

# **A results agenda for the 2030 Agenda: New approaches for changing contexts**

*Results Community workshop, hosted by the OECD  
April 10-11, 2018  
OECD Conference Centre, Paris*

## ***Key Messages from the Workshop May 2018***

### **CONTENTS**

Highlights	2
Session 1. Measuring the results of private-sector engagement through development co-operation	3
Session 2: Learning from new developments in results-based management	4
Session 3: Better use of data and new technologies for results-based management	7
Session 4: Future directions for the results agenda	8
ANNEX 1: Workshop Agenda	10
ANNEX 2: Links to workshop presentations	12

*Workshop papers can be accessed on the OECD [Results in Development Co-operation website](#).*

*Links to workshop presentations are included in Annex 2*

*Contact: [DAC.Results@oecd.org](mailto:DAC.Results@oecd.org)*

## **Highlights**

- On April 10-11 2018, the OECD hosted a workshop of the Results Community titled: *A results agenda for the 2030 Agenda: New approaches for changing contexts*. The 86 participants included representatives from 25 DAC members and observers; one OECD member, five other providers of development co-operation; seven think tanks; and five OECD divisions. The workshop was introduced by Jorge Moreira Da Silva, DCD Director, and concluded by Rahul Malhotra, Head of the DCD/RREDI Division. The workshop agenda is included as an annex to this report.
- The four sessions included two panel discussions on: i) measuring the results from private sector engagement through development co-operation (session 1) and ii) better use of data and new technologies for results-based management (session 3); a series of 6 topic presentations followed by small group discussions aimed at learning from new developments in results-based management (session 2), and a final plenary session on future directions for the results agenda, involving table discussions (session 4).
- Main points from plenary sessions:
  - Measuring the results of private sector engagement:* The development co-operation community is adapting its policies and practices to mobilise private finance and enhance the role of the private sector across a broad spectrum of development activities. Yet there is a gap in the collection of evidence and the understanding of the impact of activities involving the private sector. While different initiatives tend to focus on conceptual and technical issues related to indicators, providers need to embrace the diversity of the private sector and acknowledge the specific roles and objectives of private companies. With a view to engage with them as equal partners, they should design, at the corporate level and for each programme, a clear theory of change reconciling the goals of each partner and articulating the logic of each intervention. This should underpin monitoring systems, and in turn ensure that the different measurement needs of the various parties are met.
  - Better use of data and new technologies for results-based management:* Overall, the conversation has moved clearly from generating data to use of data. However, there is a need to take a step back and look at the overall development co-operation data eco-system with respect to results-based management, and to seek a balance between stand-alone internal systems and support for real-time country owned administrative data. As the new DAC data for development community is established, it will be important to tap into the knowledge and experience of the Results Community to build and ensure coherence and synergies between the two communities, and to help bridge the data divide.
- Overall, participants appreciated the revised format of the workshop, which facilitated interactions between participants. They also appreciated the exposure to new topics and developments in results-based management. Participants expressed continued support for Results Community workshops. In the future, they would like to see focused workshops based on concrete evidence and case studies from the field, and involving partners and other stakeholders. This would lead to more operational discussions on what works with respect to different approaches to results-based management, e.g. adaptive approaches, payment by results, and use of new technologies. There was strong interest in further analysis and identification of good practice of how partners and providers can use the SDG framework as a shared platform for results measurement and management. Finally, a number of participants noted that this technical, evidence-based work should translate into practical advice and guidance to help members set up solid approaches and systems for measuring and using results.

## **Session 1. Measuring the results of private-sector engagement through development co-operation**

Monitoring and using results of development co-operation activities and partnerships involving private companies is a critical function for accountability, direction, learning and communication purposes. The panel and discussions that followed illustrated that providers are engaged in a variety of initiatives to promote social impact investments and inclusive businesses practices, while overcoming conceptual and operational challenges to applying a results focus to private sector engagement. Approaches however vary. Providers with well-established development finance institutions are actively seeking ways to enhance the development results of their activities engaging the private sector, developing ex-ante impact assessments and improving the measurement and reporting of development outcomes, while other providers are at an early stage in setting up results systems. Yet participants noted that development-oriented evaluations of private sector engagement are rare, and most providers are not yet equipped with appropriate monitoring systems. There is still a gap in the collection and use of evidence, and in the understanding of the impact of activities involving the private sector, including their positive and negative externalities.

A number of the issues mentioned were similar to issues for development co-operation activities more broadly (e.g. proliferation of indicators; critical role of evaluation from the design phase of a programme; and limited use of results information for adaptability and learning, linked to a compliance culture and institutional barriers limiting the potential for programme managers to take action). Specific issues relate to the partnership dimension, which means working with partners driven by different objectives, business models, incentives, and culture. This also makes additionality and attribution more difficult to analyse.

**Monitoring systems:** a clear theory of change should underpin monitoring systems. Recognising that engaging the private sector is not only about mobilising funding but also about proposing better solutions, the theory of change should reconcile the goals of each partner and articulate the logic of each intervention throughout the results chain towards development outcomes. This will in turn ensure that the different needs for measurement of the various parties are met. Participants, however, argued that reconciling different logics into a single theory of change is not easy as it requires demonstrating how the private sector's focus on delivering goods and services with a financial return translates into development outcomes.

**Collecting evidence:** Participants highlighted the need to get better evidence. This applies both in terms of quality (i.e. credible and robust data, ability to track intended and non-intended effects of an intervention and to capture impact trajectories) and scope (e.g. covering the effect on different parts of a population in support of the leave no-behind pledge and inclusive growth agenda). A number of participants mentioned challenges in collecting data from private actors, whose willingness to put in place a results monitoring system can be limited. Some organisations are considering setting up technical assistance facilities to build monitoring and measurement capacities for private sector interventions. Participants also noted that while a number of initiatives aim to harmonise private-sector related indicators with standardised metrics and explore the feasibility of getting disaggregated data, there is still work to be done on data and measurement. To avoid reporting burden, partners need to identify what data is most relevant for all actors, including the private sector and partner countries.

**Bringing private sector actors on board:** Participants emphasised the diversity of the private sector. Along with this diversity, providers need to recognise the important role of the private sector, and should therefore engage in dialogue with these actors as equal partners with different cultures and business models. Yet the results agenda should be seen as mutually beneficial, demonstrating the benefits of results measurement in driving private companies' business and marketing. The theory of change should include the potential for long-term business cases for the private sector. With the right incentives, providers can change behaviour and redirect private flows towards sustainable investments in areas and regions in need –

bearing in mind for example that an increasing number of pension fund investors have sustainability goals in their guidelines.

## **Session 2: Learning from new developments in results-based management**

The purpose of this session was to expose participants to new developments in results-based management in development co-operation and to enable them to engage in discussion and debate on each of the topics from the perspective of their own agencies. Presentations on all topics were made to the plenary, followed by small-group discussions. The following presents key takeaways (identified by topic leads) from each of the topics discussed.

### **1. Adaptive management and collaborative learning (USAID)**

- USAID's presentation of their approach to adaptive management raised a lot of interest. Participants highlighted the need for clarity on whether adaptive management is just another term for good project cycle management, or whether it something more, and what this is. Providers are increasingly working in an environment where contexts change quickly – so being able to be flexible and adaptive is even more important. Giving adaptive management a name and attaching a process to it, enables a conversation around the constraints to being adaptive. However, it is important to strike a balance between principles and tangible requirements. USAID emphasized that adaptive management is not about moving the goal posts (in terms of project outcomes) but about changing the pathway towards achieving goals.
- An adaptive management approach goes beyond results-based management/ monitoring & evaluation (M&E) and has implications for planning, timelines, budgeting, communication, and engagement with partners. Participants discussed what adaptive management means in terms of planning timeframes, and how long it takes to realise a project is not on track and then take corrective action. Taking an adaptive approach requires changes to processes throughout the project cycle (such as more streamlined up-front planning).
- Moving towards a more adaptive approach requires behaviour change and also needs to be incentivised through training and good knowledge management. USAID also emphasized the importance of leadership, advocates and champions.

Participants believe the Results Community has a role to play in sharing good practice and building the evidence base to support adaptive management. It also has important links to other topics discussed in the workshop such as data – real time data should in theory enable more adaptive management – and payment by results.

### **2. Civil society and results measurement and reporting (Sida)**

- There was curiosity and interest around the approach to align with Civil Society Organisations' (CSO) results systems and procedures (frameworks), primarily because of the ownership, legitimacy and freedom it allows for CSOs. At the same time, there were queries around what consequences this approach has for the follow-up of results. As one participant asked: "how can you ensure that you get relevant results when you give so much freedom to CSOs?"
- Sida and nine other providers have agreed – as part of drafting a Code of Practice – to use CSOs' *own* results frameworks or equivalent (as opposed to requesting them to use those of providers). This draft Code of Practice builds on international commitments to aid and development effectiveness made in Busan 2011 and Nairobi 2016: to engage with civil society as an independent actor/support it in its own right.
- When CSOs apply for funding, Sida assesses the quality of their results frameworks – or any other documents they submit to understand their objectives, how they intend to achieve those and how they

will monitor/evaluate process and performance. These documents usually include indicators, but these indicators are the CSO's and not the donors'. Thus, Sida aims at aligning with its CSO partners.

- Unlike some providers, Sida does not design programmes; hence they do not have a meticulous results system which their partners must align to. Sida aims at aligning with the systems and procedures of partners. Their challenge, at the end of the day, is still that of aggregation of information from the various CSO partners. What is most important in Sida's view is to aggregate *analysis*, learn from this and adapt accordingly.

### **3. Working towards results in partner countries: new ways of measuring results orientation and country ownership (OECD- GPEDC)**

Participants provided feedback on the adjusted indicator framework for the Global Monitoring exercise that will be undertaken this year by the GPEDC, specifically on indicator one on the quality and use of partner country results frameworks. The GPEDC team will use this feedback to ensure that the monitoring provides information on the SDG uptake and on the efforts to strengthen planning and statistical systems at country level. It will also look at ways to address other specific comments (e.g. on subnational priorities and planning, statistical capacity, inclusive processes for development planning at country level, and reporting beyond provider-to-government projects (CSOs, private sector)).

Two takeaways are directly relevant to the Results Community and could lead to valuable contributions in terms of informing and facilitating action on results in partner countries:

1. Participants would like to understand better how current policies and practices of different providers facilitate country ownership. It might be worth considering a comparative analysis on providers' policies and practices that facilitate or constrain alignment to country priorities and use of country-led results frameworks and results data.
2. Participants also acknowledged that internal pressures to report results domestically or at corporate level are very strong and can contradict the requirement to align to country results frameworks. With the SDGs not being used as a basis for a common results framework, this continues to be a critical issue. In light of this, the Results Community could benefit from the identification and show-casing of good practices of providers that have managed to reconcile the tension between the need to articulate results reporting for corporate needs and the need to align to country results frameworks and jointly report on country-level results with partners.

### **4. Payment by Results: building the evidence base (DFID)**

The discussion was an opportunity to share lessons from experiences in payments by results (PBR) in a context where some countries and institutions are starting to engage with this modality (Canada, IFAD). Some good experiences were reported including by CORDAID on how PBR projects can support health system strengthening, and by DFID on how PBR can support innovative approaches (e.g. in access to clean energy). Participants also shared mixed experiences of using PBR e.g. technical assistance projects or other projects where results are less tangible and easily amenable to be specified upfront. Main points as regards lessons learned can be summarised as follows:

- There is not a single watertight definition of PBR across the development community. It is more a principle than a strict payment model.
- PBR looks quite different depending on the context. In contracts with suppliers, PBR involves paying for pre-defined and ideally tangible outputs or outcomes, e.g. better literacy rates of girls. In MoUs with governments or multilateral organisations (core funding) PBR is generally used to incentivise and catalyse reforms that are considered essential for better development outcomes, without linking payment to these development outcomes as such.

- PBR is not the “perfect” modality for development co-operation that can apply anywhere. PBR is not good at solving complex (multiple causalities), systemic issues, or at addressing non-tangible issues. PBR can also be costly for donors, as it requires an independent third party to conduct the verification.
- A number of conditions are to be met for PBR to provide added value. These include:
  - Alignment and ownership in the case of MoUs with governments and multilaterals: PBR should never be an imposed modality. It should never aim at pushing a ministry to go beyond what it wants to do, but rather support an activity that it wants to deliver but faces challenges in executing.
  - A functioning cost model – this could be a rigorous cost model (e.g. cost of a vaccination) or a model based on a “willingness to pay” for achieving a particular result.
  - A technically feasible and affordable verification (e.g. client survey on quality of health treatments).
- Even where it applies, a more nuanced approach is required. The PBR modality often applies only to a component of a project, and incentives are recalibrated. A balance is to be achieved between the need to remain firm about the PBR principle: payment paid only when an output/outcome is delivered, and renegotiating when there is a very strong case for this (external factors undermining the delivery of a project) – this requires the need to be politically astute.
- PBR does not lead automatically to greater innovation. Unless the project itself is actually linking payment to innovation, PBR projects tend to lead to hedging on the part of suppliers to reduce risk.
- We need to get better at working with smaller organisations, especially not-for-profits such as small NGOs. These organisations find it hard to acquire the upfront capital needed to pre-finance a project and they tend to be more ambitious than private sector organisations in the results they aim for.

Looking forward, more evidence coming from evaluations of PBR will be available soon and it could be useful to capitalise on this. With some coordination support, more could be done to learn from each other, and to develop synergies within the Results Community.

## **5. The new SDG focus field: implications for results-based management (OECD)**

The Results Community provided feedback on DCD’s proposal to introduce a voluntary SDG focus field to the creditor reporting system (CRS). The conversation focused on the results-based management implications of the proposal, and feedback will inform the proposal which will be presented to the Working Party on Development Statistics in June 2018. Key takeaways from the discussion were as follows:

- Data on development co-operation inputs contributing to SDG targets is already being produced by many providers, both bilateral and multilateral. There is strong interest in finding modalities to collect this data in a uniform way.
- The SDG focus field should be voluntary in the CRS, which collects ODA and other official flows (OOF) data. The SDG focus field is conceptually similar to the CRS policy markers. The field will record the intended contribution to the SDG target of the aid activities. CRS will not collect results or SDG indicators.
- The availability of an SDG field will stimulate the creation of SDG data on development co-operation activities. The field should be able to include all SDG targets, to allow information from all partners to fit in.
- The availability of SDG information will also be important for the next statistical measure that the international community is developing: Total Official Support for Sustainable Development (TOSSD). Contribution to the SDGs would be a key eligibility criterion for an activity to be counted in TOSSD.

- The Results Community should be consulted on the development of the field and implications for results-based management (e.g. potential for linking this input data with outcome data on the SDGs).

## **6. Leave no-one behind: Next steps for the results agenda**

The importance of tracking and delivering results on Leave no-one behind (LNOB) reflects the strong political imperative encapsulated in the pledge by world leaders “that no one will be left behind”. The challenge of measuring results for the poorest and often excluded people is both political and statistical.

The group discussed the overarching question of how to operationalise LNOB as a rights-based approach and as part of inclusive growth agenda. This requires setting the right objectives, and getting the right indicators and level of disaggregation of data. Going the extra mile to identify and reach marginalised populations and to come up with indicators for these people in results frameworks is a big challenge that needs to be overcome. Otherwise the impact on the poorest and marginalised will not be tracked. In this regard, participants stressed the need to build statistical capacity in partner countries. Participants also emphasised the need to identify and understand better the systemic and deep-rooted reasons why some people/groups/regions continue to be excluded and marginalised.

There is a sense that programme management tools and approaches are not fit enough to address LNOB. Analysing needs, setting indicators, and identifying and managing trade-offs between objectives are challenging. Appropriate tools and guidelines are needed to ensure that partners can identify and include indicators for the marginalised/excluded.

Participants also mentioned the risk that ODA will address LNOB and target vulnerabilities and exclusion that are easier to identify, e.g. in urban settings, due to incentives to show quick results and keep costs low. Being serious about LNOB therefore requires that providers change their narrative on ODA and results in relation to value for money. They should focus more on the comparative advantage of ODA tackling the toughest challenges in the hardest to reach places.

Participants finally noted that there is a lot of experience to build on from poverty reduction programmes, human rights, gender, etc. The Results Community should learn from experience and not over-complicate tools and approaches to LNOB.

## **Session 3: Better use of data and new technologies for results-based management**

To start the session, the DAC Chair, Charlotte Petri-Gornitzka, framed the discussion in the context of a **global data divide**. On one side a data revolution and the emergence of big data means more data, coming faster and from more sources. However, on the other side of the divide developing countries still lack the basic data and statistics required to guide their development efforts and measure progress towards the SDGs.

The DAC Chair challenged the Results Community to step up and play a role in bridging the data divide. Panel interventions focused on the potential of new data sources and big data to provide timely results information – but also the pitfalls. Panellists discussed the data strategies and systems which they have developed in-house, and how these are linked to the wider data landscape, offering examples and suggestions on how they have addressed data challenges in a way that supports partner ownership and use of data. Three key themes emerged from the panel interventions and subsequent discussion amongst workshop participants.

### **1. Building demand for use – incentives, culture and training**

As providers implement increasingly sophisticated data systems, participants stressed the importance of ensuring that these initiatives are accompanied by strategies and approaches which not only generate data, but build *demand* for data from leadership down. Participants discussed how to provide

appropriate incentives for data use (for example MCC has adjusted its knowledge management system and monitors use of results data as part of its internal business processes), and how to build capacity for use of data not only for analysis and decision making but also for communication to partners and stakeholders. They stressed the importance of ensuring that internal systems and approaches are fit-for-purpose before working with partners on the same challenges. UNICEF's organisational data strategy is a good example of a decentralised agency's commitment to elevating the role of data and building an organisational culture which focuses on demand and use.

## **2. Co-ordination and interoperability – a new narrative on development M&E**

Participants agreed on the importance of enhanced co-ordination among providers and between partners to reduce production of duplicative and overlapping data. Ensuring the interoperability of data systems from the outset was stressed. For example, New Zealand aims to work with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community to build interoperability between their own internal results data system and wider Pacific statistical systems, and AfDB is working with other multilateral development banks to harmonise indicators. Participants discussed the potential of the SDGs as a shared framework for increased co-ordination, while acknowledging methodological challenges. They suggested adopting a sectoral lens as a pathway toward increased co-ordination. To move toward greater partner ownership of data (and enhanced co-ordination), Development Gateway challenged the Results Community to re-direct resources for project specific monitoring and evaluation towards support of core-country administrative data at national and sub-national levels. There is a case for ensuring that strengthening of statistics and administrative data is systematically associated with all development interventions.

## **3. Sharing good practice on use of data and new technologies for results-based management**

Participants agreed that the Results Community has a role to play in bridging the data divide, and supported sharing good practice on use of data and new technologies for results-based management. Participants stressed the importance of situating the data required, and roles and responsibilities for this, along the results chain. They agreed that there was a place for both operational data and outcome data, but more could be done to support data systems which focus on the latter. MCC's use of the Grid Watch app to monitor power outages in real time, and AfDB's initiative to mine big data sources for enhanced monitoring information, and to tell a more powerful impact story, were shared as good practice examples. Participants questioned what is really meant by the use of real-time data to support an adaptive approach within a development architecture which is governed by reporting cycles. There was a call for concrete evidence of what works in this space.

Overall, the conversation has moved clearly from generating data to *use* of data. However, there is a need to take a step back and look at the overall development co-operation data eco-system with respect to results-based management, and to seek a balance between stand-alone internal systems and support for real-time country owned administrative data.

## **Session 4: Future directions for the results agenda**

Session four concluded the workshop with a discussion about the future directions for the Results Community. Participants discussed three themes around which future work will be focused: i) results-based management; ii) partnerships for shared results; and iii) results capacity development. Below is a synthesis of key points emerging from group discussions.

### **Theme 1 – Results-based management**

Data for results was the issue most frequently mentioned. Participants discussed when using other sources of data is important (e.g. getting people-centred data in support of a human rights based approach); how to increase capacity to use data better – while keeping a balance between quantitative and qualitative data; and how to strengthen opportunities to act on results data, ensuring appropriate data literacy of senior

management. Participants also noted the gap between the data community and national statistics, mentioning the scope to work with CSOs on this aspect.

Participants also mentioned the need to continue learning on how to use the SDGs, looking at the SDG indicators first, but going beyond where needed in areas such as governance and human rights.

Other topics included: adaptive management, with the need to maintain flexibility within rigid frameworks and management pressure; how to reconcile the tensions between provider results-based management systems and country-led results agenda requirements; and how to deal with fragile states and the differing capacity levels of partners.

Participants consider that the best way to support the Results Community is to bring concrete cases for discussion and share methods and good practices, in order to learn what works and what does not. This could lead to developing good practices and guidance for the Results Community and beyond. Participants also mentioned that repositories could help map resources that already exist on results-based management approaches and facilitate access to data.

### **Theme 2 – Partnership for shared results**

Participants acknowledged that the SDG agenda is influencing results frameworks, including selection of targets and indicators, and how they fit into comprehensive policies for sustainable development, with increased collaboration between donors and country authorities and stakeholders. This requires seeking ways to find a common frame among DAC members for data collection with a focus on working towards using partner systems. Meanwhile an appropriate sequencing is needed to ensure that partner countries create a knowledge-based, enabling environment to discuss SDGs with partners.

One group suggested conducting case studies which focus on a few SDG targets in one or two partner countries where the SDGs have been integrated in national development plans, and looking at:

- How indicators are measured and the extent to which provider indicators align to them;
- How providers and partner countries are cooperating in results achievement;
- How the relevant line ministries (and national bodies) are working together in results achievement;
- How the other stakeholders are involved.

Participants also noted that the emphasis on multi-stakeholder partnerships means the results agenda must become more collaborative and more realistic. Multi-stakeholder partnerships have the potential to support country ownership and need their own theory of change and results frameworks. The Results Community should invite relevant stakeholders to results workshops to engage in dialogue based on case studies.

Recognising the diversity within the Results Community, participants also mentioned the need to develop a common vision and reinforce a shared results culture, supported by enhanced capacity development for results.

### **Theme 3 – Results capacity development**

In terms of capacity development participants differentiated between the national level (household survey providing reliable and quality data); and the programme level (where results data is more complex and expensive to collect). The Results Community see a role for the OECD in supporting greater harmonisation of data amongst partners and providers at different levels, in support of the UN system reporting on SDG progress. They noted a gap between policies and practices within development co-operation agencies, and the scope to learn more from the DAC peer reviews. One issue for partners is the “brain-drain” on statistical capacity at partner country level, which results from the salaries offered by multilateral and bilateral providers compared with the national statistical departments.

## **ANNEX 1: Workshop Agenda**

**Tuesday 10 April 2018**

***09.00-09.30 Coffee and registration***

***09.30-10.00 Welcome***

- Welcome address by Jorge Moreira Da Silva, DCD Director
- Introduction to workshop objectives and format: Rahul Malhotra, Head of Division, DCD/ RREDI

**10.00-12.00 Session 1: Measuring the results of private-sector engagement through development co-operation**

While development partners have significantly increased their activities related to private sector engagement, there is limited evidence of the development results achieved. Yet it is important to ensure that increased engagement with the private sector creates “shared value” and delivers development results for the most vulnerable communities. The session will explore what the Results Community can do to ensure robust measurement and effective use of results information from private sector engagement.

Key questions:

1. How can providers ensure that monitoring systems related to private sector engagement enable them to make informed choices in support of sustainable development outcomes?
2. What existing tools and approaches can practitioners draw on? What components should be developed to measure development results better and trigger optimal use by all stakeholders?
3. How can the Results Community help advance this work - How should we engage other stakeholders?

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

**Panellists:** Armand Rioust de Largentaye/Melusine Detape, AFD; Jim Tanburn, Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED); Julian Frede, DEG; Karen Wilson, OECD Social Impact Investment (SII) Initiative; Jakob Kopperud, World Bank Group

**Discussion paper:** [Measuring the results of private sector engagement through development co-operation](#)

***12.00-13.30 – Lunch break (Roger Ockrent room)***

**Session 2: Learning from new developments in results-based management**

The purpose of sessions 2a & 2b is to expose participants to new developments in results-based management in development co-operation, enabling them to engage in discussion and debate on each of the topics from the perspective of their own agencies.

**Chair:** Rosie Zwart, DCD/ RREDI

**Format:** Presentations on all topics will be made to the plenary; participants will then attend two out of the three corresponding small-group discussions per session.

**13.30-15.30 Session 2a: Learning from new developments in results-based management**

7. Adaptive management and collaborative learning: Kerri DiZoglio, USAID
8. Civil society and results measurement and reporting: Helena Bjuremalm, Sida
9. Working towards results with partner countries: new ways of measuring results orientation and country ownership: Alejandro Guerrero-Ruiz, GPEDC/OECD

15 minute coffee break at 15.30

**15.45-17.45 Session 2b: Learning from new developments in results-based management**

1. Payment by results – building the evidence base: Aishah Afzal, DFID
2. The new SDG focus field: implications for results-based management: Giorgio Gualberti, OECD
3. Leave no-one behind – next steps for the results agenda: Ida McDonnell, OECD (with support from Development Initiatives)

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

**Wednesday 11 April 2018**

**08.30-09.00 Coffee**

**09.00-11.00 Session 3: Better use of data and new technologies for results-based management**

New technologies offer opportunities for development co-operation providers to capture and analyse more and better results data, and some DAC members are developing data and digitalisation strategies and systems and tools which address results. This session focuses on recognising the importance of country-owned data and statistics even as new technologies, more data, and accountability pressures change the way we measure and manage for results in development co-operation.

Key questions:

1. How can new data strategies and systems enable better use of data for results-based decision making by providers and partners?
2. How can providers and partners make use of big data and new technologies to enhance results-based approaches?
3. How can providers ensure that new approaches are shared with partners and support country-owned data in support of the SDGs?

**Chair:** Charlotte Petri-Gornitzka, Chair of the OECD Development Assistance Committee

**Panellists:** K. Casey Dunning, MCC; Jason Symons, NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade; Dr. Victoria Chisala, African Development Bank; Claes Johansson, UNICEF; Paige Kirby, Development Gateway

**Discussion paper:** [Is the Results Community ready and fit to embrace the data revolution?](#)

15 minute coffee break at 11:00

**11.15-12.45 Session 4: Future directions for the results agenda**

Based on feedback from a survey of the Results Community in 2017 three broad themes have emerged for work in 2018, and 2019-20:

1. **Results-based management:** analysing and agreeing on good practice on results-based approaches to development co-operation in the context of the SDGs.
2. **Partnerships for shared results:** undertaking analysis which enables the results agenda to adapt and respond to multi-stakeholder partnerships and changing development finance contexts.
3. **Results capacity development:** disseminating good practice, including to emerging donors and partner countries, thereby contributing to enhanced capacity for results-based management.

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

**Format:** In a facilitated session, participants will discuss and brainstorm in small groups how each of these themes can be taken forward by the Results Community, taking Agenda 2030 and the wider development co-operation landscape into account.

**12.45-13:00 Conclusions on next steps for the OECD DAC/DCD Results Community**

## **ANNEX 2: Links to workshop presentations**

- Session 1: [Measuring the results of the private sector](#)
- Session 3: [Data and new technologies for results-based management](#)
- Session 3: [AFD Proparco Presentation](#)

### **Session 2 presentations:**

- [Adaptive Management Presentation](#)
- [Civil Society Presentation](#)
- [GPECD for results indicators Presentation](#)
- [Payment by results Presentation](#)
- [The new SDG focus field Presentation](#)