# CRGE Facility – Results Matrix on Operational Effectiveness

The following matrix represents the zero draft results matrix for tracking Operational Effectiveness of the CRGE Facility. The indicators have been updated and revised based on comments received from the Facility (27/02/15), and streamlined to avoid duplication, redundancy and overlap. The matrix currently includes 14 key indicators and 3 categories of operational effectiveness: (i) Resource Mobilization & Management (disbursement indicators are now included here – in line with common practice); (ii) Quality-at-Entry; and (iii) Implementation / Delivery. Important assumptions and notes important for the Facility Teams’ consideration have been included in the last column – including where further streamlining of indicators can occur.

At this time, we recommend that the Facility team within MoFED meet to discuss the below matrix. As with the CRGE Strategy Results Matrix indicators, a good tool to help work through the operationalization of each of the proposed indicator is the **Performance Indicator Reference Sheets** (or **PIRS**; also attached). As part of the CRGE M&E system, PIRS should be included for each indicator to safeguard both the integrity and the consistency of the data being reported year after year. PIRS provide clear guidance on how each indicator will be calculated, aggregated or analyzed, and ensure that methods are documented in a transparent, replicable and comparable manner.

Also to discuss amongst the Facility team will be intended milestones, or targets, for each of the proposed indicators as well as the timescale associated with the intended targets.

| **Type**  | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** (*what year?*) | **Targets** (*what year?*) | **Data Sources & Collection Methods** | **Frequency** | **Assumptions / Notes for CRGE Secretariat Team** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Resource Mobilization & Management** | 1 | **Resource Mobilization**: Total resources mobilized, disaggregated by: |  |  |  or written commitments from donors; signed MOUs; Facility disbursement records |  | Comments (27/02/15) suggest the Facility would like to track new sources of finances vs. finances mobilized as a result of existing investors. This can be tracked in a), b) and c) by tracking both “source” and type” |
|  | 1a | * Committed (source, type and amount)
 |  |  | See above. |  |  written commitments, but no MOU/SAA, contract yet signed. |
|  | 1b | * Approved (source, type and amount)
 |  |  | See above. |  | As evidenced by signed MOUs/SAA or  |
|  | 1c | * Dispersed (source, type and amount)
 |  |  | See above. |  | Dispersed as funds spent |
|  | 2 | **Costs**: Total operating costs as a proportion of total resources mobilized, disaggregated by: |  | [*we assume this will be a percentage. Confirm with donors what would be acceptable. For DFATD, a 12% max is permitted*] | Financial records |  | Comments (27/02/15) suggest the Facility would like to track resources mobilized vs. spent on mobilization, as well as spent on administration of funds. This might be difficult to disaggregate? If you have the tracking means to do so – keep this in. If not, we advise just looking at overall .operating costs of the Facility.  |
|  | 2a | * Resource mobilization (as a percentage of total operating costs)
 |  |  |  |  | See note above. Will it be possible to disaggregate?  |
|  | 2b | * Administration (as a percentage of total operating costs)
 |  |  |  |  | See note above. Will it be possible to disaggregate?  |
|  | 3 | **Timeliness**: Average number of days between when funding request received from CRGE sector and when Management Committee approval signed | **--** |  |  |  | Does a Facility finance tracking tool (e.g. Excel spreadsheet) already exist? If so, be sure to include data on dates (e.g. when proposal was submitted vs. when financing was committed / approved / dispersed |
|  | 4 | **Timeliness:** Average number of days between when Management Committee approval signed and when disbursements begin. | **--** |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5 | Project proposals funded as a proportion of project proposals received (Number and value) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | **Compliance and Transparency**: number and type of operational management structure developed and in place |  |  |  |  | “Operational management structures” may include: financial management guidelines; environmental and social safeguard systems; M&E guidelines |
| **Quality at Entry** | 7 | **Capacity of applicants**: Number and type of capacity development activities provided by the CRGE Facility to access Facility financing |  |  | Training reports |  | Types of capacity development activities may include: awareness-raising / sensitization events; proposal writing workshops; other?  |
|  | 8 | **Capacity of applicants**: Number of people / organizations trained in proposal development (to access Facility finances) |  |  |  |  | If we need to reduce the # of indicators, consider using this one instead of #6 |
|  | 9 | **Capacity of applicants:** Proportion of first-time submitted proposals rated “satisfactory”  |  |  |  |  | What is the process for proposal submission? If a proposal is not scored “satisfactory” and hence does not get sign-off, do comments go back to the applicant for a second chance?**Satisfactory** must be defined in line with proposal appraisal guidelines / criteria (scorecard?) |
| **Delivery / Implementation** | 10 | Proportion of operations formally monitored once a year |  |  |  |  | Assumption here that this is mandatory – that all Facility financed projects must be formally monitored every year.“Formally monitored” includes joint monitoring and supervision visits. |
|  | 11 | Proportion of operations submitting satisfactory reports in a timely manner |  |  |  |  | The Facility might just consider reporting on timeliness of report submission here. Assessing quality of reporting to meet “satisfactory” criteria will be time consuming for MoFED. Most other donors/funds only report on timeliness or regular reports and “quality” of final evaluation rather. |
|  | 12 | Proportion of final evaluations rated satisfactory |  |  |  |  | Need to develop scorecard to assess levels of satisifaction. |
|  | 13 | **Financial management**: Ratio of projects without major audit findings  |  |  |  |  | AfDB has a general indicator on “problem projects” – this could be financial mismanagement, safeguard grievance lodged or non-compliance concern or something else. |
|  | 14a) | **Problem projects**: Average duration (number of days) to respond to problem |  |  |  |  | See comment above. Need to define “problem operations” |
|  | 14b) | **Problem projects**: Average number of days to close-out problem |  |  |  |  |  |