INF.7 for further background.

Rationale for selection of indicators for the IFAD10 RMF

- At the third session of the IFAD10 Consultation, members expressed broad support for Management's efforts to streamline and strategically focus the IFAD10 RMF, noting that the indicators dropped would continue to be monitored through internal performance management processes.

Level 1: Global poverty, food insecurity and agricultural investment outcomes

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1.1. Global poverty and nutrition outcomes	
1.1.1 Population living on less than US\$1.25 a day (percentage)	Retained. Given ongoing discussions on the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) framework, it is proposed that these indicators be retained temporarily in the IFAD10 RMF, as it is likely they will continue to figure in the SDG framework. Revisions may be considered in due course following approval of the SDG framework
1.1.2 Prevalence of undernourishment in population (percentage)	
1.1.3 Children under 5, percentage underweight	
1.2. Global agricultural development and investments outcomes	
Crop production index (1999-2001 = 100)	Dropped. They show negligible change year-on-year, and are of relatively limited value in terms of performance management. Consideration should be given to selecting relevant indicators from the SDG framework, once approved
Agricultural value added (annual percentage growth)	
1.2.1 Level of official development assistance to agriculture	Retained
1.2.2 Developing countries with share of agriculture in total expenditure of 5 per cent or more	Retained, with modified definition to include all developing countries with share of agriculture in total national expenditure of 5 per cent or more

Level 2: IFAD's contribution to development outcomes and impact

<i>Indicators</i>		<i>Comments</i>
2.1	People moved out of poverty	
2.1.1	People moved out of poverty (new in IFAD9)	Retained.
2.2	Impact indicators (new in IFAD9)	
2.2.1	Household asset ownership index (new in IFAD9)	Retained
2.2.2	Level of child malnutrition (3 sub-indicators - acute, chronic and underweight), disaggregated for girls and boys (new in IFAD9)	Retained
	Length of hungry season (new in IFAD9)	Retained
2.3	Outcome indicators, (percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better) at completion	
	Relevance	Dropped. Reflects a precondition for project design and approval, and thus is of limited value as an outcome indicator. Results are always close to 100%. Helps streamline indicators suite
2.3.1	Effectiveness	Retained
2.3.2	Efficiency	Retained
2.3.3	Rural poverty impact	Retained
2.3.4	Gender equality	Retained
2.3.5	Sustainability of benefits	Retained
	Innovation and learning (modified in IFAD9)	Dropped. Innovation is already taken into account in the replication and scaling up indicator (see indicator definition in annex II), as such it appears to be redundant. Helps streamline indicator suite
2.3.6	Replication and scaling up (modified in IFAD9)	Retained
2.3.7	Environment and natural resource management (new in IFAD9)	Retained
2.3.8	Support for smallholder adaptation to climate change (new in IFAD9)	Retained
2.3.9	Government performance (new in IFAD9)	Retained

Level 3: IFAD's contribution to country programme and project outputs

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Comments</i>
3.1 Overall outreach	
3.1.1 People receiving services from IFAD-supported projects (number of people, along with male:female ratio)	Retained
3.2 Natural resource management	
3.2.1 Common-property-resource land under improved management practices (ha)	Retained
3.2.2 Area under constructed/rehabilitated irrigation schemes (ha)	Retained
3.3 Agricultural technologies	
3.3.1 People trained in crop and livestock production practices/technologies (male:female ratio)	Modified. Indicator expanded to include livestock referred to in the next indicator
People trained in livestock production practices/technologies	Merged into 3.3.1. Helps streamline indicator suite
3.4 Rural financial services	
3.4.1 Voluntary savers (male:female ratio)	Retained
3.4.2 Active borrowers (male:female ratio)	Retained.
Value of loans and savings mobilized in US\$ million (new in IFAD9)	Dropped. Indicators 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 are intuitively clearer, and people-focused. Helps streamline indicator suite
Value of gross loan portfolio (new in IFAD9)	
3.5 Marketing	
3.5.1 Roads constructed/rehabilitated (km)	Retained.
Marketing groups set up/strengthened	Dropped in lieu of new indicators 3.5.2 and 3.5.3 below.
3.5.2 Processing facilities constructed/rehabilitated	New in IFAD10, given importance of better linking smallholders to markets
3.5.3 Marketing facilities constructed/rehabilitated	New in IFAD10, given importance of better linking smallholders to markets
3.6 Microenterprise	
People trained in business and entrepreneurship	Dropped. Link to upstream results not clear or strong. Helps streamline indicator suite
3.6.1 Enterprises accessing business promotion services	Retained
3.7 Policies and institutions	
3.7.1 People trained in community management topics (gender-disaggregated)	Retained
Village/community action plans prepared	Dropped. Link to upstream results not strong. Helps streamline indicator suite
3.8 Climate change adaptation	
3.8.1 Poor smallholder household members supported to cope with the effects of climate change	New in IFAD10, given importance of supporting smallholder adaptation to climate change

Level 4: Operational effectiveness of country programmes and projects

<i>Indicators</i>		<i>Comments</i>
Country programme quality at entry		
	Percentage of RB-COSOPs rated 4 or better	Dropped. Basis for measurement is not particularly robust or objective. Performance has always been reported at 100. Helps streamline indicator suite
4.1	Percentage of country programmes rated 4 or better during implementation for:	
4.1.1	Contribution to increased incomes, improved food security, and empowerment of poor rural women and men	Retained
4.1.2	Adherence to the aid effectiveness agenda	Retained
4.1.3	Engagement in national policy dialogue (new in IFAD9)	Retained
4.1.4	Partnership-building (new in IFAD9)	Retained
4.2	Percentage of projects rated 4 or better at entry	
4.2.1	Overall average (new in IFAD9)	Retained
4.2.2	Overall average for projects in fragile states only (new in IFAD9)	Retained
4.2.3	Gender	Retained
4.2.4	Monitoring and evaluation (new in IFAD9)	Retained
4.2.5	Percentage of projects receiving positive ratings on scaling up (modified in IFAD9)	Retained
4.2.6	Environment and climate change	New in IFAD10, given high importance of environment and climate change
4.2.7	Loan-financed projects have a published and verifiable economic analysis	New in IFAD10, added to ensure attention to economic analysis of project interventions
4.3	Portfolio management	
4.3.1	Time from project approval to first disbursement (months)	Retained
	Proactivity index	Dropped. They are superseded by indicator 4.3.5 which is a better predictor of eventual project outcome
	Projects at risk	
	Project time overrun (percentage)	
	Time for withdrawal application processing (days)	
4.3.2	Percentage disbursement ratio- overall portfolio (new in IFAD9)	Retained
4.3.3	Percentage disbursement ratio – for countries in fragile situations (new in IFAD9)	Retained
4.3.4	Gender focus in implementation	Retained
	Percentage of projects for which IFAD performance is rated moderately satisfactory or better	Dropped. IFAD's performance is captured - at an even broader level (i.e. at country-level) - through client/partner-survey-based indicators under section 4.1. Helps streamline indicator suite
4.3.5	Percentage of project rated moderately satisfactory or better with acceptable disbursement rate (against approved annual workplan and budget).	New in IFAD10. Added in place of indicators proposed to be dropped above, and is in keeping with the Global Partnership Monitoring Framework and the indicator for aid predictability
4.3.6	Percentage of grants rated moderately satisfactory or better for overall implementation progress	New in IFAD10. Added given strategic importance of grant programme, and in light of the new Policy on Grant Financing to be developed in 2015
4.4	Project monitoring and evaluation	
4.4.1	Percentage of projects with RIMS or equivalent baseline surveys (cumulative percentage) (new in IFAD9)	Dropped. Performance has improved significantly, inertia for continued improvement exists, no longer represents a critical performance area, arguably no need to monitor within RMF. Helps streamline indicator suite
4.4.2	Percentage of projects submitting RIMS impact survey (new in IFAD9)	
4.4.3	PCR quality (percentage rated 4 or better) (new in IFAD9)	
4.5	Cofinancing	
4.5.1	Cofinancing ratio	Retained

Level 5: IFAD's institutional effectiveness and efficiency

<i>Indicators</i>		<i>Comments</i>
5.1	Improved resource mobilization and management	
5.1.1	Percentage achieved of replenishment pledges	Retained
5.2	Improved human resources management	
5.2.1	Staff engagement index: percentage of staff positively engaged in IFAD objectives	Retained
5.2.2	Percentage of workforce from Lists B and C Member States	Retained
5.2.3	Percentage of women in P-5 posts and above	Retained
5.2.4	Time to fill professional vacancies (days)	Retained
	Improved risk management	
	Number of actions overdue on high-priority internal audit recommendations	Dropped. Performance has improved significantly, inertia for continued improvement exists, no longer represents a critical performance area, arguably no need to monitor at RMF level. Helps streamline indicator suite
5.3	Improved administrative efficiency	
	Ratio of administrative budget to the planned POLG	Dropped. It was tracked in IFAD9 RMF, and is reported on and discussed with the Executive Board and Audit Committee in the context of reviews of IFAD's programme of work and budget. Helps streamline RMF indicator suite
	New or revised (ex ante) indicators in IFAD9	
5.3.1	Share of budget allocations to: Cluster 1 Cluster 2 Cluster 3 Cluster 4	Retained. Indicator will be refined following a review of the cluster budgeting approach
	Ratio of budgeted staff positions to total budgeted positions in: Cluster 1 Cluster 2 Cluster 3 Cluster 4	Dropped. They are largely covariant with indicators under 5.3.1 above. Helps streamline RMF indicator suit.
5.3.2	Ratio of budgeted staff positions in ICOs (new in IFAD9)	Retained
	New or revised (ex post) indicators in IFAD9	
5.3.3	Loan and grant commitments in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	Retained, with some slight changes compared to the prior indicator: the indicator's name has been simplified, and the method of calculation is the reciprocal of the prior indicator, i.e. an increase in results represents improvement in performance.
	Ratio of actual administrative expenditures (including expenditures financed by management fees) less actual expenditures on "technical support" to developing Member States to the integrated POW	Dropped. It is covariant and redundant with indicator 5.3.3, thus has limited additional value in terms of performance management
5.3.4	Loan and grant commitments and project cofinancing in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	New in IFAD10, as a broader and more comprehensive measure of efficiency
5.3.5	Disbursements in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	Retained, with some slight changes compared to the prior indicator: the indicator's name has been simplified, and the method of calculation is the reciprocal of the prior indicator, i.e. an increase in results represents improvement in performance
	Ratio of actual costs of GS staff to total staff costs	Dropped. Inertia for continued improvement exists, no longer represents a critical performance area, arguably no need to monitor at RMF level. Helps streamline indicator suite

Definitions and data sources for IFAD10 RMF indicators

RMF level 1: Global poverty, food security and agricultural investment outcomes

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
1.1	Global poverty and food security outcomes		
1.1.1	Population living on less than US\$1.25 a day	United Nations, <i>The Millennium Development Goals Report</i>	The proportion of the population living in households below the international poverty line where the average daily consumption (or income) per person is less than \$1.25 a day measured at 2005 international prices adjusted for purchasing power parity.
1.1.2	Prevalence of undernourishment in population	United Nations, <i>The Millennium Development Goals Report</i>	The condition of people whose food consumption is continuously below a minimum dietary energy requirement for maintaining an acceptable minimum body size, a healthy life and carrying out light physical activity. This is equivalent to the proportion of the population who suffer from hunger or food deprivation.
1.1.3	Children under 5 underweight	United Nations, <i>The Millennium Development Goals Report</i>	The percentage of children aged 0-59 months whose weights are less than two standard deviations below the median weight for age groups in the international reference population.
1.2	Global agricultural investment outcomes		
1.2.1	Level of official development assistance (ODA) to agriculture (billions of United States dollars)	OECD, <i>Aid Statistics</i>	OECD aid flow data in constant prices to agriculture, forestry and fishing and rural development. This excludes aid to other sectors that may have a direct or indirect effect on agriculture such as food security, developmental food aid and emergency food aid.
1.2.2	Developing countries with share of agriculture in total public expenditure of 5% or more	IFPRI, ^a <i>Global Food Policy Report</i>	As per the IFPRI calculation of food policy indicators, taking into account public expenditure data as well as other variables such as deflators and exchange rates.

^a International Food Policy Research Institute.

RMF level 2: Country-level development outcomes and impact delivered by IFAD-supported projects

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
2.1	People moved out of poverty		
2.1.1	People moved out of poverty (million)	Impact evaluation surveys, RIMS surveys	The number of beneficiaries moved above a defined poverty line (defined at baseline) for projects that have closed over the last six years (e.g. between 2013 and 2018). This is based on an assessment of the number of beneficiaries that experienced upward economic mobility - defined as changes in economic status (proxied by the asset index and consumption indicators – across the period spanning from baseline to completion).
2.2	Impact indicators		
2.2.1	Household asset ownership index	RIMS surveys	The number of households (or percentage of beneficiaries) with increased asset ownership after an IFAD intervention. The list of assets owned by households is obtained from household surveys conducted at the beginning and completion of IFAD-financed projects.
2.2.2	Level of child malnutrition (3 sub-indicators – acute, chronic and underweight); male/female	RIMS surveys	The number of children (or percentage of children covered) with improved nutrition indicators. Three measures of malnutrition are used during the RIMS impact surveys. The percentage and absolute decrease in children suffering from all three types can be reported.
2.2.3	Length of hungry season (number of months)	RIMS surveys	The number of households with improved food security. In the current RIMS guidelines (2005 version), the number of months for which households suffer food insecurity is listed. The number of households which suffer from a first hungry season is also listed. The decrease in the number of households and the decrease in the average duration of the hungry season can be reported.
2.3.	Outcome indicators (percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better) at completion^a		
2.3.1	Effectiveness	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking account of their relative importance. This indicator and the others below are obtained from project completion report (PCR) ratings assessed by IFAD, as well as project completion report validation (PCRv) ratings assessed by IOE and other evaluations conducted by IOE.
2.3.2	Efficiency	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.
2.3.3	Rural poverty impact	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	The changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions. Is a composite indicator that consists of the following sub-indicators: household income and assets; agriculture and food security; human empowerment and social capital; institutions and policies; and markets.
2.3.4	Gender equality	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	Relevance of design in terms of gender equality and women's empowerment, including level of project resources dedicated to these dimensions, changes promoted by the project at the household level (workload, nutrition status, women's influence on decision-making), adoption of gender-disaggregated indicators for monitoring, analysis of data and use of findings to correct project implementation and to disseminate lessons learned.
2.3.5	Sustainability of benefits	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	The likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. Also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.
2.3.6	Replication and scaling up	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have: (i) introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction; and (ii) the extent to which these interventions have been (or are likely to be) scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and other agencies.
2.3.7	Environment and natural resource management	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	The extent to which a project contributes to the rehabilitation or protection of natural resources and ecosystem services.

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
2.3.8	Support for smallholder adaptation to climate change	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	The extent to which a project contributes to reducing the negative impacts of climate change through dedicated adaptation or risk reduction measures.
2.3.9	Government performance	PCRs & IOE PCRVs	The contribution of partners to project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation. The performance of each partner will be assessed on an individual basis in relation to their expected roles and responsibilities in the project life cycle.

^a Calculated on a three-year basis.

RMF level 3: Country-level development outputs delivered by IFAD-supported projects

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
3.1	Overall outreach		
3.1.1	People receiving services from IFAD-supported projects (million; male/female)	RIMS	The total number of people (gender-disaggregated) during the period under review receiving services or benefiting from the activities implemented by the project. Aggregate reporting of this indicator estimates the total number of people receiving services from all projects (since the start of their implementation) that were active in a given year.
3.2	Natural resource management		
3.2.1	Land under improved management practices (million ha)	RIMS	The area of land under more sustainable and resilient management practices (e.g. regarding natural resources, crop diversity, soil and erosion, livestock, agroforestry, water, diversification, weather insurance schemes) promoted by the project as at a certain time.
3.2.2	Land under irrigation schemes (ha)	RIMS	The area of land under irrigation systems that have been fully rehabilitated or constructed by the project during the period under review.
3.3	Agricultural technologies		
3.3.1	People trained in crop, livestock and fish production practices/technologies (million; male/female)	RIMS	The number of men and women who have been trained during the period under review in crop production and technologies (e.g. farming practices, application of seeds, fertilizers), in livestock production and technologies (e.g. milking, slaughtering, animal nutrition, disease prevention), and in fish production and technologies (e.g. catching techniques, management of fish sanctuaries).
3.4	Rural financial services		
3.4.1	Voluntary savers (million; male/female)	RIMS	The total number of men/women who voluntarily have funds on deposit with an IFAD-supported financial institution on a specific date (e.g. 31 December).
3.4.2	Active borrowers (million; male/female)	RIMS	The total number of male and female borrowers with an outstanding balance in an IFAD-supported financial institution at a specific date in the reporting year (e.g. 31 December).
3.5	Marketing		
3.5.1	Roads constructed/rehabilitated (km)	RIMS	Total kilometres (km) of all typologies of roads that have been fully constructed or rehabilitated (upgraded) by the project during the period under review.
3.5.2	Processing facilities constructed/rehabilitated	RIMS	The number of processing facilities (e.g. mills, hullers, shellers, extractors) that have been fully constructed or rehabilitated by the project during the period under review.
3.5.3	Marketing facilities constructed/rehabilitated	RIMS	The number of market facilities (e.g. marketplaces, shading structures, sanitary systems) that have been fully constructed or rehabilitated by the project during the period under review.
3.6	Microenterprise		
3.6.1	Enterprises accessing non-financial services facilitated by the project	RIMS	The number of enterprises that have accessed non-financial services (e.g. business planning, technical advisory, supply chain management) promoted by the project during the period under review.
3.7	Policies and institutions		
3.7.1	People trained in community management topics (million; male/female)	RIMS	The number of men and women who during the period under review have been trained in topics related to community-level decision making and management processes (e.g. participatory methods, monitoring and evaluation, financial management and accounting).
3.8	Climate change adaptation		
3.8.1	Poor smallholder household members supported in coping with the effects of climate change	RIMS	The number of men and women who directly or indirectly benefit from climate change adaptation measures under IFAD's Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP). This is aggregated from the results frameworks in ASAP-supported projects on an annual basis

RMF level 4: Operational effectiveness of IFAD-supported country programmes and projects

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
4.1	Percentage of country programmes rated moderately satisfactory or better during implementation for:		
4.1.1	Contribution to increased incomes, improved food security and empowerment of poor rural women and men	Client survey	Client rating (governments, partners, civil society) of IFAD country programmes for achieving impact on income, food security and empowerment of poor rural women and men. Monitored annually by the IFAD client survey in some 75 countries. Target indicator is the percentage of countries that on average rate IFAD at 4 (moderately satisfactory) or better.
4.1.2	Adherence to the development effectiveness agenda	Client survey	Client rating (governments, partners, civil society) of IFAD country programmes for its adherence to the five mutually reinforcing principles (ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, mutual accountability) of the development effectiveness agenda. Monitored by the IFAD client survey in some 75 countries. The target indicator is the percentage of countries that rate IFAD at 4 (moderately satisfactory) or better.
4.1.3	Engagement in national policy dialogue	Client survey	Client rating (governments, partners, civil society) of IFAD country programmes for its contribution to national policy dialogue and for its support to enable for participation of civil society in policy dialogue. Monitored annually by the IFAD client survey in some 75 countries. Target indicator is the percentage of countries that rate IFAD at 4 (moderately satisfactory) or better.
4.1.4	Partnership-building	Client survey	Client rating (governments, partners, civil society) of IFAD country programmes for their effectiveness in partnership building with key national and international stakeholders in the country. Monitored by the IFAD client survey in some 75 countries. Target indicator is the percentage of countries that rate IFAD at 4 (moderately satisfactory) or better.
4.2	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better at entry^a		
4.2.1	Overall rating for quality of design	QA	A summary rating across several dimensions, including alignment with country context, institutional capacities, implementation readiness, likelihood of achieving development objectives and extent to which quality enhancement (QE) recommendations have been addressed.
4.2.2	Overall rating for quality of design in fragile states only	QA	Same as 4.2.1, but for IFAD's list of fragile states, which combines a harmonized list agreed on by multilateral development banks and a list compiled by OECD.
4.2.3	Gender	QA	A summary rating capturing the extent to which gender issues are adequately addressed in project design. IFAD's gender marker matrix is used as a reference and common benchmark to inform the rating.
4.2.4	M&E	QA	A summary rating across several M&E dimensions, including provisions for sex- and age-disaggregated baseline, midterm and completion surveys, impact evaluations with defined poverty line at baseline, and arrangements for monitoring outreach and other key objectives over the life of the project.
4.2.5	Scaling up	QA	A summary rating across several scaling up dimensions, including identification of the specific models/interventions to be scaled up and provision of evidence that they are effective and efficient, and articulation of the pathway for scaling up.
4.2.6	Environment and climate change	QA	A summary rating across several environment and climate change dimensions, including degree of awareness, relevance of the proposed investments, likely impact on vulnerability reduction, and capacity-building of institutions and communities to manage environmental and climate-related risks.

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
4.2.7	Loan-financed projects have a published and verifiable economic analysis	Office records	The share of projects with a published and verifiable economic analysis (yearly).
4.3	Portfolio management		
4.3.1	Time from project approval to first disbursement (months)	GRIPS	The time elapsed between first disbursement date of loans (excl. supplementary) or Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) grants (excl. supplementary) and respective date of approval by the Executive Board for projects that had such first disbursement in the last 36 months.
4.3.2	Percentage disbursement ratio – overall	Flexcube	Disbursements in the review period of loans/grants divided by the value of loans/grants available for disbursement to financial closure as at the end of the reporting period minus cumulative disbursement to date.
4.3.3	Percentage disbursement ratio – fragile situations	Flexcube	Same as 4.3.2, except only for IFAD's list of fragile states which combines a harmonized list agreed on by multilateral development banks and a list compiled by OECD.
4.3.4	Percentage of projects for which gender focus in implementation is rated moderately satisfactory or better	PSR	The project's ability to address gender/women's empowerment issues in line with IFAD's framework for gender mainstreaming, including in M&E.
4.3.5	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory or better with acceptable disbursement rate (against approved annual workplan and budget)	PSR	Projects with disbursement rates that are greater than or equal to 70 per cent of the annual workplan and budget estimates for the comparable point in time.
4.3.6	Percentage of grants rated moderately satisfactory for overall implementation progress	GSR	Grants that are expected to achieve at least most major outputs and at least partially meet the development objectives at completion. The overall rating should be consistent with the ratings given for specific indicators, taking into account the performance and relative importance of components.
4.4	Cofinancing		
4.4.1	Cofinancing ratio	GRIPS	The amount of current cofinancing from domestic and international sources divided by the approved amount of IFAD financing for projects approved in a given three-year period. The ratio indicates the US\$ amount of cofinancing per US\$ of IFAD financing (36-month rolling average).

^a Calculated on a two-year basis.

RMF level 5: IFAD's institutional effectiveness and efficiency

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition
5.1	Improved resource mobilization and management		
5.1.1	Percentage of pledges over IFAD10 target	PeopleSoft (contribution module)	The value of pledges received divided by the related target level for IFAD10 at time of reporting.
5.2	Improved human resources management		
5.2.1	Staff engagement index: percentage of staff positively engaged in IFAD objectives	Global Staff Survey	The percentage of favourable responses of IFAD staff to six questions in the annual staff survey.
5.2.2	Percentage of workforce from Lists B and C Member States	PeopleSoft (HR module)	The full-time equivalents (FTEs) of IFAD staff and consultants from List B or C Member States divided by the total number of IFAD's FTEs (only for workforce under IFAD's administrative budget).
5.2.3	Percentage of women in P-5 posts and above	PeopleSoft (HR module)	The number of P5 and above posts that are held by women divided by all men and women in P-5 and above posts (excluding staff on short-term contracts and only for staff under IFAD's administrative budget).
5.2.4	Average time (in days) to finalize recruitments against Professional vacancies	Office records	Average number of days from vacancy announcement closing date to the date on which the selection decision is made (i.e. Appointments and Promotions Board) for all finalized recruitment processes in a given one-year period (12-month rolling average).
5.3	Improved administrative efficiency		
5.3.1	Share of budget allocations to: Cluster 1, Cluster 2, Cluster 3 and Cluster 4	IFAD's results-based programme of work and regular and capital budgets	Share of IFAD's administrative budget (excluding the corporate cost centre) allocated to each results cluster.
5.3.2	Ratio of budgeted staff positions in IFAD country offices	PeopleSoft (Budget Module)	Number of planned ICO staff divided by the total number of planned staff in regional divisions (administrative budget only).
5.3.3	Loan and grant commitments in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	PeopleSoft (General Ledger)	Programme funds committed by IFAD inclusive of loans, DSF grants, grants, ASAP and other (supplementary) funds managed by IFAD, divided by actual expenditures incurred under the administrative budget and other resources under IFAD's management (excluding IOE) (36-month rolling average).
5.3.4	Loan and grant commitments and project cofinancing in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	PeopleSoft (General Ledger)	Programme funds committed by IFAD inclusive of loans, DSF grants, grants, ASAP, other (supplementary) funds managed by IFAD, and international and domestic cofinancing, divided by actual expenditures incurred under the administrative budget and other resources under IFAD's management (excluding IOE) (36-month rolling average).
5.3.5	Disbursements in US\$ per US\$1 of administrative expenditure	PeopleSoft (General Ledger)/ Flexcube	Programme funds disbursed by IFAD inclusive of loans, DSF grants, grants, ASAP, and other (supplementary) funds managed by IFAD, divided by actual expenditures incurred under the administrative budget and other resources under IFAD's management (excluding IOE) (36-month rolling average).