
IFAD13 Results Management Framework (2025–2027)

Document: IFAD13/3/R.2/Rev.1/Add.1

Agenda: 3

Date: 23 October 2023

Distribution: Public

Original: English

FOR: REVIEW

Useful References: Draft IFAD13 Report (IFAD13/3/R.2/Rev.1).

Technical questions:

Donal Brown

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

Nigel Brett

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

Leon Williams

Senior Partnership Officer, Replenishment
Global Engagement, Partnership and Resource
Mobilization Division
e-mail: l.williams@ifad.org

Chitra Deshpande

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

IFAD13 Results Management Framework (2025–2027)

I. Introduction

1. Each IFAD replenishment is guided by a Results Management Framework (RMF) aligned with the specific priorities of that cycle. The RMF serves as a tool for Management and Member States to assess performance across a range of indicators. The 2019 assessment by the Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network found IFAD to have a strong results-based management architecture. ~~An evaluation~~ A review of the IFAD12 RMF¹ carried out by the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE) further confirmed that IFAD's RMF is in line with best practice.
2. Over recent replenishment cycles, IFAD's RMF has evolved in scope, structure and utility. The RMF's evolution is described in the IFAD12 RMF document.² The IFAD13 RMF retains the structure of IFAD12 with certain adjustments. This note outlines the key principles applied in designing the IFAD13 RMF and the adjustments that are proposed by tier. These will not be included in the final version of the IFAD13 Report. Only the main tables containing the RMF indicators, targets and definitions will be retained.

II. The results pathway

3. IFAD made significant changes to the business model in IFAD11 and IFAD12. A large number of commitments were made to institutionalize these adjustments within IFAD at the financial, operational and organizational levels. This included the formulation or updating of policies, procedures, guidelines and processes designed to equip the institution to be future fit, able to diversify sources of finance, and expand the operational offer to a diverse set of clients. These commitments are expected to lead to improvements in IFAD's performance and results, as monitored through the associated RMF for each replenishment cycle.

Figure 1



4. Management actions in any given cycle should have an effect on operational and organizational performance indicators at the tier III level within that replenishment cycle (1-3 years). Investments approved during the cycle drive development results and impact at the tier II level over the medium term (3–6+ years), and eventually (6–10+ years) contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The expectation is that improvements in performance at tier III will

¹ EC 2023/123/W.P.3 and EC 2023/123/W.P.3/Add.1.

² IFAD12 RMF, [IFAD12/2\(R\)/R.2](#).

translate into improvements in development results and impact at tier II, which then contribute to tier I.

5. There is an inevitable time lag in performance improvements across the tiers with improvements in tier III evident within the replenishment cycle itself, whereas for other indicators in tier II, improvements take 2-3 cycles to fully show. For example, it is likely that a high-quality design (tier III) will deliver high-quality results but the results and impact will only be fully reported at the tier II level after the project has closed. Therefore, the performance at the tier III level provides reassurance that IFAD is doing the right things and that the results linked to these performance improvements will be visible over the medium term. This time lag also has implications on the types of indicators included in every cycle. Areas that have been recently introduced as priorities (e.g. nutrition, biodiversity) will only show results at the tier II level in subsequent cycles. Therefore, indicators and targets for impact and results will also be included in subsequent cycles when the portfolio reaches maturity.
6. Tier III, where IFAD has the highest influence and highest control, is also the area where it can be held most accountable for performance. These are areas such as quality of design, quality of supervision and implementation support, proactivity and country programme performance (including non-lending activities). The IFAD12 midterm review (MTR) and the 2023 Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness (RIDE) highlight that performance is strong at the tier III level and improving. As IFAD engages with partners (i.e. borrowers), accountability, and control and influence begin to be shared primarily at tier II – development results and impact. This is because projects are designed with governments and implemented by governments. While IFAD's performance can be assessed through the indicators in tier III, improvements in results and impact indicators are not directly the consequence of only IFAD's support but a range of other exogenous factors including the government's performance and other considerations.

III. Principles for the IFAD13 RMF adjustments

A. Consistency and continuity

7. IFAD moved from a results measurement framework in IFAD10 to a results management framework in IFAD11. To effectively use the RMF as a management tool, there is a need for continuity and consistency in the indicators across cycles. This allows for accountability, tracking and monitoring performance across replenishment cycles. As each replenishment cycle spans three years – which is often not enough to fully realize performance improvements – the continuity in indicators across cycles becomes even more important. Therefore, the majority of indicators are maintained from IFAD12 to allow for effective management of performance across cycles.

B. Streamlining

8. In each cycle, efforts are made to streamline the number of indicators in the RMF. They were reduced from 79 in IFAD11 to 67 in IFAD12. In IFAD13 there is further scope for streamlining, as also indicated in IOE's ~~independent assessment of the RMF to be presented to the Evaluation Committee in October 2023~~ review. Three types of indicators are being considered for streamlining.
9. The first type includes indicators that are expected to be completed/fully achieved against set targets within the IFAD12 cycle and for which targets are not being increased. For example, IFAD has set a target for decentralization at 45 per cent by the end of IFAD12 and is fully on track to achieve this. As the target is not being increased further in IFAD13 and will be fully achieved in IFAD12, the indicator does not need to be included in the IFAD13 RMF.
10. The second set to consider are indicators that are reported on in detail in different annual reports, to avoid overlap and repetition with other reporting mechanisms

already in place for Member States. For example, there is an annual report to the Executive Board on grants performance. Retaining these indicators in the RMF gives rise to repetition. Efforts have also been made to avoid duplication between commitments and indicators.

11. The final set for streamlining are indicators that are now mainstreamed with an expectation of full achievement in every cycle due to their mandatory nature. For example, sexual harassment/sexual exploitation and abuse (SH/SEA) training is mandatory for all staff. Therefore, there is an expectation that this indicator will continue to be reported at 100 per cent. In previous cycles, when this was introduced as a newer element, there was a need to track progress. Now that such elements have been fully institutionalized, monitoring progress for every cycle in the RMF is no longer relevant. Nonetheless, in stand-alone documents, these will continue to be monitored and reported on.

C. Alignment with IFAD13 priorities and external benchmarking

12. Two types of alignment are proposed. The first is internal alignment with the priorities for IFAD13 and IFAD's evolving business model. The second is alignment with other organizations and the advances made on results-based management in other organizations while being cognizant of IFAD's niche.
13. In terms of internal alignment, selected indicators have been introduced in line with IFAD13 priorities, for example there is an increased focus on project risks, and indicators on the Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP) and procurement are to be added. Similarly, an indicator on the leverage ratio of the private sector has also been added in line with the growing attention to private sector operations in IFAD13. IFAD is also introducing an impact-level indicator on women's empowerment given the significance and increase in ~~gender focus on programmes that will create transformative programming being pursued by IFAD~~ change for gender equality and women's empowerment over previous recent cycles.
14. In terms of external alignment, IFAD conducted a desk review of the results frameworks created by other comparator organizations. These frameworks evolve in order to adapt to changing circumstances and incorporate lessons learned from operational experience.
15. Most similar institutions follow a three- or four-tier methodology that allows them to differentiate between various aspects of performance from institutional to results. These institutions share a results-oriented approach, emphasizing measurable outcomes and utilizing indicators to track progress. They also engage in regular results reporting and knowledge-sharing. However, differences arise in the terminology and structure of the frameworks, reflecting the unique organizational contexts and priorities of each institution. Additionally, IFAD's focus on agricultural development sets it apart from other multilateral development banks and United Nations agencies, which have broader sectoral mandates.
16. The number of indicators used by IFAD's RMF is in line with industry best practices. IFAD13 has further reduced the number of indicators from 67 (in IFAD12) to 56. The indicators selected reflect IFAD's priorities and preserve continuity with prior replenishment cycles.

D. Informed and evidence-based adjustments

17. IFAD's results measurement approaches have evolved and matured. IFAD now has a more robust project-level dataset that enables it to make accurate and informed evidence-based adjustments to previous indicators and impact-level targets. Two main adjustments are proposed for IFAD13. The first is on targets for certain impact indicators. As IFAD compiles more data and its dataset expands and evolves, it is better positioned to project future performance and therefore set

more accurate targets.³ Consequently, some impact targets will be adjusted based on a robust analysis of IFAD's evolving portfolio.

18. The second proposal for output- and outcome-level core indicators, and in line with other organizations,^{4,5} and the findings of the IOE review, is to move from monitoring against targets to tracking actual results against past performance benchmarks. Management will retain monitoring against targets only for completion outcome ratings.⁶ This shift in core indicator reporting is being proposed because the portfolio composition and types of projects depend on the demand from borrowing countries and thus change between replenishment cycles and from year to year. As a result, it is hard to predict what type of projects will be in IFAD's portfolio 3 to 5 years in the future, although this has a major impact on the results achieved (for example, rural finance projects have higher outreach numbers, therefore if there are fewer rural finance projects, outreach numbers could be lower). As targets are difficult to set accurately for these indicators, it is proposed that tracking and reporting on actual results achieved be undertaken without setting associated targets for output- and outcome-level indicators.

IV. Key changes by tier

19. This section summarizes the key changes introduced by tier. The changes refer to additions or deletions of certain indicators and the associated rationale for these changes. The reduction of the nutrition target compared to IFAD12 has been proposed at the impact level. Some other minor adjustments have been made to definitions for further clarity (see the detailed RMF table with definitions).

A. Tier I: Global goals and context

20. At this level, IFAD's RMF simply reports on relevant global indicators based on external sources. Management proposes dropping two indicators from this tier because in both cases, IFAD reports data from external sources. As up-to-date data have not been available in recent years, the reporting field is often left blank. Removing these indicators could streamline the RMF.

Table 1

Global indicators to be removed

Average income of small-scale food producers (SDG 2.3.2)
Government expenditure on agriculture (index) (SDG 2.a.1)

B. Tier II: Development results

21. Tier II includes three sets of indicators: (i) indicators reporting on impact assessed through IFAD's attributable impact assessments; (ii) performance ratings at completion assessed through project completion reports; and (iii) output- and outcome-level indicators aggregated through IFAD's core indicators. Some adjustments are proposed across the three sets of tier II indicators.

Impact

22. At the impact level, IFAD is proposing three key adjustments. The first is the introduction of an impact-level indicator on women's empowerment assessed through IFAD's attributable impact assessments and reported at the end of each replenishment cycle. IFAD has been systematically mainstreaming gender into its

³ For example, Management had set a very high target at the impact level on nutrition in a moment when the portfolio on nutrition-sensitive projects was limited. Therefore, the projections were made based on a very small sample. Since then, more robust data are available to make more accurate projections and, in this case, Management is proposing a reduction in the target to make it more realistic.

⁴ In particular, Asian Development Bank (ADB), African Development Bank (AfDB), International Development Association (IDA) and Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).

⁵ In particular, Asian Development Bank (ADB), African Development Bank (AfDB), International Development Association (IDA) and Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).

⁶ The rationale is that these indicators are of a different nature, given that they measure IFAD's ambitions for the performance of its projects and that these ambitions are the same for all types of projects.

operations and, in the ~~previous~~ recent replenishment cycles, it moved to IFAD increased its focus on programmes that actively examine, challenge and transform the underlying causes of gender-transformative programming. ~~IFAD's new commitments on gender-transformative programming in each cycle are~~ inequality and women and girls' disempowerment. Therefore, the focus on such programmes is expanding across IFAD's ~~gender-transformative~~ ongoing portfolio. Given the importance of gender to the impact of IFAD's operations, IFAD is proposing the inclusion of an impact-level indicator measuring women's empowerment.

23. The second proposed adjustment is the introduction of an impact-level indicator on improved food security. For IFAD11, the food insecurity experience scale indicator was used. The introduction of a formal impact indicator on improved food security into the IFAD13 RMF is proposed for three reasons: (i) the number of undernourished people in the world is projected to increase due to the current global context; (ii) the centrality of SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) to IFAD's mandate; and (iii) the complementarity between food security and nutrition, for which an impact indicator is already included.
24. In IFAD11, IFAD's results on nutrition at the impact level fell significantly short of the ambitious target. This was because the impact assessments included projects that were designed before IFAD instituted nutrition-sensitive programming and mainstreamed nutrition. While newly designed and ongoing projects are programmed to ensure nutrition-related impacts in at least 60 per cent of the portfolio, their impacts are not likely to materialize within the IFAD12 or the IFAD13 cycle. Management therefore proposes reducing the nutrition target from 11 million people to 5 million people based on projections from latest impact assessment data and the proportion of nutrition-sensitive projects closing in IFAD13. Nonetheless, the ambition to achieve 11 million in subsequent cycles remains.
25. A minor adjustment is also proposed concerning the formulation of the indicator tracking changes in economic mobility, clarifying that it concerns positive changes only.

Project-level development outcome ratings at completion

26. IFAD proposes removing the composite rating on overall project achievement at completion to further streamline the RMF. While internal self-evaluation systems will continue to report, monitor and capture overall project achievement, they will not be included in the set of outcome rating indicators that are included in the RMF. Management believes that, for Member States, other specific outcome-level indicators such as efficiency and sustainability are more relevant for monitoring and tracking than an aggregate indicator. All other outcome ratings are retained.
27. An adjustment is proposed to the target for scaling up, reducing it to 80 per cent from the previous target of 95 per cent rated moderately satisfactory or above. This is suggested as part of the development of a framework for scaling up, which is an IFAD12 commitment. The new definition adopted by Management ~~aligns~~ is consistent with IFAD's 2022 Evaluation Manual, encompassing both self- and independent evaluation, and has more stringent criteria on what constitutes scaling up, moving away from assessing potential for scaling up and scaling up with IFAD's own financing to focus on scaling by government or other partners. Management believes that scaling up by others is out of IFAD's full control and is dependent on multiple exogenous factors; therefore a target of 80 per cent of projects having the right conditions for scaling up is suitable, while still being ambitious.

Project-level outcomes and outputs

28. Two key adjustments are proposed to these indicators. The first is to further streamline and remove indicators in cases where similar or linked indicators are already included in the RMF. Management proposes removing three specific

indicators, given that they are closely linked to other indicators that are being retained.

Table 2
Indicators to be removed

<i>Thematic area of business model</i>	<i>Indicator name</i>	<i>Rationale</i>
Diversified rural enterprises and employment opportunities	Number of rural enterprises accessing business development services	It is proposed that this indicator be deleted as the area of diversified rural enterprises and employment opportunities is already covered by an output indicator and an outcome indicator
Environmental sustainability and climate change	Number of groups supported to sustainably manage natural resources and climate-related risks	It is proposed that this indicator be deleted as the area of environmental sustainability and climate change is already covered by two output indicators and one outcome indicator
Nutrition	Percentage of women reporting minimum dietary diversity (MDDW)	This nutrition-related indicator is proposed for removal as it was introduced into guidelines only in 2020 and the cohort of projects currently reporting on this is very small. Even within this small sample, only a few projects are ready for reporting as this indicator is only reported on after midterm. Therefore, the results against this indicator would be based only on a handful of projects. Furthermore, two nutrition indicators are already included in the RMF at the output and impact level and a new impact indicator on food security has also been included.

29. The second key adjustment is Management's proposal to move away from setting targets for outputs and outcomes. As commented in the 2023 RIDE, comparing outreach, outcome and output performance against targets has become less appropriate over time, given the demand-driven nature of IFAD-financed projects. As explained under the principle of informed adjustments, this is in line with the approach to reporting adopted by comparator organizations (see table 3). The IFAD projects that are reporting during a given cycle change. They are dependent on the type of activities that countries borrow for, which in turn reflects the country context and country-specific development needs – which also evolve over time. As a consequence, results on indicators also change. Predicting targets based on current portfolios that are likely to evolve is not advisable or accurate. Furthermore, projects designed in a given cycle are unlikely to achieve output outcome results early on in their life, which coincides with the reporting period within the cycle. However, Management will retain monitoring against targets for completion outcome ratings, given the different nature of these indicators, which track IFAD's ambitions for the performance of its portfolio.

Table 3
Comparator analysis on output and outcome tracking in RMF

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Framework name</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>No. of tiers</i>	<i>Output</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
ADB	Corporate Results Framework	2019-2024	4	No specific targets found	No specific targets found
AfDB	Results Measurement Framework	2016-2025	4	Annual and cumulative targets, over 10 years	No targets
IDA	Results Measurement System	2021-2023	3	Expected range, no targets	Expected range, no targets
IDB	Corporate Results Framework	2020-2023	3	No targets	No targets

C. Tier III: Operational, organizational and financial performance

30. At the tier III level, IFAD tracks a range of operational, financial and organizational indicators aligned with the IFAD13 priorities. Some adjustments are proposed at tier III on all three sets of indicators.

Aligning operational delivery

31. The operational indicators in tier III include a range of indicators to assess the performance of country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs), project design, and during project implementation, including proactivity and IFAD's performance as assessed by key stakeholders. In line with priorities for IFAD13 – including private sector engagement and strengthening the risk architecture – new indicators on the quality of non-sovereign operations at design, on procurement, and on SECAP are proposed for the IFAD13 RMF. Ratings of SECAP and procurement began only in 2022 and therefore targets have been set based on the limited dataset available for 2022 approvals.

Table 4
Indicators to be added

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rationale</i>
Designing for impact	
Overall rating for quality of non-sovereign operation (NSO) design (ratings 4 and above)	IFAD has developed a quality assurance tool for the review of private sector operations which provides a rating on various aspects that IFAD has been monitoring since the conception of the private sector window, such as relevance, additionality (financial and non-financial), impact and development results, environmental/social and governance standards and risks.
Quality of project procurement at design (ratings 4 and above)	IFAD started to rate the quality of procurement at entry in 2022. As this is a priority area for IFAD, it is proposed that this indicator be included in the IFAD13 RMF.
Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP) compliance (ratings 4 and above)	IFAD started to rate the quality of SECAP at entry in 2022. As this is a priority area for IFAD, it is proposed that this indicator be included in the IFAD13 RMF.

32. Applying the principle of streamlining, it is proposed that the indicators outlined in in table 5 be removed.

Table 5
Indicators to be removed

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rationale</i>
Designing for impact	
Overall rating for quality of grant-funded projects at entry (ratings 4 and above)	It is proposed that this indicator be deleted from the RMF. A stand-alone Executive Board report on grants has been introduced following the approval of the new grants policy. This stand-alone document contains comprehensive reporting on grants. Furthermore, all grants submitted to the Board should have a rating of at least 4. In addition, IFAD has performed well above target (at 100%) as shown by the past three RIDEs.
Performance of country programmes	
Relevance of IFAD country strategies (ratings of 4 and above)	It is proposed that this indicator be deleted in line with practices of other institutions and IFAD's high performance on relevance. Furthermore, relevance of IFAD's country programmes is an inherent expectation.
Partnership-building (ratings of 4 and above)	It is proposed that this indicator be deleted for streamlining purposes. This area is reported on under the partnership framework and associated reporting.
COSOPs integrating private sector interventions complementing the programme of loans and grants (PoLG)	This indicator duplicates the commitment that all COSOPs identify private sector opportunities. In an effort to avoid duplication of commitments and indicators, it is proposed that this indicator be dropped from the RMF but tracked through reporting on the commitments. Furthermore, a new indicator on the quality at entry of NSOs is being proposed for the RMF.

Assembling and leveraging development finance

33. It is proposed that one financial indicator be removed from the IFAD13 RMF. IFAD has strengthened its financial architecture and the Executive Board receives regular updates through the Audit Committee on IFAD's financial areas (see table 6).

Table 6
Indicator to be removed

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rationale</i>
Institutional efficiency	
Ratio of the administrative budget to the ongoing portfolio of loans and grants	Indicator is similar to 3.5.1 and is also reported on in the stand-alone budget document submitted annually to the Board. Therefore, it is proposed that this efficiency indicator be removed and that indicator 3.5.1 be retained.

Strengthening institutional effectiveness

34. Staff engagement is a critical element under institutional effectiveness for IFAD13. A new indicator is proposed for inclusion in the IFAD13 RMF on this priority area.

Table 7
Indicators to be added

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rationale</i>
Decentralization and human resource management	
Staff engagement index (Global Staff Survey) with specific indicators related to the IFAD Strategy on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	It is proposed that this indicator be included as part of the implementation of the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Strategy.

35. It is proposed that the five indicators listed in table 8 be removed from the IFAD13 RMF.

Table 8
Indicators to be removed

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Rationale</i>
Ratio of budgeted staff positions in ICOs/regional hubs	It is proposed that this indicator be deleted, as IFAD is on track to reach 45% by 2024 and this target will not be increased in IFAD13.
Time to fill Professional vacancies	It is proposed that this indicator be deleted; it monitors exclusively the duration of selections from the closure of the job opening to the date that the appointments board is convened. This is not sufficient for an effective and successful recruitment process. Monitoring of the vacancy rate, which is a better measure, has already been included in the corporate risk register.
Percentage of staff completing SH/SEA online training	It is proposed that this indicator be deleted. The training is mandatory for all IFAD staff, hence the indicator should always reach 100%. Furthermore, this is also reported on in the stand-alone SH/SEA report prepared by the Ethics Office for the Executive Board.
Performance management	This indicator was introduced in the RMF12. It is proposed that it be deleted, as it is not a sufficient indicator to assess successful performance management processes.
Transparency	
Comprehensiveness of IFAD's publishing to IATI standards	It is proposed that this indicator be deleted. No questions or comments have been raised by Member States on the past three RIDEs, and the IFAD11 target of 75 was consistently surpassed during IFAD11, as well as in 2022, as per the IFAD12 MTR. Furthermore, this is assessed by an external body (International Aid Transparency Initiative [IATI]) based on the data published.

V. Measuring and reporting

36. Management will continue to report annually on the RMF in the RIDE. The RMF dashboard will continue to be accessible both internally as a management tool and externally to allow the Executive Board to assess IFAD's performance against RMF indicators at any given moment.
37. The timeframe for reporting on each indicator may vary. For example, impact indicators are reported only at the end of each cycle. Other indicators are reported on annually. IFAD will continue to report on stand-alone and thematic topics through separate reports such as the Report on IFAD's Mainstreaming Effectiveness that was introduced in IFAD12, the ethics report, the grants report, and others.

38. The full proposal for the IFAD13 RMF, including indicators with targets, definitions and data sources, is provided below. The IFAD13 RMF provides specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound indicators to measure IFAD's development effectiveness, ensuring focus on the IFAD13 key priority areas. Work is under way to report on areas for which data have been collected but are not as yet ready for reporting (e.g. biodiversity).

IFAD13 Results Management Framework indicators

Tier I – Global goals and context

Code	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Baseline (year)
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	United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD)	N/A
1.2	SDG 2: Zero hunger			
1.2.1	Prevalence of food insecurity	2.1.2	UNSD	N/A
1.2.2	Prevalence of malnutrition among children under 5 years of age	2.2.2	UNSD	N/A
1.2.3	Productivity of small-scale food producers	2.3.1	UNSD	N/A

Tier II – Development results

Code	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Baseline	IFAD12 target	IFAD13 proposed target
2.1	Impact					
2.1.1	Number of people experiencing positive economic mobility (millions)	2.3 and 1.2	Impact assessment (IA)	77.4	68	87
2.1.2	Number of people with improved production (millions)	2.3.2	IA	62.4	51	71
2.1.3	Number of people with improved market access (millions)	2.3	IA	64.4	55	73
2.1.4	Number of people with greater resilience (millions)	1.5	IA	38.2	28	43
2.1.5	Number of people with improved nutrition (millions)	2.1	IA	0.6	11	5
2.1.6	Number of people with improved food security (millions)	2.1.2	IA	58.3	NEW	66
2.1.7	Number of people in households with improved women's empowerment (millions)	5.6	IA	NEW	NEW	61
2.2	Project-level development outcome ratings at completion					
2.2.1	Government performance (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)	Not applicable (N/A)	Project completion report (PCR) ratings	88	80	80
2.2.2	IFAD's performance (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)	N/A	PCR ratings	95	90	90
2.2.3	Efficiency (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)	N/A	PCR ratings	76	80	80

Code	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Baseline	IFAD12 target	IFAD13 proposed target
2.2.4	Sustainability of benefits (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)	N/A	PCR ratings	83	85	85
2.2.5	Scaling up [revised definition] (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)	N/A	PCR ratings	87	95	80
2.2.6	Gender equality (ratings 4 and above/ratings 5 and above) (percentage)	5	PCR ratings - 4 and above	89	90	90
		5	PCR ratings - 5 and above	42	60	60
2.2.7	Environment and Natural Resource Management (ENRM) and climate change adaptation (CCA) (percentage)	13 and 15	PCR ratings - ENRM	93	90	90
		13 and 15	PCR ratings - CCA	92	90	90

Code	Thematic areas	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Baseline	IFAD12 target	IFAD13 proposal
2.3	Project-level outcome and outputs						
2.3.1	Outreach	Number of persons benefiting from services promoted or supported by the project	1.4	Core indicators	78.5 million	127 million	Tracked
2.3.2	Access to agricultural technologies and production services	Number of hectares of farmland under water-related infrastructure constructed/rehabilitated	2.3	Core indicators	381,580	610,000	Tracked
2.3.3		Number of persons trained in production practices and/or technologies (millions)	2.3	Core indicators	2.5 million	3.25 million	Tracked
2.3.4	Inclusive financial services	Number of persons in rural areas accessing financial services (savings, credit, insurance, remittances, etc.) (millions)	2.3	Core indicators	9.9 million	23 million	Tracked
2.3.5	Diversified rural enterprises and employment opportunities	Number of persons trained in income-generating activities or business management (millions)	4.4	Core indicators	3.5 million	3.1 million	Tracked
2.3.6		Number of beneficiaries with new jobs/employment opportunities	8.5	Core indicators - outcome	-	Tracked	Tracked
2.3.7	Rural producers' organizations	Number of supported rural producers that are members of rural producers' organizations	2.3	Core indicators	1.3 million	1 million	Tracked
2.3.8	Rural infrastructure	Number of kilometres of roads constructed, rehabilitated or upgraded	9.1	Core indicators	8,170	19,000	Tracked
2.3.9	Environmental sustainability and climate change	Number of hectares of land brought under climate-resilient management (millions)	2.4	Core indicators	1.92 million	1.9 million	Tracked
2.3.10		Number of households reporting adoption of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient technologies and practices	13.1	Core indicators – outcome	237,701	350,000	Tracked

2.3.11		Number of tons of greenhouse gas emissions (carbon dioxide equivalent [CO2e]) avoided and/or sequestered (million tons of CO2e over 20 years)	13.1	Core indicators - outcome	20.2 million	95 million	Tracked
2.3.12	Nutrition	Number of persons/households provided with targeted support to improve their nutrition (millions)	2.1	Core indicators	2.07 million	6 million	Tracked
2.3.13	Access to natural resources	Number of beneficiaries gaining increased secure access to land	1.4	Core indicators	51,050	Tracked	Tracked

Tier III – Operational, organizational and financial performance

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Baseline	IFAD12 target	IFAD13 proposed target
Aligning Programme Delivery					
3.1	Designing for impact				
3.1.1	Overall rating for quality of project design (ratings 4 and above/ratings 5 and above)	Quality assurance ratings – 4 and above	100	95	100
		Quality assurance ratings – 5 and above	New	New	25
3.1.2	Climate finance: Climate-focused PoLG	Corporate validation based on the multilateral development banks' (MDB) methodologies for climate finance tracking	30	40	45
3.1.3	Climate capacity: Projects designed to build adaptive capacity (percentage)	Corporate validation	69	90	90
3.1.4	Projects designed to transform <u>achieve transformative outcomes for gender norms, equality and relations-women's empowerment</u>	Corporate validation	53	35	35
3.1.5	Appropriateness of targeting approaches in IFAD investment projects (ratings 4 and above/ratings 5 and above)	Quality assurance ratings – 4 and above	New	NEW	100%
		Quality assurance ratings – 5 and above	New	NEW	50%
3.1.6	Overall rating for quality of non-sovereign operation (NSO) design (ratings 4 and above)	Quality assurance reviews	NEW	NEW	100%
3.1.7	Quality of project procurement at design (ratings 4 and above)	Quality at entry ratings	50	NEW	50
3.1.8	Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP) compliance (ratings 4 and above)	Quality at entry ratings	90	NEW	100

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Baseline	IFAD12 target	IFAD13 proposed target
3.2	Proactive portfolio management				
3.2.1	Disbursement ratio	Oracle FLEXCUBE	16.8	15	16
3.2.2	Overall implementation progress (ratings 4 and above)	Supervision ratings	80	85	80
3.2.3	Proactivity index	Corporate validation	80	70	80
3.2.4	Quality of project target group engagement and feedback (ratings 4 and above)	Supervision ratings	94	80	85
3.3	Performance of country programmes				
3.3.1	Effectiveness of IFAD country strategies (ratings moderately satisfactory and above)	COSOP completion reports (CCRs)	86	80	80
		Stakeholder survey	86	90	90
3.3.2	Country-level policy engagement (ratings of moderately satisfactory and above)	CCRs	86	80	80
		Stakeholder survey	78	90	90
3.3.3	Knowledge management (ratings of moderately satisfactory and above)	CCRs	71	80	80
		Stakeholder survey	93	90	90
3.3.4	Overall quality of SSTC in COSOPs (ratings of 4 and above) (percentage)	Quality assurance ratings	100	90	100%
Assembling and leveraging development finance					
3.4	Resources				
3.4.1	Deployable capital	Corporate databases	24.9	Tracked	Tracked
3.4.2	Debt-to-equity ratio	Corporate databases	23.6	Tracked	Tracked
3.4.3	Cofinancing ratio	Grants and Investment Projects System (GRIPS)	1:1.63	1:1.5	1:1.6
	Cofinancing ratio (domestic)	GRIPS	1:0.88	1:0.8	1:0.8
	Cofinancing ratio (international)	GRIPS	1:0.75	1:0.7	1:0.8
3.4.4	Leverage effect of IFAD non-sovereign investments	Corporate databases	6.5	5	5
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	15.1	12.5	12.5

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Baseline	IFAD12 target	IFAD13 proposed target
3.6	Decentralization and human resource management				
3.6.1	Decentralization effectiveness	IFAD Country Office survey	72	80	80
3.6.2	Percentage of women in P-5 posts and above	Corporate databases	44.4	40	=>45
3.6.3	Staff engagement index (Global Staff Survey) with specific indicators related to the IFAD Strategy on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	Global Staff Survey	<i>NEW</i>	<i>NEW</i>	80
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)	87/85	85/90	85/90

Definitions and data sources for IFAD13 RMF indicators

Tier I – Global goals and context

Code	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
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	United Nations Statistics Division (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	SDG 2: 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

Code	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
2.1	Impact			
2.1.1	Number of people experiencing positive economic mobility (millions)	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 (millions)	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 (millions)	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 (millions)	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 (millions)	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-19 and other global shocks). The indicator will be reported in 2028.
2.1.6	Number of people with improved food security (millions)	2.1.2	IA	Projection from IFAD impact assessments of the number of people with improved food security (decrease in Food Insecurity Experience Scale of 10 per cent or more). The indicator will be reported in 2028.

Code	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
2.1.7	Number of people in households with improved women's empowerment (millions)	5.6	IA	The number of people living in households where women have improved economic participation, as measured by decision-making over income sources (10 per cent or more). The indicator will be reported in 2028.
2.2	Project-level development outcome ratings at completion			
2.2.1	Government performance (ratings 4 and above) (percentage)	Not applicable (N/A)	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, the adequacy of the borrower's assumption of ownership and responsibility during all project phases, including the 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)	N/A	PCR ratings	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better on 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)	N/A	PCR ratings	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better for efficiency, of the total number of projects closed in the previous three years with efficiency ratings. 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" means 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 means 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)	N/A	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)	N/A	PCR ratings	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better for scaling up. Scaling up takes place when: (i) bilateral and multilateral partners (private sector, communities) adopt and disseminate the solution tested by IFAD; (ii) other stakeholders invest resources to bring the solution to scale; and (iii) the Government applies a policy framework to generalize the solution tested by IFAD (from practice to policy). Scaling up is not confined to innovations.
2.2.6	Gender equality (ratings 4 and above/ratings 5 and above) (percentage)	5	PCR ratings – 4 and above	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4), satisfactory (5) or better for gender equality, meaning that they made a partial contribution to addressing gender needs and achieving gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) by addressing two of the three gender policy objectives: (1) economic empowerment; (2) equal voice and influence in decision-making; and (3) equitable balance in workloads.

Code	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
			PCR ratings – 5 and above	The definition for this indicator is the extent to which IFAD interventions have contributed to better GEWE in terms of women's access to and ownership of assets, resources and services; participation in decision-making; workload balance and impact on women's incomes, nutrition and livelihoods; and 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) (percentage)	13 and 15	PCR ratings - ENRM	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better for environment and natural resources management and climate change. The definition for this indicator is the extent to which the project has contributed to enhancing environmental sustainability and resilience to climate change in small-scale agriculture. For ENRM, 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, agroecosystems 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; and (iii) whether 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	Number of persons benefiting from 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 of the reporting period).
2.3.2	Access to agricultural technologies and production services	Number of hectares of farmland under water-related infrastructure constructed/rehabilitated	2.3	Core indicators	The number of hectares of farmland under water-related infrastructure constructed/rehabilitated measure the irrigation potential created, or the area that can be irrigated annually by the quantity of water that could be made available by all the connected and completed works up to the end of the water courses or the last point in the water delivery system. Water-related infrastructure includes dams and ditches, irrigation and drainage infrastructure, infrastructure for rainwater harvesting (at field level), wells and other water points, etc. constructed or rehabilitated with support from the project.
2.3.3		Number of persons trained in production practices and/or technologies	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 of the reporting period). Training topics may concern crop, livestock or fish production.
2.3.4	Inclusive financial services	Number of persons in rural areas accessing financial services (savings, credit, insurance, remittances, etc.)	2.3	Core indicators	Number of individuals who have accessed a financial product or service specifically promoted or supported by the project and partner financial service provider, at least once (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as of the reporting period). Such services include loans and micro-loans, savings funds, micro-insurance/insurance, remittances, and membership in a community-based financial organization (e.g. savings and loan group).

Code	Thematic areas	Indicator name	SDG	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
2.3.5	Diversified rural enterprises and employment opportunities	Number of persons trained in income-generating activities or business management	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 of the reporting period).
2.3.6		Number of 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 of the 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) are excluded.
2.3.7	Rural producers' organizations	Number of supported rural producers that are members of rural producers' organizations	2.3	Core indicators	Rural producers belonging to a rural producers' organization supported by the project, whether formally registered or not, during the review period (cumulative value for the ongoing and recently completed portfolio as of the reporting period).
2.3.8	Rural infrastructure	Number of 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 of the reporting period). All types of roads are included, e.g. feeder, paved, primary, secondary or tertiary roads.
2.3.9	Environmental sustainability and climate change	Number of hectares of land brought under climate-resilient management	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 of the reporting period).
2.3.10		Number of 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).
2.3.11		Number of 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 greenhouse gas emissions avoided and/or sequestered (expressed in tons 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 to 8 years), during which project activities are carried out, as well as the capitalization phase (usually 12 to 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.
2.3.12	Nutrition	Number of persons/households provided with targeted support to improve their nutrition	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.
2.3.13	Access to natural resources	Number of 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 of the reporting period) in gaining formal ownership or user 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, organizational and financial performance

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
Aligning programme delivery			
3.1	Designing for impact		
3.1.1	Overall rating for quality of project design (ratings 4 and above/ratings 5 and above) (percentage)	Quality assurance ratings – 4 and above Quality assurance ratings – 5 and above	A summary rating provided during the quality assurance process across several dimensions including: (i) alignment with country context; (ii) assessment of national/local institutional capacities; (iii) consistency of the proposed objectives, activities and expected outputs and outcomes; (iv) implementation readiness; (v) likelihood of achieving development objectives; and (vi) extent to which quality enhancement recommendations have been addressed. The ratings are reported on a 12-month average basis.
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 multilateral development bank (MDB) methodologies for tracking climate change adaptation and mitigation finance. Climate finance is calculated at design, based on the final cost tables and project design reports of approved IFAD operations. Reporting on climate finance under the enhanced Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP+) will be distinguished from climate finance under the programme of loans and grants (PoLG), 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. increased 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	Projects designed to transform <u>achieve transformative outcomes for gender normsequality and relationswomen's empowerment</u>	Corporate validation	Such project actively seeks to transform <u>address</u> gendered power dynamics by addressing social norms, practices, attitudes, beliefs and value systems that represent structural barriers to gender equality and women's 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.
3.1.5	Appropriateness of targeting approaches in IFAD investment projects (ratings 4 and above/ratings 5 and above)	Quality assurance ratings – 4 and above Quality assurance ratings – 5 and above	Percentage of projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better or satisfactory (5) 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.
3.1.6	Overall rating for quality of non-sovereign operation (NSO) design (ratings 4 and above)	Quality assurance reviews	Percentage of non-sovereign operations rated moderately satisfactory and above for overall quality at entry. This assessment includes the relevance, additionality, development results/impact, environmental, social and governance standards and the risks.
3.1.7	Quality of project procurement at design (ratings 4 and above)	Quality at entry ratings	Percentage of new projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better through quality assurance review on the Quality of projects' procurement design "at entry" for IFAD-funded investment projects. This includes an assessment of (i) National Legal and Institutional frameworks of Public Procurement in the Borrower's country, (ii) Implementation Capacity of the parent Ministry (the Implementing Agency) and related management systems, the capacity of the Project's Implementation Unit (PIU) to undertake project procurement and contract management, (iii) National Market Competitiveness and Delivery Capacity, (iv) SECAP compliance and (v) Fitness for Purpose of the project's Procurement Plan, Supervision Arrangements and status of project design and its readiness for implementation.

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
3.1.8	Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP) compliance (ratings 4 and above)	Quality at entry ratings	Percentage of new projects rated moderately satisfactory (4) or better during the quality assurance process for their level of compliance with IFAD Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP). The review assesses how the new design integrates social, environment and climate change considerations; i.e. the extent to which the design: (i) is based on sound assessments of potential risks and impacts related to biodiversity conservation, resources efficiency and pollution prevention, cultural heritage, indigenous peoples, labour and working conditions community health and safety, physical and economic resettlement, and climate change; (ii) includes measures for the mitigation, management and monitoring of these risks and impacts; (iii) has developed a stakeholder engagement plan and project level grievance redress mechanism; and (iv) prepared the required thematic plans and studies, or developed TORs and estimated budgets for plans and studies to be carried out during start up/early implementation.
3.2	Proactive portfolio management		
3.2.1	Disbursement ratio	Oracle FLEXCUBE	The total amount disbursed over the review period from the PoLG, divided by the undisbursed balance of loans and grants that have been approved and signed, and their entry into force or disburseable status at the beginning of the review period
3.2.2	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 of project management and financial management, and execution. Includes scores on quality of project management, quality of financial management, disbursement, procurement, etc.
3.2.3	Proactivity index	Corporate validation	Percentage of ongoing projects rated as problem projects in previous approved performance ratings that have been upgraded, restructured, completed/closed, cancelled or suspended in the most recent approved performance ratings.
3.2.4	Quality of project target group engagement and feedback (ratings 4 and above)	Supervision 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.
3.3	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, stated objectives and 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 have made progress, in supporting 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.

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
		Stakeholder survey	Average 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.
3.3.4	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 South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC) Strategy: (i) is tailored to the country context; (ii) contributes to the strategic objectives of country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs), in synergy with other lending and non-lending activities; and (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
Assembling and leveraging development finance			
3.4	Resources		
3.4.1	Deployable capital	Corporate databases	In line with the Capital Adequacy Policy (see EB 2019/128/R.43) the deployable capital ratio is defined as ICA plus total resources required plus buffer ICA divided by the ICA. 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	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 at the end of each year.
3.4.3	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 the PoLG in a given three-year period (in current United States dollars). The ratio indicates the United States dollar amount of cofinancing per each dollar of IFAD financing (36-month rolling average).
	Cofinancing ratio (domestic)	GRIPS	The amount of cofinancing from domestic sources divided by the amount of IFAD financing for the PoLG approved in a given three-year period (in current United States dollars). The ratio indicates the United States dollar amount of cofinancing per each dollar of IFAD financing (36-month rolling average).
	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 (in current United States dollars). The ratio indicates the United States dollar amount of cofinancing per each dollar of IFAD financing (36-month rolling average).
3.4.4	Leverage effect of IFAD non-sovereign investments	Corporate databases	Value of IFAD non-sovereign investment 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 an early development stage of such funds/vehicles, the target size of the fund or vehicle will be used as a 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		

Code	Indicator name	Data source	Definition (preliminary)
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 the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD [IOE]) divided by PoLG funds committed by IFAD inclusive of loans, Debt Sustainability Framework and other grants, and ASAP – all phases 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 such as General Service (GS) staff at headquarters and liaison offices, and national GS staff, junior professional officers, special programme officers, staff funded under partnership agreements, staff on loan to IFAD, staff on positions financed by supplementary funds, staff on coterminous positions, individuals hired under non-staff contracts such as consultants, fellows, those under special service agreements, interns, etc., and staff from hosted entities.
3.6.3	Staff engagement index (Global Staff Survey) with specific indicators related to the IFAD Strategy on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	Global Staff Survey	Staff engagement index as measured by the Global Staff Survey (GSS) with diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) specific indicators, e.g. agreement with the statement: "All IFAD employees are treated with respect".
3.7	Transparency		
3.7.1	Percentage of PCRs submitted within prescribed deadline, and percentage of which are 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 assessments, data collection, review and analysis). Of these, share of PCRs published on IFAD's website.