
IFAD13 Results Management Framework indicators (2025-2027): preliminary definitions

Addendum

Document: IFAD13/2/R.2/Add.1

Agenda: 3

Date: 24 May 2023

Distribution: Public

Original: English

FOR: INFORMATION

Useful references: IFAD at the midterm of the Twelfth Replenishment ([IFAD13/1/R.2/Rev.1](#)); IFAD13 Directions ([IFAD13/1/R.6/Rev.1](#)).

Technical questions:

Donal Brown

Associate Vice-President
Programme Management Department
e-mail: d.brown@ifad.org

Satu Santala

Associate Vice-President
External Relations and Governance Department
e-mail: s.santala@ifad.org

Nigel Brett

Director
Operational Policy and Results Division
e-mail: n.brett@ifad.org

Chitra Deshpande

Lead Adviser, Results & Resources
Operational Policy and Results Division
e-mail: c.deshpande@ifad.org

IFAD13 Results Management Framework indicators (2025-2027): preliminary definitions and data sources

Tier I – Goals and global context

<i>Code</i>	<i>Indicator name</i>	<i>SDG</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Definition (preliminary)</i>
1.1	SDG 1: No poverty			
1.1.1	Proportion of population below the international poverty line of US\$1.90 a day	1.1.1	UNSD	SDG indicator 1.1.1 – The indicator is defined as the percentage of the population living on less than US\$1.90 a day at 2011 international prices. The international poverty line is currently set at US\$1.90 a day at 2011 international prices.
1.2	SDG2: Zero hunger			
1.2.1	Prevalence of food insecurity	2.1.2	UNSD	SDG indicator 2.1.2 – Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale.
1.2.2	Prevalence of malnutrition among children under 5 years of age	2.2.2	UNSD	SDG indicator 2.2.2 – Prevalence of malnutrition (weight for height >+2 or <-2 standard deviation from the median of the World Health Organization's Child Growth Standards) among children under 5 years of age, by type (wasting and overweight).
1.2.3	Productivity of small-scale food producers	2.3.1	UNSD	SDG Indicator 2.3.1 – Volume of agricultural production of small-scale food producer in crop, livestock, fisheries and forestry activities per number of days. The indicator is computed as a ratio of annual output to the number of working days in one year.

Tier II – Development results

<i>Code</i>	<i>Indicator name</i>	<i>SDG</i>	<i>Data source</i>	<i>Definition (preliminary)</i>
2.1	Impact			
2.1.1	Number of people experiencing economic mobility	2.3. and 1.2	Impact assessment (IA)	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of rural people with changes in economic status (10 per cent or more) including income, consumption and wealth. The indicator will be reported in 2028.
2.1.2	Number of people with improved production	2.3	IA	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of people with substantial gains (20 per cent or more) in production of agricultural products. The indicator will be reported in 2028.
2.1.3	Number of people with improved market access	2.3	IA	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of people with greater value of product sold (20 per cent or more) in agricultural markets. The indicator will be reported in 2028.
2.1.4	Number of people with greater resilience	1.5	IA	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of people with improved resilience (20 per cent or more). The indicator will be reported in 2028.
2.1.5	Number of people with improved nutrition	2.1	IA	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of people with improved nutrition (increase in dietary diversity of 10 per cent or more) (depending on COVID and other global shocks).

Code	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
				The indicator will be reported in 2028.
2.1.6	Number of people in households with improved women's empowerment		IA	The number of people that live in households where women have improved economic participation measured by decision making over income sources (10 per cent or more).
2.2	Project-level development outcome ratings at completion			
2.2.1	Government performance (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)		Project Completion Report (PCR) ratings	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better on the borrower's performance. Borrower's performance is defined as the extent to which the Government (including central and local authorities and executing agencies) supported design, implementation and the achievement of results, conducive policy environment, and impact and the sustainability of the intervention/country programme. Also, to the adequacy of the Borrower's assumption of ownership and responsibility during all project phases, including government and implementing agency, in ensuring quality preparation and implementation, compliance with covenants and agreements, supporting a conducive policy environment and establishing the basis for sustainability, and fostering participation by the project's stakeholders.
2.2.2	IFAD's performance (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)		PCR ratings	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better on the IFAD's performance. IFAD's performance is defined as the extent to which IFAD supported design, implementation and the achievement of results, conducive policy environment, and impact and the sustainability of the intervention/country programme.
2.2.3	Efficiency (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)		PCR ratings	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better for efficiency, over total number of projects closed in the previous three years that have rated this dimension. The definition for this indicator is the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. "Economic" is the conversion of inputs (e.g. funds, expertise, natural resources, time) into outputs, outcomes and impacts, in the most cost-effective way possible, as compared to feasible alternatives in the context. "Timely" delivery is within the intended timeframe, or a timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context. This may include assessing operational efficiency (how well the intervention was managed).
2.2.4	Sustainability of benefits (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)		PCR ratings	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better for sustainability of benefits. The definition for this indicator is the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention or strategy continue and are scaled up (or are likely to continue and be scaled-up) by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and other agencies. This entails an examination of the financial, economic, social, environmental and institutional capacity of the systems needed to sustain net benefits over time. It involves analyses of resilience, risks and potential trade-offs.
2.2.5	Scaling up (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)		PCR ratings	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better for scaling up. Scaling-up takes place when: (i) bi- and multi laterals partners, private sector, communities) adopt and diffuse the solution tested by IFAD; (ii) other stakeholders invested resources to bring the solution at scale; and (iii) the government applies a policy framework to generalize the solution tested by IFAD (from practice to policy). Scaling up does not only relate to innovations.
2.2.6	Gender equality (ratings 4 and above/5 and above) (percentage)		PCR ratings – 4 and above	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) / satisfactory (5) or better for gender equality, implying that they made a partial contribution to addressing gender needs and achieving GEWE, addressing two of the three gender policy objectives: (1) economic empowerment; (2) equal voice and influence in decision making; (3) equitable balance in workloads.
			PCR ratings – 5 and above	The definition for this indicator is the extent to which IFAD interventions have contributed to better gender equality and women's empowerment. For example, in terms of women's access to and ownership of

Code	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
				assets, resources and services; participation in decision making; workload balance and impact on women's incomes, nutrition and livelihoods; and in promoting sustainable, inclusive and far-reaching changes in social norms, attitudes, behaviours and beliefs underpinning gender inequality.
2.2.7	Environment and Natural Resource Management (ENRM) and Climate change adaptation (CCA)		PCR ratings - ENRM	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better for environment and natural resource management and climate change. The definition for this indicator is the extent to which the project has contributed to enhancing the environmental sustainability and resilience to climate change in small-scale agriculture. For environment and natural resource management, the rating considers positive or negative changes in the natural resources base (including forests, marine/fisheries resources, pastureland, water resources) that may be attributable to project interventions, together with positive or negative changes—intended or unintended—on the environment.
			PCR ratings - CCA	For adaptation to climate change, the rating considers: i) the quality of interventions that aim to reduce the vulnerability of households, agro-ecosystems and natural systems to the current and expected impacts of climate change; ii) how the project has empowered rural communities to cope with, mitigate or prevent the effects of climate change and natural disasters; iii) if the project has been effective in channelling climate and environmental finance to smallholder farmers.

Code	Thematic areas	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
2.3	Project-level outcome and outputs				
2.3.1	Outreach	Persons receiving services promoted or supported by the project	1.4	Core indicators	Total number of persons in the households supported by IFAD-financed projects (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period).
2.3.2	Access to agricultural technologies and production services	Persons trained in production practices and/or technologies (millions)	2.3	Core indicators	Number of persons who have been trained at least once in improved or innovative production practices and technologies during the considered period (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period). Training topics may concern crop, livestock or fish production.
2.3.3	Inclusive financial services	Persons in rural areas accessing financial services (savings, credit, insurance, remittances, etc.) (millions)	2.3	Core indicators	Number of individuals who have accessed a financial product or service specifically promoted/supported by the project and its partner financial service provider (FSP), at least once (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period). Such services include loans and micro-loans, saving funds, micro-insurance/insurance, remittances, and membership of a community-based financial organization (e.g. savings and loan group)
2.3.4	Diversified rural enterprises and employment opportunities	Persons trained in income-generating activities or business management (millions)	4.4	Core indicators	Persons who have received training in topics related to income-generating activities, including post-production handling, processing and marketing (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period).
2.3.5		Beneficiaries with new jobs/employment opportunities	8.5	Core Indicators - outcome	New full-time or recurrent seasonal on-farm and off-farm jobs created thanks to project activities since project start-up, either as independent individuals (self-employed) or as employees of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the

Code	Thematic areas	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
					reporting period). Jobs created within farmers' organizations that received project support are also included, but temporary jobs created for a limited period (e.g. for road construction) shall be excluded.
2.3.6	Rural producers' organizations	Supported rural producers that are members of rural producers' organizations	2.3	Core indicators	Rural producers that belong to a rural producers' organization supported by the project, whether formally registered or not, during the considered period (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period).
2.3.7	Rural infrastructure	Kilometres of roads constructed, rehabilitated or upgraded	9.1	Core indicators	The total length, in kilometres, of roads that have been fully constructed, rehabilitated or upgraded (e.g. from feeder road to asphalt road) (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period). All types of roads should be included, such as feeder, paved, primary, secondary or tertiary roads.
2.3.8	Environmental sustainability and Climate change	Hectares of land brought under climate-resilient management (millions)	2.4	Core indicators	Number of hectares of land in which activities were undertaken to restore the productive and protective functions of the land, water and natural ecosystems and/or reverse degradation processes with a view to building resilience to specific climate vulnerabilities (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period).
2.3.9	Environmental sustainability and Climate change	Households reporting adoption of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient technologies and practices	13.1	Core indicators – outcome	Households reporting that: (a) they are fully satisfied with the inputs, practices or techniques promoted; and (b) they are now using those inputs, practices and technologies instead of previous ones (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period).
2.3.10		Tons of greenhouse gas emissions (carbon dioxide equivalent [CO ₂ e]) avoided and/or sequestered (million tons of CO ₂ e over 20 years)	13.1	Core indicators - outcome	This indicator is measured in terms of total GHG emissions avoided and/or sequestered (expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent or tCO ₂ e) over a 20 year time horizon (tCO ₂ e/20y). This 20 year time horizon comprises both the project implementation phase (usually 6-8 years), during which project activities are carried out, as well as the 'capitalization phase' (usually 12-14 years, adjusted based on project length to give a 20 year projection), during which the impact of project activities continues to be visible, for instance in terms of soil carbon content or biomass.
2.3.11	Nutrition	Persons/households provided with targeted support to improve their nutrition (millions)	2.1	Core indicators	This indicator refers to the number of people that have directly participated in project-supported activities designed to help improve nutrition (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period). Nutrition-sensitive activities are tailored to address context based nutrition problems. Based on the type of nutrition-activity, these may target household members and not individuals, as is the case for backyard poultry or vegetable gardens.
2.3.12		Women reporting minimum dietary diversity (MDDW)	2.1	Core indicators – outcome	Women surveyed reporting that they are consuming a diversified diet, i.e. they are consuming at least 5 out of 10 prescribed food groups. This is a proxy indicator to assess adequacy of micronutrient (e.g. vitamins, minerals) consumption by women. It is also a proxy to gauge the adequacy of nutrition intake of the household members.
2.3.13	Access to natural resources	Beneficiaries gaining increased secure access to land	1.4	Core indicators	Number of beneficiaries supported (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as at the reporting period), in gaining formal ownership or use rights over land (forests, farmland, pasture), water (for livestock, crop, domestic and drinking use) or over water bodies (for capture fisheries or fish farming), as recognized or incorporated in cadastral maps, land databases or other land information systems accessible to the public.

Tier III – Operational and organizational performance

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
Aligning programme delivery			
3.1	Designing for impact		
3.1.1	Projects designed to be gender transformative (percentage)	Corporate validation	A gender transformative project actively seeks to transform gendered power dynamics by addressing social norms, practices, attitudes, beliefs and value systems that represent structural barriers to women's and girls' inclusion and empowerment. This indicator is measured at design, based on a range of criteria verified in the project design reports of IFAD operations approved during the cycle
3.1.2	Climate finance: Climate-focused PoLG	Corporate validation based on MDB Methodologies for Climate Finance Tracking	United States dollar value reported as a percentage share of total IFAD approvals, calculated based on the internationally recognized MDB Methodologies for Climate Change Adaption and Mitigation Tracking. Climate finance is calculated at design, based on the final cost tables and project design reports of approved IFAD operations. Reporting on ASAP+ climate finance will be distinguished from PoLG climate finance, to ensure accurate attribution to donors of core resources and ASAP+ resources.
3.1.3	Climate capacity: Projects designed to build adaptive capacity (percentage)	Corporate validation	Percentage of IFAD projects that include activities aiming to build climate-related adaptive capacity across multiple dimensions (e.g. increasing incomes; improved access to productive resources; empowerment of vulnerable groups). This indicator is measured at design, based on the project design reports of IFAD operations approved during the cycle.
3.1.4	Appropriateness of targeting approaches in IFAD investment projects	Quality Assurance ratings	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better for quality of target group engagement and feedback. Elements assessed include, for example, the extent to which planned target group engagement and feedback activities are implemented consistently well and on time, including measures to promote social inclusion and participation of vulnerable, marginalized and disadvantaged groups, and to 'close the feedback loop'; and the extent to which project grievance redress processes are efficient, responsive and are easily accessible to target groups.
3.1.5	Overall quality of SSTC in COSOPs (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Quality assurance ratings	A summary rating provided during the quality assurance process across several dimensions, including an assessment of the extent to which the SSTC strategy: (i) is tailored the country context; (ii) contributes to COSOP's SOs, in synergy with other lending and non-lending activities; (iii) is based on a clear identification of needs, opportunities, partnerships, areas, resources and monitoring mechanisms. The ratings are reported on a 12-month average basis
3.1.6	Overall quality of COSOPs	Quality assurance reviews	[PLACEHOLDER FOR INDICATOR DEFINITION]
3.1.7	Overall rating for quality of NSO design (ratings 4 and above)	Quality assurance reviews	[PLACEHOLDER FOR INDICATOR DEFINITION]
3.1.8	Indicator on compliance - procurement [PLACEHOLDER]	[PLACEHOLDER]	[PLACEHOLDER FOR INDICATOR DEFINITION]
3.1.9	Indicator on SECAP compliance [PLACEHOLDER]	[PLACEHOLDER]	[PLACEHOLDER FOR INDICATOR DEFINITION]

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
3.2 Proactive portfolio management			
3.2.1	Overall implementation progress (ratings 4 and above)	Supervision ratings	Percentage of projects rated 4 or above for this key supervision and implementation support rating, which is calculated based on progress on a mix of indicators on project management and financial management and execution. Includes scores on quality of project management, quality of financial management, disbursement, procurement, etc.
3.2.2	Proactivity index	Corporate validation	Percentage of ongoing projects rated as 'actual problem' in the previous approved performance ratings that have been upgraded, restructured, completed/closed, cancelled or suspended in the most recent approved performance ratings.
3.3 Performance of country programmes			
3.3.1	Effectiveness of IFAD country strategies (ratings moderately satisfactory and above)	COSOP Completion Reports (CCRs)	The extent to which the country strategy achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results at the time of the evaluation, including any differential results across groups.
		Stakeholder survey	Refers to the average of the percentage of responses rated favourably (3+ on a 4 point scale) for all questions specific to effectiveness of IFAD country strategies on the stakeholder survey for the relevant period.
3.3.2	Country-level policy engagement (ratings of moderately satisfactory and above)	CCRs	The extent to which IFAD and its country-level stakeholders engage, and the progress made, to support dialogue on policy priorities or the design, implementation and assessment of formal institutions, policies and programmes that shape the economic opportunities for large numbers of rural people to move out of poverty
		Stakeholder survey	Refers to the average of the percentage of responses rated favourably (3+ on a 4 point scale) for all questions specific to country-level policy engagement of IFAD country strategies on the stakeholder survey for the relevant period.
3.3.3	Knowledge management (ratings of moderately satisfactory and above)	CCRs	The extent to which the IFAD-funded country programme is capturing, creating, distilling, sharing and using knowledge.
		Stakeholder survey	Refers to the average of the percentage of responses rated favourably (3+ on a 4 point scale) for all questions specific to knowledge management of IFAD country strategies on the stakeholder survey for the relevant period.
Assembling and leveraging development finance			
3.4 Resources			
3.4.1	Debt-to-equity ratio	Corporate databases	In line with the Integrated Borrowing Framework (see EB 2020/130/R.31), the ratio is defined as the principal portion of total outstanding debt divided by initial capital available (ICA) expressed in percentage terms. The ICA is defined as: total equity less contributions and promissory notes receivable plus allowance for loan losses. Total equity is defined as: contributions plus general reserves less accumulated deficit. The ratio will be calculated as of 31 December of each year.
3.4.2	Cofinancing ratio	Grants and Investment Projects System (GRIPS)	The amount of cofinancing from international and domestic sources (government and beneficiary contributions) divided by the amount of IFAD financing for its Programme of Loans and Grants (PoLG) in a given three-year period (current United States dollar amounts used). The ratio indicates the US\$ amount of cofinancing per US\$ of IFAD financing (36-month rolling average).
	Cofinancing ratio (domestic)	GRIPS	The amount of cofinancing from international sources divided by the amount of IFAD financing for the PoLG approved in a given three-year period (current United States dollar amounts used). The ratio indicates the US\$ amount of cofinancing per US\$ of IFAD financing (36-month rolling average).

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
	Cofinancing ratio (international)	GRIPS	The amount of cofinancing from international sources divided by the amount of IFAD financing for the PoLG approved in a given three-year period (current United States dollar amounts used). The ratio indicates the US\$ amount of cofinancing per US\$ of IFAD financing (36-month rolling average).
3.4.3	Leverage effect of IFAD private sector investments	Corporate databases	Value of IFAD investment to a private sector project divided by total cost of the project. For projects entailing support to financial intermediaries, total project cost is defined as follows: For investment funds and vehicles: total resources mobilized by the fund or investment vehicle. At early development stage of such funds/vehicles, target size of the fund or vehicle will be used as proxy. For banks, and other financial institutions: total cost of the projects funded by the financial institution thanks to IFAD financial support.
Aligning institutional framework			
3.5 Institutional efficiency			
3.5.1	Ratio of IFAD's administrative expenditure to the PoLG (including IFAD-managed funds)	Corporate databases	Actual expenses incurred under the administrative budget and other resources under IFAD's management (excluding IOE) divided by PoLG funds committed by IFAD inclusive of loans, Debt Sustainability Framework (DSF) and other grants, and ASAP and other (supplementary) funds managed by IFAD in the reporting period. The full loan or grant amount should be used (36-month rolling average).
3.6 Decentralization and human resource management			
3.6.1	Decentralization effectiveness	IFAD Country Office (ICO) survey	ICO Survey question on whether IFAD staff and offices in the field are well equipped, able and adequately empowered to deliver the expected results in order to enhance IFAD's impact on the ground (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)
3.6.2	Percentage of women in P-5 posts and above	Corporate databases	Number of women in the national and international Professional category holding fixed-term or indefinite appointments from National Professional Officer (NPO) D-level NOD) / P-5 to Vice-President, out of total number of national and international Professional staff holding fixed-term or indefinite appointments in the same grade range. Staff included in the calculation must hold positions under the IFAD administrative budget, IOE budget or Credit Union budget. Exclusions: the President, Director of IOE; short-term staff; locally recruited staff (General Service [GS] staff in headquarters and liaison offices, national GS staff), junior professional officers (JPOs), special programme officers (SPOs), partnership agreements, staff on loan to IFAD, staff on supplementary-funded positions, staff on coterminous positions, individuals hired under a non-staff contract (consultants, fellows, special service agreements [SSAs], interns, etc.) and staff from hosted entities.
3.6.3	Staff engagement index (GSS) with DEI-specific indicators	[PLACEHOLDER]	Staff engagement index (GSS) with DEI-specific indicators, e.g. agreement with the statement: "All IFAD employees are treated with respect"
3.6.4	Vacancy rate	[PLACEHOLDER]	[PLACEHOLDER FOR INDICATOR DEFINITION]
3.7 Transparency			
3.7.1	Percentage of PCRs submitted within prescribed deadline, of which the percentage publicly disclosed	Operational Results and Management System (ORMS)	Share of PCRs that were submitted within the prescribed deadline (usually six months after completion, but deadline may be extended to undertake Impact Assessment or to ensure data collection, review and analysis). Of these, share of PCRs published on IFAD's website.