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Introduction

Background

- Pilot Evaluation Product – rigorous evaluation of subjects amenable to quick turn-around to provide action-oriented findings in a short time window

Purpose

- Assess the soundness, relevance, and utility of the RMF of IFAD12 in tracking the progress towards the agreed results targets and for managing for development results;

Scope

- Inform the design and implementation of the RMF of IFAD 13.
- Design quality - processes and technical quality (coverage, evaluability,)
- Utility of RMF and integration into IFAD’s operations and oversight

Approach

- Sources: Relevant IOE evaluations, comments on Impact Assessments submitted to the EB (based on several years of impact evaluation experience), Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, Comparison with select IFIs
- Validation: Triangulation of data from different sources and methods
• The RMF serves as a vital instrument of accountability for the core resources mobilized by tracking progress during replenishment cycle

• RMF plays a crucial role in prioritizing and organizing IFAD’s interventions linked to the replenished resources to deliver the agreed targets.

• IFAD has instituted sound processes for designing the RMF and has integrated the framework well into its programming. Overall, the design and use of the RMF constitute international good practice.
There is broad-based management commitment to improving the design of RMF.

Despite streamlining efforts, relatively high number of indicators that adversely affects the focus of the RMF.

Uneven rigour in setting targets - targets were not always set based on evidence and experience.
KEY FINDINGS – IMPLEMENTING RMF

• IFAD took important steps to develop tools and systems to track progress and share data more broadly.

• Uneven credibility and reliability of reported data - Financial data of tier III were audited; data for few of the tier II and III indicators came from sources outside IFAD. Past evaluations and this review show threats to validity of such data.

• Despite efforts to recruit additional M&E staff, limited M&E capacity poses challenges to ensuring the quality of the data collection, analysis and reporting.

• Ownership and full understanding of the rationale for RMF indicators vary across IFAD. IFAD is yet to develop comprehensive metadata for all its indicators.
The RMF was used widely across IFAD as an organizing framework for prioritizing areas of interventions and staff performance towards achieving RMF targets.

Evidence shows that the use of online RMF dashboard is limited.
1. **Have targets only when they are feasible** in line with the emerging international practice (4 of 66 RMF indicators do not have targets).

2. **Develop and make readily available metadata** for all RMF indicators and facilitate clear understanding of it by users.

3. **Take into account the cost considerations** associated with new/additional RMF indicator data.

4. **Establish an IFAD community of** practice for all relevant indicators to strengthen the capacity to collect required data at the country level.

5. **Strengthen the credibility and reliability of all RMF indicator data** (quality audit/validate data used, use data from independent sources, when available).
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