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This issues paper is targeted at the OECD/DAC Results Community and is intended to provoke discussion during the workshop session two on the development of guiding principles on 4 April.

The “OECD/DAC Results Community”, supported by the OECD/DCD Results team, aims to strengthen results-based management for effective development co-operation, fostering exchange, sharing good practice and driving collective learning among development co-operation providers, CSOs, research institutes and partner countries.

Recognising the evolving development co-operation context and management practices since the Managing for Development Results (MfDR) sourcebook was developed in 2006, the draft principles developed by the OECD/DAC Results Community aim to provide guidance to support members and partners of the Results Community in setting up sound results-based management approaches and systems that are fit for the 2030 Agenda and can be used for accountability, decision-making, learning and communication.

This paper presents in a first section the rationale for developing such principles, including the purpose, process and follow-up, and in a second section the key elements that should frame the principles. It concludes with a third section in proposing preliminary draft guiding principles.

Questions for the discussion

Group and plenary discussions at the workshop will address successively the three following sets of issues:

- Proposed status and structure in four pillars of the guiding principles (section 3.1)

- Review of draft principles: Any principle missing? Any unclear principle that needs re-drafting to clarify or nuance? Any principle that should not be there? (Section 3.2)

- Next steps: Any comments on the proposed process and timeframe? (Section 1.2) and any proposal for the title of these principles: e.g. results-based management, managing for sustainable development results?
1. Rationale and process for developing guiding principles

1.1. Purpose

Interpretation and practice of results-based management (RBM) in development co-operation has evolved over the last twenty years. The context for development co-operation itself has also changed. The SDGs stress the need to work in partnerships, adopt cross-sectoral approaches and focus on localised, context-based approaches while targeting those left behind; all aspects having an impact on the results approaches and systems. Meanwhile opportunities in using new information technologies have grown.

Development co-operation providers have developed various, often mixed, approaches to address this complexity and navigate volatile and uncertain environments. In developing their approach to results, most of them are also driven by the pressing need to be accountable to their domestic constituencies. Providers therefore focus reporting on outputs and short-term outcomes, often relying on sets of standard, aggregate indicators. This may come at the expense of using results information for learning, adapting and achieving longer term outcomes. In partner countries, this may also make it more difficult to align to national results frameworks and counter bottom-up, context-sensitive approaches. In a number of domains (e.g. private sector engagement), providers have shifted their policies and management practices to adapt to Agenda 2030, but are still struggling to get the evidence they need to ensure their engagement has sustainable development impact. Meanwhile new development co-operation providers are building their results approaches and systems, often with limited resources, and come with new demands for guidance. All these developments call for revisiting the approach to results-based management. While recognising the variety of management practices, a fresh look should lead to a shared understanding of the key building blocks that need to be in place to best design, manage, achieve and demonstrate how development interventions contribute to sustainable development results.

Against this background, a limited core set of principles can have value in: i) providing a widely recognised benchmarking framework; ii) helping to change the mind-set and supporting change management processes within donor agencies; and iii) guiding new donors in setting up their results approaches – as well as staff of more experienced providers. They can be useful to show a possible continuum between different approaches and promote the use of results for learning and decision-making. They will help guide providers towards more efficient and harmonised results-based management systems, conducive to collaborative approaches.

Recognising that there is no one-size-fits all approach, these shared principles will be designed as ‘guiding principles’ – as opposed to standards or guidelines, leaving scope to operationalise them in different ways, depending on each context and level of maturity.

1.2. Process for developing the guiding principles

This exercise does not start from scratch. In 2014, DCD conducted a review of results-based management challenges and practices among DAC members and observers that led to a policy paper on Measuring and managing results in development co-operation. More recently, the Results Community conducted seven case studies on members’ results-based management approaches, which were synthesised into a Policy Paper that was discussed at the Results Community workshop in October 2017. One of the recommendations of the paper was that providers articulate the purpose of their results systems, and then undertake external evaluation and/or review of their results-based management approach on a periodic

---

1 See key messages from the OECD/DAC Results Community workshop of 29-30 October 2018.
basis. In line with this recommendation, several members of the Results Community and other actors have conducted evaluations and/or reviews of this nature over the period of 2015-18.

In 2018, the Secretariat, with the guidance of a Results Community Reference Group\(^2\), conducted a review and analysis of the findings from various evaluations and reviews of results-based management systems carried out by members of the Development Assistance Committee, the Results Community Secretariat and other bodies over 2015-18. This analysis, complemented by a review of emerging practices related to results-based management in development co-operation, is synthesised in the OECD Working Paper “Learning from Results-Based Management Evaluations and Reviews”.

These reviews create a substantive evidence base on the practice of results-based management in development co-operation. Together with the broader principles that guide development co-operation actors in managing their programme, they form the basis for developing guiding principles\(^3\).

This paper, which includes a first draft of guiding principles, has been developed by the Secretariat with the involvement of the reference group.

The following steps are proposed to lead to the adoption of guiding principles for results-based management in development co-operation:

- Consultation and review by the OECD/DAC Results Community: 4-5 April 2019 Workshop
- Consultation with the Results Community and external stakeholders: May 2019
- Draft Guidance shared for comments with the DAC: 19 June 2019
- Discussion at the DAC: Meeting of 10 July 2019
- A second discussion might be organised depending on the results of the consultative process.

### 1.3. Disseminating principles, monitoring implementation and evaluating principles

The OECD/DAC Results Community will play an important role in helping members, experts and friends of the Community to disseminate and implement the guiding principles, as appropriate. The workshops will be a vehicle to report back and share good practices related to the implementation of the guiding principles. Capacity development activities will be conducted to support their operationalisation depending on the context of each development co-operation agency.

A widely recognised benchmarking framework, guiding principles for RBM in development co-operation will provide a clear reference base for the DAC peer review process.

The OECD/DAC Results team will design a plan for an evaluation in the mid-term (3 to 5 years). Working together with EvalNet, an evaluation team will be mandated to develop a framework combining qualitative

---

\(^2\) The Reference Group comprises of representatives from Finland, Norway, Switzerland, USAID, Asian Development Bank, the Multilateral Organisations Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) Secretariat and the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) of the United Nations System.

\(^3\) This work is also informed by insights from the October 2018 workshop of the OECD/DAC Results Community and In-Depth seminar. It also draws on focused discussions on thematic aspects, e.g. the event on “Managing for Development Impact: Key building blocks for donors and DFIs” organised by the OECD/DCD Results Secretariat in January 2019 in the context of the OECD PF4SD week, and EvalNet (DAC Network on Development Evaluation) meeting (27-28 February 2019).
and quantitative methods and assess how the principles are understood and used. Depending on the results of the evaluation, principles will be adjusted and toolboxes or guidelines developed to meet the needs and requests from providers.

2. Scope and elements framing the draft guiding principles

Three aspects help shape the guiding principles for results-based management in development co-operation: lessons from practice, new context, and existing guiding principles.

2.1. Principles should build on the lessons drawn from the practice of results-based management

Principles should build on what proved useful and effective in managing for results while helping to address any shortcomings. The main findings of the review of evaluations of RBM conducted by the OECD/DCD Results team in 2018 (Box 1) suggest that the principles should stress the following requirements:

- **Rationale** – importance of clearly defining and communicating the RBM purpose, and balancing the use of results for accountability, communication, learning and decision-making purposes.

- **Results culture** – sustained through consistent messages from the leadership and supported by appropriate guidance and tools as well as proper staff incentives.

- **Adapting to context** – One size does not fit all – management methods and approaches would need to be adapted and depend on context at corporate level and in partner countries.

- **Keeping measurements and RBM simple** – Results frameworks and systems need to be commensurate to each organisation’s capacities and needs.

- **Country ownership of results** – aligning to, strengthening and using their results frameworks.

- **Getting the communication right** – based on quantitative and qualitative evidence, and considering that the story line is important for both decision making and reporting.

**Box 1. Lessons from RBM practice**

Providers have made progress in integrating results-based management in their internal systems (planning, implementation and reporting). They are better equipped to monitor and report on output data and short-term outcome data, and they are increasingly using results data for communication and domestic accountability purposes. Still, uneven progress is noted on the use of results information for direction and learning, which might reduce the potential contribution of RBM to development results.

Providers still face a number of challenges that relate to the strategic, organisational and technical management dimensions. They include: i) insufficient guidance and incentives on RBM which, combined with the lack of a results culture leads staff to interpret and apply RBM in inconsistent ways; ii) structural and system issues affecting the results chain; iii) capacity constraints; iv) measurement and method issues, making it difficult to assess how interventions contribute to development results; and v) limited uptake of the ownership and harmonisation dimensions in partner countries, running against recent commitments to support and use country-led results data.

In addition, the way in which providers implement RBM undermines its potential and leads to negative, unintended effects. In particular, providers tend to: i) prioritise what can be measured easily; ii) pursue the purpose of
accountability at the expense of learning and policy direction; and iii) become overly bureaucratic and rigid, thereby increasing transactions costs and hampering innovation.

These challenges and unintended consequences become more acute when an organisation has not communicated clearly the purpose of its results approach and system – which is often the case.

Besides improving the RBM practice, a stronger focus is now put on adaptability and learning to address complexity. The renewed emphasis put on these aspects is useful as RBM practice needs to evolve to better respond to the new development context that involves dealing with complexity and multiple types of actors and partnerships.

Conducting regular reviews of RBM systems and how they affect practice can help to ensure that the system fulfils its purpose and adjust as needed.

Source: OECD, 2019 “Learning from Results-Based Management Evaluations and Reviews”

### 2.2. Principles need to be fit for the evolving and complex nature of development co-operation

Development co-operation is about bringing transformational change, and results-based management is therefore closely related to change management. Moreover, systemic change is not linear, predictable, or controllable, and this is all the more the case in development co-operation activities. Whether at the corporate or at the project level, widely-owned principles can help an organisation to navigate the uncertainties, evolving opportunities and challenges of complex environments involving an increasing diversity of stakeholders. For this to happen, results-based management principles need to:

- be value-based and inspiring;
- be grounded in actual, evidence-based good practice;
- provide meaningful and actionable guidance;
- promote change management as a process with people at the heart;
- be able to fit to different levels of organisational maturity;
- be able to adapt to various operational contexts (e.g. fragility), types of partnerships and larger system interventions where coherence and multidisciplinary approaches are needed;
- speak to all, with a language understandable by all stakeholders;
- be monitorable.

### 2.3. Principles need to build on existing principles

Principles need to be consistent and make linkages with other guidelines that operate at different levels or address specific dimensions (e.g. blended finance principles). A review of the principles that were developed to guide RBM and development co-operation since 2006 reveals interesting features in terms of content and format (list in Annex 1).

In terms of content, RBM principles often reflect the context in which they were formulated: for instance the Managing for Development Results (MfDR) principles, dating from 2006, were influenced by, at the time, the recent adoption of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and put a strong focus on
More recent principles stress the need for a clear purpose upfront, insist on adaptation and learning, or raise the importance of communicating about results and balancing accountability and learning (JIU, 2017). At the same time several elements come consistently across the sets of principles and can be considered as key building blocks, even if stated differently. They include the results framework, monitoring and evaluation systems, the different uses of results information and the need to keep reporting systems simple while also cost-effective.

In regards to form, a number of development co-operation principles are short, prescriptive, and written in an imperative form. They contain only a few principles, making them easy to remember and aspirational, e.g. MfDR, INCAF, blended finance, Paris Declaration. The OECD Blended finance principles are accompanied by a short descriptive text. The Good humanitarian donorship principles are written in an imperative form but they are lengthier with numerous and detailed principles that do not leave much scope for adaptation and make them more prescriptive. Finally both the MfDR principles and the OECD/DAC evaluation principles are in the form of handbook documents.

These elements, and messages from the OECD/DAC Results Community in October 2018, suggest that the guiding principles should respect the following:

- Have a few and relatively short, but clear and easy to remember, principles around key building blocks.
- Balance the aspirational nature of the principles with their guiding dimension, through including a few guiding principles under each building block – leaving room for every organisation to appropriate the principles. Guidance and toolboxes could be developed at a later stage, based on good practice in implementing the principles.

3. Managing for Sustainable Development Results – Draft guiding principles

3.1. Proposed status and structure

The results of development co-operation matter for beneficiaries, managers and politicians. Guiding principles aim to guide development co-operation stakeholders in setting up or refining results-based management approaches and systems that are fit for Agenda 2030. While providing a widely recognised benchmarking framework, guiding principles leave scope to operationalise them in different ways, depending on each context and level of maturity.

The proposed guiding principles include a set of four core pillars. These are the key building blocks that need to be in place to best design, manage, achieve and demonstrate how development interventions contribute to sustainable development results. Under each pillar, guiding principles describe how the RBM system should function to deliver on its key functions of direction (in terms of adaptation, steering and decision-making), learning, accountability and communication while leaving space for adaptability and innovation to manage complexity and be responsive to evolving situations and relationships.

---

4 In promoting alignment, the MfDR principle 2 provides guidance that could be understood as recommending fixed set of indicators – which should be managed carefully (OECD, 2006, p. 11).
3.2. Proposed principles

- **VISION** – Design results-based management approaches to align to and address development goals and desired change
  - Linking the RBM system to the ultimate objective of development co-operation policy and contribution to achieving Agenda 2030;
  - Focusing on outcomes and long-term goals while acknowledging the evolving and complex nature of development co-operation.

- **RATIONALE** – Set a clear purpose for results-based management and maximise use of results information
  - Fine-tune the balance between the different purpose of RBM, clarifying what information is monitored and how results evidence from monitoring and evaluation can be used:
    - By staff and partners to implement the programme and **adapt** to evolving situations
    - By management to **steer** the programme and allocate resources to maximise effectiveness and impact
    - By all stakeholders to **learn** what works and what does not work and make changes where needed
    - By management to provide **feedback** to beneficiaries and constituencies on achievements of the programme
    - By all stakeholders to **communicate** on the programme, at different levels, to various audiences
  - Foster management leadership on results – communicating widely the purpose of RBM; linking planning, programming, budgeting and human resources to the expected and actual results; and enhancing the results and learning culture, with appropriate incentive, knowledge management and training systems;
  - Design sound theories of change at corporate, sector, programme and project levels with clear results objectives and indicators aligned to the SDGs and aiming to address the leave no one behind pledge.

- **SYSTEM** – Design an interconnected and agile RBM system supported by a sound change management process, with a view to:
  - Set up and run a streamlined monitoring, evaluation and reporting system able to produce credible quantitative and qualitative evidence that meets the needs and capacities of the institution;
  - Promote cross-sector approaches and linkages supported by multi-disciplinary teams, in line with the integrated approach of the Sustainable Development Goals, and foster innovation;
  - Tailor management approaches to different organisational levels, operational contexts and types of partnerships, balancing compliance and empowerment to allow staff to adapt to country-specific contexts and change processes, with a focus on achieving end outcomes;
  - Review the results-based management system on a regular basis, including the quality and use of results information that is generated, to maintain a fit for purpose, user-friendly and lean system.

- **PARTNERSHIP** – Enhance national ownership and foster mutual accountability at country level
  - Align to national results frameworks, and strengthen and use partner countries’ monitoring and statistical systems;
  - Encourage stakeholder involvement in all aspects of analysis, design, monitoring and evaluation, to facilitate adaptation, foster ownership, enhance capacity and ensure sustainability;
  - Foster joint accountability when engaging in partnerships, with a clear understanding of the common goal and each parties’ contribution to achieving shared outcomes.
Annex 1

Review of existing international principles related to results-based management and development co-operation

1. RBM Principles

   a) MfDR principles (OECD, 2006)

The first edition of the Management for Development Results (MfDR) Sourcebook was developed in 2006 by the OECD/DAC Joint Venture on MfDR and the World Bank. It includes five MfDR principles (Box 2). According to the Sourcebook, these principles apply at any level and within a variety of interventions (national, sector, programme, project, and organisation), and they influence the use of specific strategies and tools at various phases of national and development programming. Principles are quite generic, do not constitute a step-by-step, sequential recipe for MfDR. Interestingly, the MfDR Sourcebook came with examples of a variety of tools and strategies and tools that could be used to apply the MfDR principles.


| Principle 1 | At all phases – from strategic planning through implementation to completion and beyond – focus the dialogue on results for partner countries, development agencies and other stakeholders. |
| Principle 2 | Align actual programming, monitoring and evaluation activities with the agreed expected results. |
| Principle 3 | Keep the results reporting system as simple, cost-effective, and user-friendly as possible. |
| Principle 4 | Manage for, not by, results, by arranging resources to achieve outcomes. |
| Principle 5 | Use results information for management learning and decision making, as well as for reporting and accountability. |

Source: OECD, 2006, MfDR Sourcebook


As part of its high-impact model for managing for achieving results, the JIU has developed a set of principles that drives the development of the benchmarking framework.

   JIU RBM principles

| (a) Vision and clarity of the desired impact, with implications for focus on outcomes and long term goals; |
| (b) Causal linkages for change to happen defined in a hierarchy of results (inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, impact); |
| (c) Systems operation that goes beyond causal linear logic but espouses equifinality, multiple interacting and interdependent factors for achieving outcomes, and risks and conditions for success for achieving outcomes and higher-level results addressed; |
| (d) Performance measurement for objectivity in management and accountability for transparency and consensus among key stakeholders; |
(e) Monitoring and performance assessment for continuous improvement and adaptive management focused on progress towards outcomes;
(f) Evaluation for strategic changes, direction-setting, and innovation.

Source: UN (2017)

---

### 2. Examples on internally agreed development co-operation principles

#### a) Development Effectiveness Principles

**Paris Declaration principles (2005)**

- **Ownership**: Developing countries set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions and tackle corruption.
- **Alignment**: Donor countries align behind these objectives and use local systems.
- **Harmonisation**: Donor countries coordinate, simplify procedures and share information to avoid duplication.
- **Results**: Developing countries and donors shift focus to development results and results get measured.
- **Mutual accountability**: Donors and partners are accountable for development results.

**Busan partnership principles (2011)**

- **Ownership** of development priorities by developing countries. Partnerships for development can only succeed if they are led by developing countries, implementing approaches that are tailored to country-specific situations and needs.
- **Focus on results**. Our investments and efforts must have a lasting impact on eradicating poverty and reducing inequality, on sustainable development, and on enhancing developing countries’ capacities, aligned with the priorities and policies set out by developing countries themselves.
- **Inclusive development partnerships**. Openness, trust, and mutual respect and learning lie at the core of effective partnerships in support of development goals, recognising the different and complementary roles of all actors.
- **Transparency and accountability** to each other. Mutual accountability and accountability to the intended beneficiaries of our co-operation, as well as to our respective citizens, organisations, constituents and shareholders, is critical to delivering results. Transparent practices form the basis for enhanced accountability.

#### b) OECD/DAC Evaluation principles (1991)

The OECD/DAC evaluation principles are from 1991 and have consequently been used for development of the Evaluation Criteria. The principles are set out in a 20 page document. This is a short summary of the principles:
1. **Purpose of evaluation:**
   a. to improve future aid policy, programmes and projects through feedback of lessons learned;
   b. to provide a basis for accountability, including the provision of information to the public.

2. **Impartiality and interdependence.** The evaluation process should be impartial and independent in its function from the process concerned with the policy making, the delivery and the management of development assistance.

3. **Credibility.** The credibility of evaluation depends on the expertise and independence of the evaluators and the degree of transparency of the evaluation process. Credibility requires that evaluation should report successes as well as failures. Recipient countries should, as a rule, fully participate in evaluation in order to promote credibility and commitment.

4. **Usefulness.** To have an impact on decision-making, evaluation findings must be perceived as relevant and useful and be presented in a clear and concise way.

5. **Partnership.** Whenever possible, both donors and recipients should be involved in the evaluation process.

6. **Donor co-operation.** Collaboration between donors is essential in order to learn from each other and to avoid duplication of effort.

7. **Evaluation programming.** An overall plan must be developed by the agency for the evaluation of development assistance activities.

8. **Design and implementation of evaluation.** Each evaluation must be planned and terms of reference drawn up.

9. **Reporting, dissemination and feedback.**

c) **Fragile state principles/OECD/DAC/INCAF (2007)**

1. Take context as the starting point
2. Ensure all activities do no harm
3. Focus on state building as the central objective
4. Prioritise prevention
5. Recognise the links between political, security and development objectives
6. Promote non-discrimination as a basis for inclusive and stable societies
7. Align with local priorities in different ways and in different stable societies
8. Agree on practical co-ordination mechanism between international actors
9. Act fast...but stay engaged long enough to give success a chance
10. Avoid pockets of exclusion (“aid orphans”)

d) **Good Humanitarian Donorship Principles (2003)**

The 24 principles Good Humanitarian Donorship Principles are from 2003. Three principles define objectives of Humanitarian Action. Seven are general principles. The rest relate to donor financing, management and accountability. The principles were developed by the GHD initiative, an informal donor forum and network.
Objectives and Definition of Humanitarian Action

1. The objectives of humanitarian action are to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity during and in the aftermath of man-made crises and natural disasters, as well as to prevent and strengthen preparedness for the occurrence of such situations.

2. Humanitarian action should be guided by the humanitarian principles of humanity, meaning the centrality of saving human lives and alleviating suffering wherever it is found; impartiality, meaning the implementation of actions solely on the basis of need, without discrimination between or within affected populations; neutrality, meaning that humanitarian action must not favour any side in an armed conflict or other dispute where such action is carried out; and independence, meaning the autonomy of humanitarian objectives from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regard to areas where humanitarian action is being implemented.

3. Humanitarian action includes the protection of civilians and those no longer taking part in hostilities, and the provision of food, water and sanitation, shelter, health services and other items of assistance, undertaken for the benefit of affected people and to facilitate the return to normal lives and livelihoods.

General Principles

4. Respect and promote the implementation of international humanitarian law, refugee law and human rights.

5. While reaffirming the primary responsibility of states for the victims of humanitarian emergencies within their own borders, strive to ensure flexible and timely funding, on the basis of the collective obligation of striving to meet humanitarian needs.

6. Allocate humanitarian funding in proportion to needs and on the basis of needs assessments.

7. Request implementing humanitarian organisations to ensure, to the greatest possible extent, adequate involvement of beneficiaries in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian response.

8. Strengthen the capacity of affected countries and local communities to prevent, prepare for, mitigate and respond to humanitarian crises, with the goal of ensuring that governments and local communities are better able to meet their responsibilities and co-ordinate effectively with humanitarian partners.

9. Provide humanitarian assistance in ways that are supportive of recovery and long-term development, striving to ensure support, where appropriate, to the maintenance and return of sustainable livelihoods and transitions from humanitarian relief to recovery and development activities.

10. Support and promote the central and unique role of the United Nations in providing leadership and co-ordination of international humanitarian action, the special role of the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the vital role of the United Nations, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and non-governmental organisations in implementing humanitarian action.

Funding

11. Strive to ensure that funding of humanitarian action in new crises does not adversely affect the meeting of needs in ongoing crises.

12. Recognising the necessity of dynamic and flexible response to changing needs in humanitarian crises, strive to ensure predictability and flexibility in funding to United Nations agencies, funds and programmes and to other key humanitarian organisations.
13. While stressing the importance of transparent and strategic priority-setting and financial planning by implementing organisations, explore the possibility of reducing, or enhancing the flexibility of, earmarking, and of introducing longer-term funding arrangements.

14. Contribute responsibly, and on the basis of burden-sharing, to United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeals and to International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement appeals, and actively support the formulation of Common Humanitarian Action Plans (CHAP) as the primary instrument for strategic planning, prioritisation and co-ordination in complex emergencies.

**Promoting Standards and Enhancing Implementation**

15. Request that implementing humanitarian organisations fully adhere to good practice and are committed to promoting accountability, efficiency and effectiveness in implementing humanitarian action.

16. Promote the use of Inter-Agency Standing Committee guidelines and principles on humanitarian activities, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the 1994 Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief.

17. Maintain readiness to offer support to the implementation of humanitarian action, including the facilitation of safe humanitarian access.

18. Support mechanisms for contingency planning by humanitarian organisations, including, as appropriate, allocation of funding, to strengthen capacities for response.

19. Affirm the primary position of civilian organisations in implementing humanitarian action, particularly in areas affected by armed conflict. In situations where military capacity and assets are used to support the implementation of humanitarian action, ensure that such use is in conformity with international humanitarian law and humanitarian principles, and recognises the leading role of humanitarian organisations.


**Learning and Accountability**

21. Support learning and accountability initiatives for the effective and efficient implementation of humanitarian action.

22. Encourage regular evaluations of international responses to humanitarian crises, including assessments of donor performance.

23. Ensure a high degree of accuracy, timeliness, and transparency in donor reporting on official humanitarian assistance spending, and encourage the development of standardised formats for such reporting.

**Modalities of Humanitarian Assistance**

24. Systematically consider the use of cash transfers alongside other modalities according to context, in order to meet the humanitarian needs of people in the most effective and efficient manner.
e) Blended Finance principles (2018)

The five blended finance principles were adopted in 2018 by the OECD/DAC as follows (OECD, 2018).

1. Anchor blended finance use to a development rationale
2. Design blended finance to increase the mobilisation of commercial finance
3. Tailor blended finance to local context
4. Focus on effective partnering for blended finance
5. Monitor blended finance for transparency and results

Each principle has three to four accompanying guidance descriptions. Principle 1 is for example accompanied by:

i. Use development finance in blended finance as a driver to maximise development outcomes and impact
ii. Define development objectives and expected results as the basis for deploying development finance.
iii. Demonstrate a commitment to high quality.

In addition each principle is accompanied by a short descriptive text.
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