

Results approaches for the SDG era: shared challenges and collective solutions

*Results Community workshop, hosted by the OECD
29-30 October 2018
OECD Conference Centre, Paris*

Key Messages from the Workshop November 2018

CONTENTS

Highlights	2
Session 1. Measuring and Managing the results of multilateral contributions	3
Session 2: Using the SDGs as a framework for shared results – emerging findings from country-level case studies	4
Session 3: Learning from evaluations & reviews of RBM approaches and systems – development of guiding principles	4
Working Lunch with GENDERNET	6
In-depth seminar: Building a fit for purpose results approach in the SDG era	6
Annex 1: Workshop agenda	7
Annex 2: Links to workshop presentations	9

Workshop papers can be accessed on the OECD [Results in Development Cooperation website](#).

Links to workshop presentations are included in Annex 2

Contact: DAC.Results@oecd.org

Highlights

On October 29-30 2018, the OECD hosted a workshop of the Results Community titled: *Results approaches for the SDG era: shared challenges and collective solutions*. The 104 participants included representatives from 29 DAC members and observers; two OECD members; five other providers of development co-operation; representatives from four partner countries; nine international organisations and multilateral development banks; five think tanks and civil society organisations and two OECD directorates. The workshop agenda is included as an annex to this report.

The workshop involved three main sessions: i) Measuring and managing the results of multilateral contributions; ii) Using the SDGs as a common platform for shared results in partner countries, and iii) Learning from past reviews of results-based management (RBM) systems to develop guiding principles. A joint GENDERNET/Results Community lunchtime session was an opportunity to explore some of the challenges of measuring the results of gender equality initiatives. The workshop was followed by an in-depth seminar bringing together DAC and non-DAC members that are developing their results-based approach with more experienced providers to share experiences and learn how to build results systems fit for Agenda 2030.

Main points from plenary sessions

Measuring and managing the results of multilateral contributions: Bilateral providers and multilateral organisations share the same overarching objective of delivering sustainable development results from the funding they provide and the programmes they implement. Panel discussions sought ways to reconcile the respective results-related needs of stakeholders. This requires a trust relationship among all stakeholders, with a deepened dialogue and enhanced support to multilateral organisations' self-improvement and to partner countries' results and statistical systems. It also involves aligning business processes and making better use of existing evidence for accountability, learning and decision-making.

Using the SDGs as a common platform for shared results: Early findings from OECD-led research have highlighted the complexities of SDG alignment, measurement and use in corporate results frameworks especially at country-level. Many different, though SDG-linked, indicators are being used. Early findings suggest there is potential for adopting SDG-like methodologies to measure the results of development co-operation, but this must be supported by strong co-ordination (e.g. by linking SDG institutional set-ups to sector groups), and enhanced support for RBM and statistical capacity building in partner countries. Workshop participants support expansion of the research to different sectors and countries.

Learning from past reviews of RBM systems to develop guiding principles: The session aimed to discuss the preliminary findings of an analysis of evaluations and reviews of RBM systems, and to explore how these can help to shape guiding principles. The discussion highlighted the diversity of interpretations of "RBM" and the various, often mixed, approaches adopted by members. A core set of principles can have value in: i) providing a widely recognised benchmarking framework; ii) helping to change the mindset 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. Such principles should avoid being overly prescriptive.

Final evaluation

Overall, participants appreciated the relevance of the topics, the quality of the background papers, and the variety of perspectives brought by panellists, including from partner countries. Participants expressed continued support for focused Results Community workshops based on concrete evidence and case studies. In the future, they would like to have more time for group discussions and longer breaks for networking and informal exchanges. There was strong interest in deepening the work on the three topics, by translating the evidence-base into practical advice and guidance for members. Participants are interested in hearing about the next steps and consultations that will inform the development of guiding principles for results-based management.

Session 1. Measuring and managing the results of multilateral contributions

Measuring and managing the results of multilateral contributions is important given the role of the multilateral organisations in delivering Agenda 2030 and the funding they receive, and becomes crucial in a context where multilateralism is increasingly at stake. Panel discussions explored the respective needs of stakeholders and sought ways to reconcile the accountability needs of bilateral providers and the imperative put on multilateral organisations to deliver development results aligned to their goals and to country-led results frameworks.

As illustrated by Canada, accountability and reporting needs are all the more important when a significant share of ODA goes through multilateral organisations (53% in the case of Canada in 2016). Canada also shows that bilateral donors tend to rely on the information generated by the RBM systems of multilaterals to report on core funding, but request specific reporting for earmarked funding. Meanwhile they can actively support multilateral organisations in improving their results systems through their participation in the governing bodies and in providing technical assistance and training. Beyond their specificities, international organisations (represented by ADB and the JIU) shared their common concern over the additional requirements put on them by bilateral donors, which can undermine their ability to deliver and report effectively on the results of their mandate, while also aligning to partner country results frameworks. Both MDBs and UN organisations are making efforts to harmonise and strengthen their RBM approach to remain accountable while using the results evidence for adapting, and increasingly, for learning.

Panellists outlined a number of ways forward to reconcile the different perspectives, stressing that:

- Stakeholders need a [better understanding](#) of how global governance works, the power asymmetries it encompasses and the shifting role of multilateral organisations – including regional bodies. They also need to capture the evolving context of partner countries, most of which are in transition mode and can access broader financial resources. Meanwhile these countries have little influence on the multilateral system (e.g. a weak representation in MDBs).
- [Improved dialogue](#) and understanding is needed to re-build a trust relationship, with a recognition of the respective mandates of the organisations, the needs of stakeholders, and the robustness of the respective results systems. Developing a common development narrative focused on long-term, sustainable development outcomes that speaks to all actors including in partner countries and embracing a multi-actor perspective can help to co-build multi-stakeholder programmes with agreed indicators.
- [Better aligning business processes](#) can help to reduce considerably the transaction costs of aid channelled through multilateral organisations – as illustrated by the ADB-DFID co-financing guide. Multilateral organisations could make better use of IT systems to report more real time results to bilateral donors.
- [MOPAN](#) could further support through diminishing the number and scope of bilateral assessments, and has the potential to serve the self-improvement of organisations better.
- It is important to reconcile the accountability purpose with the need to use results information for [learning, knowledge management and decision-making](#). Meanwhile more emphasis should be put on the sustainability dimension - managing and measuring [sustainable](#) results.
- [Building partner country results and statistical systems](#) – as well as promoting an evaluation culture – should be a priority. While multilateral organisations are making efforts to align their results framework to the SDGs at country level, they could be more systematic in supporting national results systems, adopting a long-term perspective and recognising that the multiplicity of exogenous shocks makes it more complicated to measure actual results.

Participants supported a continued deepening of work on this topic, with a focus on practical solutions.

Session 2: Using the SDGs as a framework for shared results – emerging findings from country-level case studies

The purpose of Session 2 was to discuss the potential as well as the challenges of using the SDGs as a shared framework for results in development co-operation. The session commenced with a presentation on emerging findings from an OECD case study research project on this topic. Desk-based analysis and fieldwork focused on SDGs 6.2.1 (access to sanitation) and 7.1.1 (access to energy) suggest that providers and partners use many similar, but slightly different indicators, with varying levels of SDG alignment. In addition, there is a limited amount of publicly available data against results indicators. However, the fieldwork suggests potential for a more co-ordinated approach to results data through sector-level working groups – linked to national SDG structures, and adoption of SDG-like methodologies for indicators. At the same time, capacity building is required at country-level to strengthen more integrated data systems, to enable disaggregated data, and to bolster *use* of data for learning and mutual accountability.

Panel interventions were given by research participants, from both the provider and partner side. Government of Kenya panellists described strong alignment between the SDGs and Kenya's Vision 2030. Kenya's forthcoming third medium-term plan (MTP II) is viewed as the concrete entry point for the SDGs into Vision 2030. MTP III programmes and projects will be referenced to SDG targets and indicators to improve visibility, and make monitoring and follow-up easier. In the sanitation sector, participation in voluntary reporting against SDG 6 has strengthened co-ordination. However, a fragmented approach to data and a lack of clarity in terms of reporting responsibility between national and county levels create challenges. From the provider side, the EU discussed the relationship between their corporate results framework (a new iteration will shortly be released), which is used mostly for communication; and country level frameworks (both for the EU and for EU Joint Programming), which support alignment to partner systems and mutual accountability.

Three presentations provided alternative perspectives on the same challenges. NEPAD presented on how African countries are internalising and domesticating continental and global agendas (Agenda 2063 and the SDGs). NEPAD provides support for the technical mainstreaming and alignment of the two agendas into national frameworks, and emphasised that mutual accountability from community to global levels, and collective and co-ordinated knowledge management are essential. The Global Partnership Initiative on Results and Mutual Accountability presented their work on strengthening country results frameworks. They highlighted key messages with regard to SDG alignment and integration, including the need for supporting regional processes, and the potential of thematic or sectoral groups, as well as donor joint programming efforts to promote alignment and harmonisation. Finally, PARIS21 presented their ADAPT tool for strengthening data planning in partner countries, which can contribute to harmonising indicators and reducing fragmented data systems, ultimately ensuring data can inform policy and planning at the different levels.

Participants had the opportunity to discuss a set of questions related to the research. Most groups agreed the research would benefit from deeper examination of how to strengthen RBM and statistical capacity (especially for disaggregation), and how sector-level working groups can facilitate a more co-ordinated approach to SDG alignment, measurement and use. Groups also agreed that adopting SDG-aligned methodologies for results indicators could happen at country-level, but also at provider headquarter level and via global fora, and that this had potential to enhance alignment and country ownership. Participants saw value in publishing web-based indicator inventories, with some concerns about the feasibility of any efforts to aggregate SDG-aligned provider results data against these indicators. There was support for expansion of the project to different SDG areas (particularly gender and climate change), and geographically to LDCs and fragile and conflict-affected states, drawing on the findings from the first case studies.

Overall, while the research is still in the data collection stage, participants appreciated the opportunity to engage with findings on how to practically operationalise the SDGs in results frameworks.

Session 3: Learning from evaluations and reviews of RBM approaches and systems – development of guiding principles

The purpose of the session was to discuss the preliminary findings of an analysis of recent evaluations and reviews of RBM systems and explore how these can help shape guiding principles for results-based management in development co-operation.

To start the session, the consultant presented the preliminary findings, to which four representatives of institutions having conducted an evaluation of their RBM system responded. This was followed by three presentations bringing complementary views from a partner country perspective and alternative approaches. The main points from the panel and small group discussions are presented below.

Challenges of RBM systems: members pointed out that most challenges lie in RBM practice rather than in the system itself, which in theory allows for adaptability and alignment. RBM is a transformative process; the level of sophistication of RBM systems therefore varies across organisations and its use evolves over time, as shown by the MCC example. In addition, agencies implement RBM in selective ways, usually with a stronger focus at project and portfolio levels (through monitoring, evaluation and reporting). At the strategic level, RBM tends to be driven by accountability needs, with less attention on developing a culture of results across the organisation. Members noted that RBM systems are often mixed with no clear distinction between “traditional” RBM systems and what is presented as “alternative” approaches. Panellists cautioned against the push towards managerial, top-down approaches that rely on quantitative data, and called for adaptive, non-linear and qualitative approaches, favouring learning-based management and evidence-based approaches.

Opportunities to move beyond challenges: Participants in the group discussions stressed the importance of: i) learning from good practice; and ii) adaptive management - two dimensions which are addressed by a number of initiatives (e.g. the WBG-hosted [Global Delivery Initiative](#) and USAID [Collaborative, Learning and Adapting \(CLA\)](#)). An increasing focus on these dimensions requires organisational changes (e.g. embracing a portfolio approach that allows risk-taking; making more use of information technologies), and a culture of results, which implies a strong leadership commitment. The discussion groups also highlighted that the SDGs, in offering a shared results framework, provide an opportunity for enhanced ownership and harmonisation of indicators. Providers are attempting to better align to country-led results frameworks (e.g. the WBG Country Partnership Frameworks). The example of Benin, however, shows a number of obstacles that require a collective effort: limited capacity to develop sound results frameworks and robust data collection systems on partner country side, and tensions between corporate and country-led results frameworks on the provider side. Participants also noted that a clear purpose and a limited number of principles can help to motivate staff and guide RBM implementation. Other elements mentioned include the need for more evidence-based analysis to support quality dialogue and communication efforts.

Guiding principles: Guiding principles for RBM in development co-operation should be aspirational rather than prescriptive, allowing each organisation to adapt them depending on its context and level of maturity. A limited core set of principles can be useful to bring the organisational change perspective; show a possible continuum between different approaches; promote the use of results for learning and steering; and give a clear reference base for the DAC peer review process. Principles could include the clarity of purpose; elements of (non-linear) causality; open systems responsive to evolving context and relationships; and support to collective accountability with recognition of country ownership and need for better alignment, coordination, knowledge sharing and harmonisation. They could be accompanied by toolboxes and process guidelines.

Overall, the discussion highlighted the diversity of interpretation of “RBM” and the various, often mixed approaches that are inherent to transformative processes. A core set of generic principles, not legally binding and allowing flexibility in their use, can have value in: i) providing a widely recognised benchmarking framework; ii) helping to change the mindset and supporting change management processes within donor agencies; and iii) guiding new donors setting up their results approaches – as well as staff of more experienced providers.

Working lunch with GENDERNET

The session was an opportunity to bring together two DAC policy communities (results and gender specialists) for an exchange on how to monitor and demonstrate truly transformative results for gender equality and women's empowerment. In their introductions, the two co-chairs (respective Heads of GPP and RREDI) highlighted that the gender equality and development community has long been reflecting on how to monitor and demonstrate results for gender equality. While measuring and monitoring ODA inputs toward gender equality is important, the discussion is an opportunity to focus on demonstrating outcomes and tangible change for women and girls. This raises complex issues with no single, straightforward answer.

Two DAC countries, Finland and Switzerland, presented their respective approaches.

- Gender equality is one of four focus areas of the upcoming Finnish results-based management report. Finland presented how the gender equality and results teams have come together to develop a theory of change on priority areas for women and girls, a dimension which is both a vertical priority and crosscutting in the Finnish development co-operation programme. Finland also updated its guidance on intersectionality (e.g. combining disability and gender dimensions) to help identify sector-specific outcomes.
- Switzerland presented SDC's recent report on gender effectiveness, which reviews ten years of SDC gender equality work, comparing the effectiveness of dedicated programming on women's empowerment to gender mainstreaming. It shows a high level of contribution to structural changes but also unintended effects. It also shows that under-reporting, lack of clear objectives and weak gender analysis make it difficult to report on gender equality results. The report therefore recommends, alongside maintaining the current SDC policy (in terms of thematic focus, policy dialogue and leadership commitment), increasing the number of projects targeting structural gender changes, conducting sectoral analyses, and building capacity.

Paris21 presented on gender statistics, stressing the opportunities they offer to raise awareness, monitor progress and support mainstreaming and evidence based-analyses, and suggesting ways forward to mainstream gender in national policy frameworks.

In-depth seminar: Building a fit for purpose results approach in the SDG era

The workshop was followed by an in-depth seminar bringing together DAC and non-DAC members that are developing their results-based management approach with more experienced providers to share experiences and learn how to build results systems that are fit for Agenda 2030. There were 35 participants, including representatives from new DAC members (Czech Republic, Hungary, Iceland, Poland, Slovak Republic and Slovenia), DAC participants (Qatar and Romania), non-DAC OECD members (Latvia, Lithuania) and non-OECD members (Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan).

The seminar involved a plenary discussion on defining the purpose of RBM and linking the results system to global and agency goals. This was followed by small group discussions around three specific aspects of results systems on i) establishing country-level strategies and results; ii) building a results culture and tools and iii) templates to build RBM into project design and project cycle management.

Participants appreciated the format allowing for concrete, informal exchanges between new and more experienced providers on ways to address common challenges as well as possible solutions. They found the seminar inspiring, informative and educative. In the future, they would like to have small seminars tailored to specific needs with more time to dig into issues with concrete examples such as RBM templates provided. Regional formats with the participation of one or two experienced provider(s) could be explored.

ANNEX 1: Workshop Agenda

Monday 29 October 2018

09.00-09.30 Coffee and registration

09.30-10.00 Welcome

- Welcome address by Rahul Malhotra, Head of Division, Reviews, Results, Evaluations and Development Innovation Division (RREDI), DCD
- Introduction to workshop objectives and format: Chantal Verger, Head of Results Team, DCD/ RREDI
- Tour de table in small groups

10.00-12.00 Session 1: Measuring and managing the results of multilateral contributions – perspectives and shared challenges

Measuring and managing the results of multilateral contributions is important given the role of the multilateral organisations in delivering Agenda 2030 and the funding they receive. Bilateral providers and multilateral organisations share the same overarching objective, aiming to achieve development results from the funding they provide and the programmes they implement. Yet their respective needs are different. The session will explore related challenges from the sides of multilateral and bilateral development co-operation providers as well as partner countries, and look at solutions to reconcile respective needs.

Key questions:

- 1) How do bilateral providers incorporate the results of their funding to multilateral organisations into their overall approach? How can they support efforts of multilateral organisations to strengthen their results-based management system?
- 2) How do multilateral agencies reconcile donor accountability/reporting requirements, the need to align to partner country goals and results, and alignment to their own agency goals and strategies?
- 3) How can partner countries play a leading role at country level and strengthen their role as members or shareholders of multilateral organisations?

Chair: Chantal Verger, Head of Results Team, DCD/ RREDI

Panellists: Tina Guthrie, Global Affairs Canada; Bernard Woods, Asian Development Bank; Sukai Prom-Jackson, Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) of the United Nations System; Kako Nubukpo, CIRAD, University of Lomé, Togo; Samer Hachem, MOPAN

Introduction by DCD/FSD Multilateral team on the OECD Multilateral development finance report

Discussion paper: available on the OECD/DAC Results Community Workshop website

12.00-14.00 WORKING LUNCH

How do donors demonstrate results on gender equality at the country and agency-wide level?

Joint learning session with GENDERNET

Venue: Chateau de la Muette (Roger Ockrent and George Marshall rooms)

Lunch will be available in the room

Co-Chairs: Rahul Malhotra, Head of DCD/RREDI and Paloma Duran Y Lalaguna, Head of DCD/GPP

Presentations starting at 12h30:

- Finland's results-based reporting on gender equality (Eppu Mikkonen-Jeanneret and Suvi Virkkunen)
- Effectiveness of Swiss international cooperation in the field of gender equality, 2007–2016 (Pradeep Itty and Ursula Keller, SDC)
- Gender statistics for gender equality (Emilia Rossi, PARIS21)
- Discussion

14:00-17:45 Session 2: Using the SDGs as a framework for shared results – emerging findings from country-level case studies

This session is an opportunity to discuss the potential as well as the challenges related to using the SDGs as a shared framework for results in development co-operation. Emerging findings from desk and field-based research by the OECD will form the basis of the discussion in small groups and plenary, and there will be an opportunity to hear from other actors who are engaged in similar analyses.

Key questions:

1. How can the SDGs be used as a shared framework for results at country-level?
2. What challenges & opportunities have emerged for alignment, measurement and use of results data?
3. How can the OECD/DAC Results Community further support?

Chair: Rosie Zwart, DCD/RREDI; Co-Chair: John Egan, DCD/RREDI

Panellists: Stephen Odhiambo Nabakho, the National Treasury & Planning, Kenya (VC); Rose Ngure, Ministry of Water and Sanitation (VC), Kenya; Andrea Alfieri, DG DevCo, European Commission.

Presenters: Simon Kisira, NEPAD (VC); Isaora Zefania Romalahy and Andrea Ries, Global Partnership Initiative on Results and Mutual Accountability; Ranjan Raiv, PARIS21.

Discussion paper: available on the OECD/DAC Results Community Workshop website

Format: Introductory remarks by chair and participants in the project will be made to the plenary, followed by small group discussions. Back in the plenary, participants will hear from related initiatives. A synthesis of the responses from the groups will form the basis for a final discussion.

15 minute coffee break at 16.15

18.00-19.30 Drinks reception in the OECD Chateau (Roger Ockrent room)

Tuesday 30 October 2018

08.30-09.00 Coffee

09.00-12.00 Session 3: Learning from evaluations and reviews of RBM approaches and systems – development of guiding principles

The DCD Results team is undertaking a new project that aims to build on existing evidence to identify good practice and generate lessons that development co-operation providers and partners can concretely use to design or refine their results-based management approaches and systems. This will ultimately translate into guiding principles for results-based management in development co-operation.

Key questions:

- 1) What are the key opportunities to move beyond the entrenched challenges and unintended consequences of RBM in development co-operation?
- 2) To what extent does ensuring a clear purpose for an agency-wide approach to results help overcome challenges?
- 3) How prescriptive should guiding principles for RBM be? What should they include?

Chair: Jorge Moreira Da Silva, Director, DCD

Respondents and panellists: Marianne Skaiaa, NORAD; Jos Verbeek, World Bank; Sukai Prom-Jackson, JIU; Elizabeth Roen, USAID; Thierry Somakpo, Ministry of Economy and Finances, Benin; Jelmer Kamstra, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands; Thomas Kelly, MCC.

Discussion paper: available on the OECD/DAC results Community Workshop website.

Format: Presentation of key findings by Janet Vähämäki, consultant, will be followed by responses from panellists and presentation of complementary approaches. Group discussions will feedback in a final plenary.

15 minute coffee break at 10.45

12.00-12:15 Conclusions and next steps for the OECD DAC/DCD Results Community (Rahul Malhotra)

Results Workshop Key Messages – October 2018

ANNEX 2: Links to workshop presentations

SESSION 1

[FSD Multilateral Development Finance Report](#)

SESSION 2

[Session 2 - Using the SDGs as a framework for shared results](#)

[GPI on Results and Mutual Accountability presentation](#)

[Paris21 ADAPT presentation](#)

SESSION 3

[Learning from RBM evaluations and reviews](#)

[Country Results frameworks by the cooperation providers of Benin](#)

[Dutch Result Framework](#)

SEMINAR

[Swedish experience - establishing a results system](#)

[Netherlands RBM system](#)

LUNCH

[SDC - Gender equality results](#)

[Paris21 - Gender statistics](#)