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Highlights

On 17-18 December 2019, the OECD hosted the Results Community workshop on “Renewing results approaches for the SDG era: What will it take?”. The 85 participants included representatives from 24 DAC member countries, one partner country (Peru), 12 multilateral development banks and United Nations organisations, two Regional Communities of Practice on Managing for Development Results, eight think tanks, civil society organisations and academia. The workshop agenda is included as an annex to this report.

Main points from plenary sessions

**What will it take to operationalise the Guiding Principles on Managing for Sustainable Development Results (MfSDR)?** This session focused on the concrete ways to support members in the uptake of the Guiding Principles on MfSDR. Three sub-sessions explored ways to: i) disseminate the principles internally and externally; ii) operationalise the principles in ways that are fit for each situation, drawing on a self-assessment survey; and iii) develop support tools, in particular an e-learning platform. Discussions showed the importance of disseminating the principles and the various vehicles agencies can use. They also confirmed the variety of results approaches and the need to tailor implementation of the principles to each agency. Discussions on the e-learning platform fed into Session 4 on future work.

**What will it take to use the SDGs as a shared framework for results?** The discussion was informed by presentations of international monitoring processes that are measuring uptake of the SDGs; results initiatives that are helping to put the SDGs at the core of development efforts at regional or country levels; and the second phase of the SDG research project. Presentations and discussions showed that while both partner country governments and development co-operation providers are making progress in using the SDG targets to guide their strategies and measure progress overtime, there are still a number of challenges to address (e.g. definition and measurement aspects, co-ordination issues, unequal uptake of the SDGs across governments). Participants also considered solutions, sharing successful initiatives and reflecting on how to develop further synergies between countries’ and providers’ efforts using the SDGs as a common framework.

**What can we learn from each other?** In the first part of this peer learning session, six members shared insights into their results approach and system. The session continued with four introductory pitches followed by breakout sessions providing an opportunity for mutual learning and interactive exchanges on practical issues related to RBM. Key takeaways were shared in a final plenary session.

**Shaping the future: Next steps for the OECD/DAC Results Community:** This session reflected on the ways to increase the impact of the Results Community work, building on a survey that was conducted in November and the feedback from the table discussions on a suggested e-learning platform (Session 1). Participants delivered consistent messages on the importance of the Results Community as a space for mutual learning supported by concrete examples and solid evidence, as well as on the need to join forces with other communities such as EvalNet without losing its identity. Participants welcomed the proposed thematic and system topics while stressing the need to focus on operationalising the Principles. They recommended pursuing a scoping study to identify the potential niche (and check feasibility) for an e-learning platform, and showed some openness to organise on a regular basis longer workshops jointly with EvalNet and Data for Development – with webinars to maintain continuity.

**Workshop evaluation feedback**

Participants appreciated the balance between interactive and informative sessions as well as the format of the workshop, which facilitated interactions between participants with the opportunity to engage with the topics in table discussions and share views through live voting. They particularly appreciated the opportunities to exchange information and have in-depth discussions around practical examples shared by members. They also valued the opportunity to discuss the future of the Results Community. Overall, participants expressed continued support for focused Results Community workshops based on concrete evidence and best practices, with enough time to explore each topic. In the future, participants would also like to have more time dedicated for sharing concrete experience. They noted that engaging participants via video participation worked well - a possibility to replicate in the future.
Welcome session

In his welcome remarks, Rahul Malhotra, Head of Reviews, Results, Evaluation and Development Innovation Division (RREDI/DCD) highlighted the importance of the topics put on the agenda of the workshop. He thanked the members for their constructive engagement in the process of developing the Guiding Principles on Managing for Sustainable Development Results (MfSDR) approved by the DAC in July 2019. While this is a big achievement, he stated that now is the time to operationalise the principles, which is both an individual and a collective effort. The workshop offers an opportunity to discuss ways to disseminate the principles, to implement them, and the types of support that would be needed. Using the SDGs as a common framework for results is also a way to be more efficient in collecting and using results data. A session of the workshop looks at how the Results Community can work in synergy with different results initiatives that exist at global, regional and national levels. With mutual learning an important objective of the network, a full session is dedicated to experience sharing and new developments related to results approaches. Finally, the workshop is an opportunity for members to share views on ways to increase the impact of the Results Community work, thereby contributing to shape the future OECD Programme of Work and Budget 2021-22 and the work of the DAC.

Session 1: What will it take to operationalise the Guiding Principles on Managing for Sustainable Development Results?

Session 1 comprised three sub-sessions focusing on dissemination, operationalisation and potential tools for supporting implementation of the Guiding Principles on MfSDR. It was introduced by a short presentation on the process for developing the principles and their main features.

i) Disseminating the Guiding Principles

Following an introduction highlighting the importance of disseminating the principles and the members’ role in doing so, table discussions focused on the various vehicles members can use to disseminate the Principles as well as the languages in which the Principles could be translated to maximise their use.

Responses from the live voting showed that members mostly use e-mails to disseminate new regulations or policies and that only a few have elements in place to disseminate the principles (e.g. UNFPA learning afternoons with implementing partners). This suggests that the Secretariat could usefully provide a pro-format email to members to help them disseminate the principles within their institutions and with implementing partners. This initial step should not prevent additional processes supported by concrete guidance to increase ownership of the Principles, such as organising dedicated meetings with groups of targeted people and reaching out to partner countries and other stakeholders (e.g. universities). Making explicit linkages with development effectiveness processes can support this approach.

Arabic came out as the top language to translate the principles (in addition to English, French and Spanish). Members noted that translating the Principles in African languages might also be useful given the priority put on Africa. The Secretariat is willing to engage with any volunteers who could support translation in a specific language, noting that this exercise also helps stakeholders have a clear understanding of the concepts, leading to a higher degree of ownership and use of the principles.

ii) Self-assessment against the Guiding Principles

While recognising that each situation is different, internalising the Principles requires overcoming personal and structural inertia to bring in transformational change. A presentation of the findings from the self-assessment survey on results-based approaches conducted in November and an opening panel with representatives from the Netherlands, Slovak Republic and UNICEF showed the variety of situations in terms of alignment to the Guiding Principles. Overall, according to the survey completed by 30 different organisations, it seems easier to align to principle two (adaptation) and principle four (learning and decision-
making) than to principles three (country ownership, mutual accountability and transparency), five (culture of results and learning) and six (manageable and reliable results system). The perspectives given by the panellists illustrated the need to tailor approaches to each specific context. Table discussions took place to discuss how the aggregate findings resonate with each participant’s experience, the principles that are lagging behind and those that should become a priority, as well as participants’ strengths and weaknesses in aligning to the Guiding Principles. Participants were invited to conclude their discussions on how to build on those strengths and address weaknesses. Discussions were rich and several participants expressed their willingness to pursue this type of concrete exchange.

iii) Operationalising the Guiding Principles

This sub-session started with structured table discussions on the existing tools and practices that members use to support results-based approaches and what needs to be added/changed to help implement the Principles. Discussions showed a variety of tools and practices ranging from system approaches covering the full programme cycle with results frameworks at project, country and corporate levels and data aggregated by indicator at country level, to more focused, project-based activities in terms of frameworks and evaluations. Operational training appears as a pillar in developing results approaches. Participants mentioned as key areas where progress is needed: i) assessing results of cross-sector approaches and moving from measuring outputs to outcomes and impact; ii) reflecting the beneficiary feedback in a better way; iii) coaching on RBM within the organisation continually; iv) sharing information internally and with partners to raise ownership; and v) having a knowledge management system in place that enables learning.

Following a presentation in Plenary of a proposal for setting-up an e-learning platform to help support members and partners to operationalise the Guiding principles, table groups discussed the opportunity and risks associated with the proposal and the way forward. Feedback from this discussion were presented in session 4 (Box 1).

Session 2: What will it take to use the SDGs as a shared framework for results?

i) Where do we stand? Lessons from international processes and initiatives

Understanding international megatrends in terms of results-based management and SDG uptake can serve as a compass for providers as they refine their own results approaches in support of the SDGs. The first segment of Session 2 presented key findings from recent international monitoring processes on these two aspects.

The Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation presented the results from 86 partner countries from a recent global monitoring round. The results indicate that both partner countries and providers are increasingly incorporating SDG targets and indicators in their country-level results frameworks. Furthermore, partner countries have made strides in terms of results-based planning in comparison with 2011. Yet, this progress has not always resulted in an increased use of governments’ results frameworks as a basis for country-level results planning, and providers’ reliance on country-generated data and statistics in half of the cases. These mixed results call for finding a way to strengthen the synergies between countries’ efforts and providers’ own efforts using the SDGs as a common framework.

UNDESA reflected on lessons learned during four years of countries’ Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs). Most countries have carried out one national assessment of progress against the SDGs, with a growing number of countries already carrying out a second wave of assessment. In general, initial VNR assessments lacked SDG data and relied on existing sources at the time, but the process is generating demand for timely SDG data. Data disaggregation continues to remain a challenge across the board, which prevents for accurate reporting of within-country disparities. Country government leadership also means selectivity in what is reported, and in many countries, civil society also produces a “shadow” VNR report to complement monitoring on areas not reflected in the VNR, but limitations in terms of disaggregated data need to be addressed. In recent years, the Cape Town Global Action Plan and the Dubai Declaration bolstered the attention for SDG data generation,
with an emphasis on the central role that National Statistics Offices should play in strengthening countries’ data ecosystems.

Other participants reacted to these findings. **UNFPA** reflected on the usefulness of pooled funds for census purposes (a foundation of good data ecosystems) and underlined the importance of subnational data. **Finland** considered VNRs useful as long as these are repeated overtime (institutionalisation) and contain both quantitative metrics and qualitative analysis that gives meaning to these metrics for the public and policy makers. **UNICEF** provided examples of how to use social data for national results monitoring, learning and impact, while still being in line with government goals.

### ii) Support and dialogue with partner countries and existing initiatives on Managing for Results

The second segment moved from the global to the regional level, looking at the numerous regional and transversal initiatives that have been operating since the mid-2000s in support of countries’ efforts to become more results oriented.

The **African Community of Practice on Results Based Management (RBM)** reflected on the effectiveness of regional multi-stakeholder platforms that provide continuity and facilitate peer learning among like-minded countries, while remaining sensitive to the evolving list of development priorities at regional level. The **Latin American and Caribbean Community of Practice on RBM** reflected on a decade and a half monitoring and supporting countries’ progress towards better RBM systems, recognising that painfully slow progress can be washed away by substantive changes in governing coalitions. Nevertheless, examples abound of countries introducing good results based approaches and leading to tangible improvements in the short term, as in Peru (reducing child mortality) and in Honduras (improving citizen security). **UNICEF** also shared a few country examples of successful RBM strengthening with provider support, dispelling the myth that those investments do not pay off if carefully deployed. **UNDESA** reflected on the lessons provided by their own cross-regional support to national monitoring systems, highlighting the difficulty of identifying appropriate national indicators and targets that are relevant across administrations and at different levels. UNDESA is working with pilot countries to design a methodology and toolkit that enable an adequate prioritisation and specification of country indicators to measure progress against sustainable development.

### iii) Getting specific – How do we move forward? Experience sharing and learning from the field

The OECD team is conducting a new series of country case studies on how to better use the SDGs as a shared framework for results, with a focus on drawing lessons on how providers can strengthen their country-level results frameworks with a link to the SDGs. Two case studies have been conducted to date (in Samoa and Peru) with another two planned in Bangladesh and Uganda.

The Secretariat reflected on some emerging findings from these two first case studies. Governments have made good progress in adopting the SDGs into national planning and monitoring systems in both Samoa and Peru, with strong government ownership. However, country capacities and data availability are very different – thus requiring different provider strategies. In Samoa, providers are letting the country lead, but could strengthen the leadership of central institutions by bringing the SDGs at the core of the conversations with line ministries and within sector co-ordination mechanisms more proactively. These efforts will also pay off in terms of making results data available for their own monitoring needs, while helping expand the scope of SDGs that can be measured and analysed in Samoa. In Peru, an upper-middle income country (UMIC), country planning and monitoring capacities are relatively strong although the link between national strategic planning/monitoring and development co-operation is weaker. Nevertheless, most providers are actively referring to the SDGs in their programming practice, although they find difficulties in producing meaningful results chains as their contributions are a small part of the total (most programmes are complemented with government funding), or they refer to areas that are difficult to measure, such as risk management, prevention, human rights, or overall public policy change. The set of challenges to use the SDG indicators meaningfully in UMICs was acknowledged by the majority of providers, save those whose financial
contributions are substantive, and/or clearly focused on the infrastructure sector – such as the multilateral development banks.

The **Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Co-operation, Spain** accompanied the mission in Peru. The experience allowed Spain to compare their own SDG-focus approach with the full array of providers working in the country, and to identify the linkages that providers need to strengthen with the national statistics system, the whole national strategic planning process, and the entities in charge of co-ordinating development co-operation. It recognised the default trend towards fragmentation that can be addressed by identifying shared challenges for all providers and country institutions. Bringing in the SDGs can also enhance the role of sector co-ordination groups. Efforts are also needed to expand the work with civil society and the private sector, but with a human rights/inclusion perspective, and to increase the sustained availability of disaggregated data, including subnational and socioeconomic data – a fundamental aspect in unequal middle-income countries. Innovation is also a hot topic that needs to be more prominent on future SDG work in MICs. Spain reflected on the need to make better use of the strong country capacities and for headquarters to communicate better to field offices on how to use the SDGs in these country contexts.

The **Peruvian Agency for International Co-operation** highlighted that the assessment found that most of Peru’s providers have aligned to the SDGs (to a certain extent), and that the SDGs are creating a common language for policy dialogue and co-ordination. The Peruvian Agency for International Co-operation is strengthening its capacities and information systems to be able to co-ordinate all partners around results. Providers are struggling to use SDG indicators, in part because many contributions relate to intangible issues, such as helping improve public policies. Overall, the analysis helped Peru realise that there is a need to raise awareness about the need to adopt the SDGs across development partners and also in many sector ministries and regional governments – but also with the private sector and civil society. Finally, as a South-South and Triangular Co-operation provider, Peru finds itself in the same difficulties: co-operation activities are broadly associated to the Goals (92%) but they face difficulties to use SDG indicators to track small in-kind or technical support, which is often the main support modality for Latin American south-south co-operation providers.

Several members shared their experience from the floor. **ADB** briefly presented an approach they have developed to directly use or adapt SDG indicators in a transparent manner based on their organisational needs and feasibility. **Korea** discussed current efforts to strengthen project management through results management frameworks connected to the SDGs – with complementary work with local institutions (including academic institutions) to generate the necessary results data in partner countries and an emphasis on capacity building. This was a theme that other participants highlighted as critical going forward.

The session ended with members being asked what they would like to be the focus of the SDG report and guidance on how to use the SDGs at country level. In their response, members prioritised “How to use SDG targets and indicators at several levels”, closely followed by “How to set up effective SDG monitoring approaches at country level” and “Good practices on using qualitative information for SDG monitoring/learning”.

**Session 3: What can we learn from each other?**

Session 3 revolved around discussing solutions to practical challenges faced by donors and partners in implementing RBM.

**Session 3a:** Session 3a began with an informal tour de table to allow participants to share any information on new developments in their results approaches and systems. The Swiss organisation, **SECO**, highlighted different ways to measure SDG alignment, raising important questions about distinguishing meaningful contribution to SDGs and artificial attribution of SDGs. SECO’s integrated framework with an impact hypothesis makes this distinction clearer. Sweden’s **SIDA** and its implementing partner, **ERRC**, argued that establishing strong donor-partner relationships is essential for achieving the Agenda 2030. Trust and clear communication are important variables in building such a relationship. Korea, represented by **KOICA**, explained their outcome-based approach. Their temporal approach to results focuses on measuring medium-term and long-term results of development co-operation and aims to integrate specialised indicators (specific...
health indicators, for example) for more coherent development results. **Austria** presented the benefits of having a set of standardised indicators based on contextual evidence, explaining how they can support cross-donor co-ordination. **AfDB** stressed the role of technology (e.g. big data, satellite imagery) in measuring progress towards achieving the SDGs. AfDB’s practice shows that collecting data in electronic form makes it more manageable and can increase transparency. **ADB** presented how they integrate SDG indicators into their new results frameworks. They differentiate four types of indicators: *direct* indicators are verbatim SDG indicators (e.g. “proportion of population”); *derived* indicators use the same data as SDG indicators but present it in a different form (e.g. “number of people”); *aligned* indicators are similar to an already existing SDG indicator (e.g. “number of women opening new bank accounts”); and *proxy* indicators measure results which are not measured by SDG indicators but still contribute to SDGs (e.g. “reduction in greenhouse gas emissions”).

**Session 3b**: Focus was put on four experiences introduced in a plenary session (links to PPTs in Annex 2) and discussed in more depth in four breakout sessions with open-ended discussions to facilitate mutual learning. Key takeaways were presented in a plenary concluding session. A summary of each topic discussion is presented below.

**How to manage results information and knowledge to strengthen evidence-based learning and decision-making in development co-operation?**

Introduced by **Finland**, this discussion built on the findings of an evaluation commissioned by the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs. The presenters highlighted the importance of: i) integrating the evaluation function better into the system as part of knowledge management; conducting needs-based, participatory evaluations; and discussing the respective roles of monitoring, evaluation and audit within the Ministry. Using annual reports synthesising results information for decision making with an appropriate sequencing and producing short knowledge-based papers for learning prove an effective practice. The presenters also noted that taking the time to reflect on achievements, valuing information provided by staff, and emphasising good practices without overlooking failures, is critical to learning and improving performance. This requires appropriate training and use of incentives as well as consistent engagement of senior management.

The participants discussed a range of challenges they face in seeking to use results information for evidence-based decision-making. One critical challenge is the request for domestic accountability, which pushes agencies to report to government on best practices and short term, tangible results. In the case of Finland, maintaining a transparent relationship with the Parliament has created a safe space enabling the Ministry to share both successes and failures. Participants also discussed ways to deal with fragmented information, and agreed that new approaches are required to improve the collection, aggregation and management of results data. They also noted that while evaluations may pursue various purpose, being clear about the balance between accountability and learning makes a huge difference.

**How to encourage learning and adaptation to reach better results?**

Led by **Sida** and its implementing partner **European Roma Rights Centre (ERRC)**, this discussion offered insights into strengthening donor-partner relationships for better results. While recognising the inherent power imbalance in donor-partner relationships, Sida and ERRC emphasised the importance of engaging with partner organisations (not just assessing documents) and balancing accountability and flexibility in order to build strong working relationships. Forging trust is essential for this to happen. In the case of the Sida-ERRC partnership, this was achieved through Sida leaving space for ERRC to identify context-specific problems and their solutions, and ERRC being financially transparent and maintaining clear communication with Sida.

The discussion focused on the practicalities of building a meaningful relationship. Managing cultural differences is needed as these may affect the communication between partners. Sida and ERRC did so by prioritising in-person meetings and e-mails interactions. Procurement of services requires balancing accountability and flexibility, which USAID managed to do by treating the partner as equal, incentivising milestones, working with local organisations and providing technical help to build capacity.
Participants also discussed the lack of partners’ absorptive capacity which might lead to decreasing effectiveness of incremental aid - maximising the impact per dollar ratio requires consulting with in-country teams regarding their administrative and technical capacity. They also noted the inability of small-scale organisations to invest in a RBM system. This might create an entry barrier for smaller organisations looking for funding, a situation that is worsened where donors use different indicators, creating an additional burden for partners.

**How to shift from accountability to learning - Example of the UNFPA 3+5 framework of RBM principles and standards**

The discussion was informed by **UNFPA's** new “3+5” RBM framework for achieving development results. This new approach tends to counterbalance the previous over-emphasised focused on accountability, which happened at the cost of learning. **UNFPA** presented the three “core principles” of UNFPA RBM framework, and the additional five “support principles” that relate to leadership, results culture, strategic and operational plans and frameworks, partnerships, and review. **UNFPA** has developed a set of indicators against each of these principles that teams will use to self-assess where they stand vis-à-vis each principle. This will help management to design an enhancement plan, and improvements will be subject to an independent assessment.

While still in a pilot and research stage, the framework, implementation of which is supported by four staff at headquarters level, is expected to produce a big shift in the way the organisation as a whole uses results information. Accountability will remain at the heart of the RBM framework but will be complemented by learning as a core element.

Participants discussed the implementation of the framework in country offices. Two country offices in each of the six regions participated in the pilot phase, on a voluntary basis. **UNFPA** is aiming to reach all countries by 2030. **UNFPA** stressed the importance of the self-assessment stage and of letting country offices design the process. This allows country teams to better identify the problem areas that need improvement and increase their ownership of the solutions. This also facilitates learning across country offices as shown in the case of **Uganda**, which is now keen to learn from the pilot programme in **Kenya**.

**How to perform effective thematic and country portfolio management - Striking a results oriented, coherent and manageable balance**

The **Netherlands**, leading the discussion, described how the Ministry focuses on de-fragmenting the portfolios and planning/managing them more effectively. This is done by reducing thematic/country fragmentation through better pipeline management and portfolio management, scaling up programmes and more coherent decision-making across the 11 thematic priorities. This creates room for dedicating more attention to the quality of implementation, M&E and learning at programme and institutional level.

The **Netherlands** focuses these streamlining efforts on the thematic level, with action plans developed for each thematic portfolio. Such organisational portfolio plans should match the corresponding thematic theory of change and results frameworks that are subsequently reflected in the multi-annual country strategies and annual plans.

Participants discussed the connection between the thematic and country portfolios, taking into account the different levels of decision-making and management responsibilities. In particular, the strategic allocation of resources and thematic synergies at headquarters level, and theory of change/context analysis and stakeholder analysis at country/regional level.

They also noted the difficulty of defining criteria for such de-fragmentation (and therefore effective portfolios) if contextual data and knowledge is still missing. Linked to that, they highlighted the risks of management at portfolio level, as it moves decision-making ‘up’ – with risks of decontextualised and politicised decisions. While recognising these issues, they agreed that more manageable portfolios (using results frameworks that
align to the SDGs and avoiding fragmented programmes) is a necessary first step to achieve better quality of development results.

**Session 4: Shaping the future: Next steps for the OECD/DAC Results Community**

The session started with a presentation of the findings from the last part of the survey conducted in November on expectations from members on the future of the Results Community. The 30 agencies having participated in the survey ranked “Data, digitalisation and results” and “Measuring/managing results in specific areas” (e.g. LNOB, climate change) as the top two thematic issues to focus on in the next biennium. In system issues, “Strengthening the learning dimension of RBM”; “Aligning to the SDGs”; and “Improving knowledge management” came as the top three priorities. Participants also considered that pursuing research work, organising workshops, and developing tools for capacity development (e-learning platform, on-demand events) were the best ways to increase impact.

The secretariat presented a summary of the feedback from the table discussions on the proposed e-learning platform that took place in the framework of Session 1. As detailed in Box 1, participants provided a mixed picture of the value added and feasibility of the e-learning platform.

---

**Box 1. Summary of the discussions on the e-learning platform**

**Added value:** feedback was generally positive. In particular the platform would allow to: i) connect the results and evaluation communities; ii) have all information in one place; iii) connect practitioners across organisations; iv) reverse the trend of lengthy paper documents; and v) develop a more thorough understanding of the principles and what they mean in practice in each context (e.g. bilateral or multilateral agencies). Some critical views expressed were that the content is not specific enough and the approach focuses only on one tool while others (including more traditional approaches) could also be considered. The purpose should be clearly defined before looking at technical solutions.

**Audience and use:** participants stressed the need to define the audiences more clearly, and keep these audiences in mind to make sure the platform is designed with what is most relevant to them. Audiences range from expert groups of results community and evaluator networks; to programme and portfolio managers/operational people; senior management; and the wider development community, including partner countries. Useful content of the platform would include: a lists of contacts and conferences related to M&E; tools for visualising results data; training material; high quality reports and templates; good practice examples; and blogs. The platform could be used also as a forum for discussion, enabling virtual meetings with people working on similar issues. Participants also noted that use of the platform would depend on the maturity of the RBM systems and level of integration of the Guiding Principles. In the short run, the platform might be mostly used at headquarters level.

**Feasibility and risks:** participants noted that the risks are well identified but could be more explicit, including their likelihood and size. Mitigation measures could also be further expanded. Participants stressed the risks related to the quality of the material and related screening, quality control, tailoring and updating processes; the associated costs and ability to maintain a resource intensive project in the long-term; the technical aspects related to access and search tools; and communication aspects. Some participants also noted that while complementary, the communities of evaluators and results specialists are different and have different needs. Ensuring the platform is fit for the two communities requires a careful approach. The timeframe was considered ambitious. It would require this project to become the core-focus in the coming year with adequate resources.

**Way to go:** participants suggested mapping the many e-learning initiatives on RBM – establishing a sort of baseline to ensure there is added value in creating a new platform or seeking opportunities to join existing platforms. They also suggested conducting an online survey to see what organisations would have material ready to share – this would be helpful for gauging availability of, and testing, material, and what their needs are. The level of survey engagement could provide an idea of likely interest in the platform. A feasibility study should include identification of the material that would go on the platform, what this would bring together as a valuable extra resource as well as a cost-benefit analysis. Finally, the scoping study should not prevent from considering alternatives: e.g. provide a static list of existing country/organisation platforms people can consult.
Building on these findings, participants discussed in small groups: i) the topics to focus on in 2021-22; ii) the ways in which the Secretariat could support actors in setting up or refining their results systems – in particular an e-learning platform; and iii) the format of the future workshops. The feedback provided in plenary by each table discussion showed:

- strong support to the topics proposed for the next biennium, alongside a request for focused sessions allowing to go deeper on each topic and a need to focus on the six Guiding Principles on MfSDR themselves to unpack them and strengthen knowledge management and learning. Themes often mentioned were:
  - data/digitalisation: information management systems that are fit for purpose and embed qualitative aspects; mechanisms for gathering feedback - including the use of new, non-orthodox sources/methods for more granularity; development of IT skills
  - alignment to the 2030 agenda principles (LNOB) and SDGs - and related measurement aspects
  - climate change and the environment, fragility, results based-financing, adaptive management, measuring results of private sector engagement. Assessing government capacity for measuring results in SIDS was also proposed.

- agreement to pursue the scoping study on the e-learning platform, considering the resource intensiveness of setting-up such a tool. This should include a mapping of existing platforms and networks to identify useful resources that can be shared and see whether there is a gap to fill.

- mixed views on the format of upcoming results workshops: the idea of an annual workshop back to back with EvalNet is welcome, but this should not prevent from separate meetings. Some participants would prefer to maintain two workshops a year, while others appreciate the opportunity of using webinars for detailed discussions on specific areas, maintaining the community alive while being climate-friendly. Suggestions were also made to organise shared regional events on focused topics in the meantime and to facilitate participation via video-link.

Rahul Malhotra, Chair of the session, concluded stressing the consistency of the messages sent by members. There is a general move towards more joint approaches yet without losing individual elements. In this spirit, synergies should be sought with the work done on data for development (D4D) as it links with results-based management, the measurement agenda, new information technologies and innovation. Capacity development is also an issue common to several networks (EvalNet, D4D) where synergies can be brought, including on evaluative thinking on capacity development.

Meanwhile the focus on the principles in relation with knowledge management and learning will be maintained. The Secretariat will also support the organisation of member-driven webinars as well as regional workshops when opportunities arise. As recommended by members, it will scan the horizon as part of the scoping study for the e-learning portal, conducting a mapping and seeking potential gaps.

Rahul Malhotra also stressed the scarcity of the results team resources in the face of this ambitious agenda and called on members to support the Secretariat either through funding or in-kind contributions (e.g. hosting events, covering travel costs, secondments or JPO programmes). Paige Kirby, who was seconded from Development Gateway to work on the SDG project for the last 3 months as part of the Results team, proved to be a win-win for both Development Gateway and the OECD.

The next workshop is for now scheduled on 20-21 April in Addis Ababa, together with NEPAD. The Secretariat will confirm the date shortly.
ANNEX 1: Workshop Agenda
Tuesday 17 December 2019

08:45 – 09:15 Coffee and registration

09:15 – 9:30 Welcome
- Welcome address by Rahul Malhotra, Head of Division, Reviews, Results, Evaluation and Development Innovation Division (RREDI), Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD)
- Introduction to workshop objectives and format: Chantal Verger, Head of Results Team, DCD/RREDI
- Tour de table in small groups

09:30 – 13:00 Session 1: What will it take to operationalise the Guiding Principles on Managing for Sustainable Development Results?

This session will help members to start to disseminate the principles internally and with partners as well as to operationalise the Guiding Principles. The session will aim to: i) discuss the dissemination strategy; ii) help members to self-assess where they stand vis-à-vis Guiding Principles; and iii) discuss the tools that would be most helpful to help implement the principles.

Chairs: Bernard Woods, Director, Results Management and Aid Effectiveness unit (SPRA), Asian Development Bank and Suvi Virkkunen, Senior Advisor, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland

09:30 – 10:15 Disseminating the Guiding Principles
Format: Brief introduction and review of the OECD/DAC Guiding Principles on MfSDR followed by a ten-minute table exchange around a few proposals followed by an interactive plenary discussion on ways to help each organisation disseminate the principles internally and with partners

10:15 – 11:30 Self-assessment against the Guiding Principles
Panellists: Christian Kuitert, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Netherlands; Izabela Nagoya, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Slovak Republic; Francesca Morandini, UNICEF
Format: Table discussions introduced by a presentation of the findings from the survey on results-based approaches and a panel involving a range of different stakeholders on what the Principles mean for each (strengths, weaknesses, needs)

11:30 – 11:45 Coffee break

11:45 – 13:00 Operationalising the Guiding Principles
Format: The session will start with table discussions on the existing tools and practices that members use to support results-based approaches and what would need to be added/changed to help operationalise the Principles. A plenary will follow where the Secretariat will present an going feasibility study to set-up an on-line learning platform. The Session will end with structured table discussions, seeking views on the added value, possible audiences/user profiles, and feasibility of the learning platform.

Support documents: Guiding Principles on Managing for Sustainable Development Results
Discussion paper: A Learning portal on Results-Based Management and Evaluation? Aggregate findings from the survey on results-based approaches will be shared at the workshop.
13:00 – 14:15  Lunch

14:15 – 16:45  Session 2. What will it take to use the SDGs as a shared framework for results?

This session will provide participants with a clear view of the results initiatives that are helping to put the SDGs at the core of development efforts in partner countries. Drawing on sharing of experience, participants will reflect on how to move forward at country level.

14:15 – 15:00 Where do we stand? Lessons from international processes and initiatives

Chair: Alejandro Guerrero, Policy Analyst, DCD/RREDI Results Unit

Format: Two presentations on global trends followed by a 15 min Q&A.

Presenters:
- Ashley Palmer, GPEDC – Where do we stand in strengthening and using country results frameworks at national and global levels? Findings from GPEDC 2018 Monitoring Round on strength and use of country results frameworks and M&E systems and data
- Yongyi Min, UN DESA – HLPF 2019: What have we learned from Voluntary National Reviews and SDG Follow-Up and Review? What is needed? How data and statistics are used for the VNRs, and related opportunities/progress and challenges

15:00 – 16:00 Support and dialogue with partner countries and existing initiatives on Managing for Results

Chair: Rudy Petras, Principal Results Specialist, AfDB

Format: An interview-style panel followed by Q&A to get an overview and reflect on how to engage with the various initiatives on managing for results that exist

Speakers: Roberto García López, Executive Secretary, Latin American CoP on MfDR (CoPLAC); Mamadou Lamine N’Dongo, Chair, African COP on MfDR (AfCOP); Sami Areikat, UNDESA; Francesca Morandini, UNICEF

16:00 – 17:00  Getting specific – How do we move forward? Experience sharing and learning from the field

Chair: Alejandro Guerrero, Policy Analyst, DCD/RREDI Results Unit

Format: Emerging findings from two country case studies (Phase 2) by Paige Kirby from the Results team as well as Ms Nancy Silva, Director, Peru’s International Co-operation Agency and Juan Ignacio Izuzquiza, Senior Advisor, Min. of Foreign Affairs, European Union and Co-operation, Spain, followed by three short interventions from Korea, Switzerland and the Asian Development Bank on concrete challenges they are facing and steps taken to move forward. Live voting will be available during the session, which will end with a short plenary discussion on most frequently shared challenges and how to move forward in solving them.

Support documents: Key facts from the Global Monitoring (tbc); List of initiatives on strengthening management for results at country level

17:00 – 18:00  Session 3a. What can we learn from each other?

Session 3 is a learning session aiming to: i) allow participants to share any new developments in their approach to results (session 3a); and ii) expose participants to new developments/unexplored challenges in results-based management in development co-operation, enabling them to engage in discussions on each topic from the perspective of their own agencies (session 3b).

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

Format: Session 3a will consist of an informal tour de table to allow participants to share any information on new developments in their results approaches and systems.

18.00 – 19.30  Group photo followed by drinks reception in the OECD Chateau (Roger Ockrent room)
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08.45 – 09.15 Coffee

9:15 – 11:30 Session 3b: What can we learn from each other?

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

Format: Session 3b will start with four introductory pitches presented in plenary (45 min) followed by four focused break-out sessions with open-ended discussions to learn from each other’s experiences (one hour per topic discussion) and a 15 min plenary to share key points from the group discussions. Each group will have a facilitator/topic lead and provide a brief report for the summary record.

Selected topics

- How to manage results information and knowledge to strengthen evidence-informed learning and decision-making in development co-operation: discussion introduced by Finland
- How can a donor encourage implementing organisations to learn and adapt in order to achieve better development results: discussion introduced by Sida together with one of Sida’s implementing organisations
- How to shift from accountability to learning - Example of the UNFPA 3+5 framework of RBM principles and standards: discussion introduced by UNFPA
- How to perform effective thematic and country portfolio management; striking a results oriented, coherent and manageable balance: discussion introduced by the Netherlands.

11:00 – 11:15 Coffee break

11:15 – 11:30 Plenary with facilitators sharing key takeaways from the discussions

11:30 – 13:00 Session 4. Shaping the future: Next steps for the OECD/DAC Results Community

This concluding session will reflect on ways to increase the impact of the Results Community work, thereby contributing to shape the future OECD Programme of Work and Budget 2021-22.

Chair: Rahul Malhotra, Head of Division, DCD/RREDI

Format: Presentation of the findings from the survey on expectations from members on the future of the Results Community and feedback from table discussions on a proposed e-learning platform (Session 1), followed by structured table discussions and a plenary.

Key questions:

- What are the thematic and system issues related to the results agenda that could be addressed in the future work programme?
- How can the Community and its Secretariat be more helpful – In which ways can its impact be enhanced?

ANNEX 2: Links to workshop presentations
Results Community Workshop - Managing for sustainable development results - December 2019 (Master slide)
Managing for Sustainable Development Results - Mapping Members' Baseline Status
GPEDC - Strengthening and using country results frameworks
UNDESA - Data best used for national and implementation of the SDGs and VNRs
Using the SDGs as a shared results framework

Session 2
Results information for evidence-informed learning and decision-making
Effective thematic and country portfolio management
How to encourage learning and adaptation to reach better results
UNFPA - the 3+5 framework