



The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development

Results Measurement Working Group Meeting Minutes

Tuesday 2nd July 2013, The Hague, Netherlands

16th August 2013

Participants

Henk van Trigt, Netherlands MoFA (host)

Simon Calvert, DFID

Jack Glen, IEG

Utkir Umarov, IFC

Ola Nilsmo, Sida

Ben Fowler, Market Share Associates

Jason Alferink, AusAID

Birgit Seibel, GIZ

Markus Pilgrim, ILO

Jim Tanburn, DCED Secretariat

Adam Kessler, DCED Secretariat

Part-time: Arnold Jorge, AusAID; Lasse Møller and Henrik Vistisen, Danida; Lilia Naas, ITC

Apologies: Matthias Altmann and Monica Peiro-Vallejo, EC; Merten Sievers, ILO; Lars Christian Oxe, Danida; Claudio Volonte, IFC; Sara Ulväng Flygare, Sida; Margareta de Goys, UNIDO

Member Updates

AusAID: AusAID is developing practical guidance on ways of working with business on aid and development which includes a section on results measurement outlining the value of the DCED Standard for Results Measurement. Jason Alferink is happy to share it with the group once it has been cleared by AusAID.

BMZ/GIZ: Birgit Seibel provided an update of the links between new results measurement guidelines in Germany, and the DCED Standard. The two systems are very similar, although the DCED Standard is 'stricter'. Against the background of the quality criteria of the new measurement guidelines in Germany, three add-ons to the DCED Standard have been identified: 1) DCED Standard requires implementers to build a story around attribution, while BMZ/GIZ results-based monitoring system does not make any reference to attribution. 2) The DCED Standard encourages implementers to estimate the contribution of other donors and programmes where possible, while BMZ/GIZ just requires acknowledgement of the contribution of others in the progress reporting. 3) The DCED Standard requires implementers to measure up to impact level where possible, while BMZ/GIZ projects (module) usually only go up to outcome level; impact level usually falls within BMZ programme level which is made up of several projects (modules), projects however are only required to measure up to outcome level.

BMZ/GIZ have developed a draft menu of PSD results models including a list of indicators.

DFID: Simon Calvert summarised a recent [DFID-funded review of evaluations of 14 M4P programmes, conducted by ITAD](#). Overall findings: 1) Evaluation practice is weak, especially in using a theory of change. 2) There is weak triangulation of data. 3) Quasi-experimental methods were used in a couple of programmes, but were unsuccessful due to the adaptive nature of the programme (which rendered baselines irrelevant) and spill-over effects (which prevented the isolation of a control group.) 4) Qualitative methods were used, but primarily just focus group discussions and interviews – it was unclear how they were conducted and analysed. In conclusion,

the review advocated a deeper use of theory based evaluation, and highlighted the DCED Standard as good practice in this area.

Simon's presentation was followed by a discussion on the increased use of evaluation. Markus Pilgrim highlighted the importance of a solid 'knowledge partner' for the evaluation – a bad evaluation weakens the evidence base. Henk van Trigt also mentioned challenges with inadequate evaluations. Simon Calvert agreed with these concerns, as DFID has invested significantly in evaluations. DFID now needs to synthesise the evaluations and show that they have demonstrated attribution or provided additional knowledge.

ILO: ILO have two DCED audits in the pipeline. They find pre-audits valuable to assuage programme's worries about being 'examined' on their results measurement. They are also conducting three experiments on entrepreneurship training, and Marcus Pilgrim can share the concept notes. Finally, ILO are setting up an internal knowledge portal (www.entxchange.org) to share good practice in results measurement and proposal writing – including indicators, logframe examples, and a forum for staff to ask questions. External visitors can see the Introduction.

IFC: IFC are moving towards an evaluation strategy which will make evaluation a systematic exercise, rather than ad hoc. It is likely to include post-implementation measurement, usually three years after the end of the project.

Netherlands MoFA: Programmes in the MoFA are expected to follow at least the spirit of the DCED Standard. There is a strong pressure for accountability to government, which is leading to a greater investment in results and evaluation. One challenge is the measurement of more universal indicators, especially around employment. Henk van Trigt argued that it is impossible to be precise when measuring the number of jobs created, given issues of sustainability, quality, attribution, direct/indirect etc. There was a lot of interest in this issue in the group, and different opinions on the extent to which it is possible/desirable to give precise numbers of jobs created. Utkir Umarov cited a recent IFC study that aim to establish a methodology for measuring the number of jobs created.

EC: Jim Tanburn presented a recent evaluation of [EU support to PSD](#). Key messages included: 1) EU is a big player in PSD. 2) Funding decisions and policies are often driven by political or macro considerations, apparently more than a narrow focus on results. 3) Macro/meso interventions of the EU have performed better than micro-level interventions. 4) Gaps in results measurement make it difficult to fully assess results achieved.

Update on Working Group Activities

- A team of consultants (Market Share Associates) has been contracted by IFC to expand what the Secretariat can do with the Standard.
- The DCED has moved to version VI of the Standard, which is streamlined and clearer, but otherwise not significantly different to version V.
- Three formal audits have been conducted in the last year, and there is a rapid increase in demand, with 10-12 programmes going for audit in the next year. There is a need for cadre of auditors and solid induction process so that all auditors understand the spirit and letter of the Standard.
- DCED is speaking at a number of external venues about the Standard, including with Danida, Mastercard Foundation, etc.

- Other working groups are working to relate the Standard to their own theme, including for example PSD in conflict-affected environments, business environment reform etc.
- Planning is starting now for a Seminar on results measurement using the DCED Standard, similar to January 2012 conference in Bangkok. March 2014 is the target month.

Update on Market Share Associates Activities by Ben Fowler

- Market Share Associates was contracted by IFC to support the DCED Standard in three main areas:
 - 1) Expanding technical capacity in the Standard,
 - *Achievements:* Training providers identified, 6 interviewed in detail.
 - *Findings:* Mixed demand for formal training. Preference for mixed models of training (external, in-house, consultancy support, mentoring etc.)
 - *Next steps:* Assess the market for providing training in the Standard, and approach existing training providers to 'pitch' the Standard to be included in their courses.
 - 2) Developing technical materials related to the Standard
 - *Achievements:* Developed version 1 of Guidance for Results Measurement in Challenge Funds Using the DCED Standard. Translated version VI of Standard into Spanish and French.
 - *Findings:* Desire for more practical guides, including 'how to guidance' on attribution and measuring systemic change. Desire for communities of practice.
 - *Next steps:* Developing guidance on measuring employment and systemic change. Translating additional Standard materials if time available.
 - 3) Marketing of the Standard.
 - *Achievements:* Assessed donor mentions of the DCED Standard in tender documents, interviewed 8 practitioners.
 - *Findings:* Identified 5 key value-adds of the Standard. Many practitioners follow the Standard as a framework, but not to the letter. Value of pro-active marketing activities; conferences, webinars, practitioner network. Some misunderstandings about the audit process.
 - *Next steps:* Conduct donor interviews, and present Standard to donors based in North America.

Following Ben's presentation, discussion centred on the following points:

- Members expressed support for the finding that a mixture of consultancy experience and training is more desirable than training alone. To promote this might require approaching big consulting firms rather than training specialists. Markus Pilgrim highlighted that one key bottleneck is lack of consultants – so how can they be trained? **Members were asked to send 3-4 names of consultancy firms and contacts within them to Ben for him to contact.**
- When marketing the Standard, Ben should consider whether to go to board level or programme managers of relevant organisations (e.g. World Bank.) **Jack Glen can provide contacts for the World Bank to Ben.**
- Suggestion that MSA consider marketing the Standard to businesses directly, through business associations like the WBCSD, or business consultancy firms like Steward Redqueen. There was some discussion on whether businesses would be interested in using the Standard, and general agreement that it might be of interest to big firms or

businesses particularly interested in their social impact. **Ben should scope this out and explore ways to leverage business interest.**

Future work of the Group

In addition to the work discussed above, the nature of the 2014 event was also considered; in particular:

- Should the event include a broad-based introduction to results measurement (or even PSD), to tempt newcomers, or should it provide a forum for a 'deep dive', with experienced practitioners sharing their problems and solutions together? On balance, it was agreed that the latter was more timely; the IFC event last November in Paris was taken as a good model, as it featured a clinic format where specific cases were presented for discussion by the group. Nonetheless, individual themes might be considered, such as a focus on specific strands of PSD, or on specific measurement techniques and issues.
- Should the event be global or regional? There is substantial demand for regional events; they could also cover topics of more general PSD interest so should probably be considered separately by the Secretariat.
- The event could be to some extent self-financing if participants paid a fee, but this would limit participation. Members therefore discussed whether they might contribute, for example to the cost of the venue and key resource people. **Markus Pilgrim will investigate the possibility that ILO could cost-share on a global event.**
- Jason Alferink pointed out that there are many agendas at the moment that could relate to the work on the Standard, including the post-2015 agenda, G20, the B20 - C20 interface etc. Linking to them could enhance interest in the planned global event.
- The Secretariat was tasked with taking the planning process forward, in consultation with the Group.

There was also some discussion about whether the Group could act as a forum for agreeing indicators and their definitions – partly to harmonise understanding and partly as a step towards rationalising and reducing the number of indicators in use. It was agreed that **members will first share their current agency indicators and definitions with the Group; based on this exchange, Utkir Umarov offered on behalf of IFC to then draft Terms of Reference.**

Another agenda item for the next meeting will be the guide to using the Standard in Challenge Funds, which the Secretariat will circulate to the Group in draft form shortly.

Date of next meeting

It was agreed that the Group should meet next (or connect by teleconference) in September or October. **Simon Calvert noted that DFID Advisors meet in September in London, and that there could be synergies if the Group met around that time; he proposed to check on exact dates and possibilities and revert to the Group.**