Democracy Assistance and Results Management: Ownership and Learning in Action

International IDEA Workshop Report, 2–3 June 2016

www.idea.int

Democracy Assistance and Results Management: Ownership and Learning in Action

International IDEA Workshop Report, 2–3 June 2016

William Sjöstedt

International IDEA resources on political parties, participation and representation

International IDEA
Strömsborg
SE–103 34
Stockholm
SWEDEN
Tel: +46 8 698 37 00, fax: +46 8 20 24 22
Email: info@idea.int, website: www.idea.int

Graphic design by International IDEA

Contents

Executive Summary

On 2–3 June 2016 the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) hosted a workshop, 'Democracy Assistance and Results Management: Ownership and Learning in Action' at its office in Stockholm. The purpose of the workshop was to share experiences of locally led and learning-oriented approaches to the planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME) of democracy-assistance projects and programmes. Results-based PME can play a crucial role in supporting progress, particularly when context, inclusivity, and sensitivity to partners' space for internal accountability are taken into account. This was the third workshop on results management hosted by International IDEA. The long-term objective of this workshop series is to contribute to further movement towards PME approaches that are less focused on upward accountability and control only, and more focused on learning and local ownership. Partner countries' capacities to drive and own democratization and development is crucial, in particular in light of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The workshop's two days each had a distinct focus. The first day saw presentations of different innovative approaches to PME and practical examples of how they had been used. Presenting were practitioners, donors, implementers and consultants, often in chains wherein people occupying different roles in the same programme would speak of their experience. The focus of the second day was action: how can we move forward and reach a wider audience? Participants worked in groups to achieve tangible outputs and planned for the future. This involved one group writing an op-ed on the case for PME approaches that promote ownership and learning; a second group drafted their best advice to peers on evaluation principles and guidelines; a third group formulated a list of 'dos and don'ts' for evidence based adaptive management and learning; and a fourth group drafted a joint action plan on how to initiate and sustain strategic debates on how to change policy and practice with regards to ownership and learning, including how to sustain our network. The ambition was that every participant would leave the workshop with a sense of accomplishment and a clear understanding of what to do next.

The workshop was attended by 28 participants representing many roles in the democracy-assistance field. Attending were donors, practitioners, evaluators, and consultants from organizations including BBC Media Action, Big Push Forward, Christian Aid, the Danish Institute for Parties and Democracy (DIPD), the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), the European Endowment for Democracy (EED), the European External Action Service (EEAS), Global Partners Governance, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), the National Democratic Institute (NDI), the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD), Christian Democratic International Center (KIC), SPM Consultants, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Westminster Foundation for Democracy.

A survey was sent to the participants to assess the quality of the workshop. A total of 19 participants responded to the survey. All of the respondents had either a very positive general impression of the workshop or a somewhat positive impression of it, with 73 per cent of respondents being very positive. These percentages were exactly duplicated when asked to evaluate whether workshop was a learning opportunity. When asked about their main takeaways from the workshop, many interesting answers were given including: 'All results assessment methods require work, time and money—there is no such thing as zero-cost accountability' and 'the need to separate a bit "planning, monitoring, reporting" from "evaluation" as they are not the same thing.'

When asked what actions the participants intended to take as a result of the workshop, answers included writing policy documents, discussion papers, op-eds or thought pieces. Many said they would try to bring in methods learned, convince colleagues and try to move their organisations towards a more participative direction. Another outcome was that they were planning to keep in touch with other participants and use the network created at these workshops. Two participants are tentatively planning on holding similar workshops, picking up the baton. It would appear fair to claim success, bearing in mind that the goals of the workshop were to nurture greater awareness of these methods, spreading them beyond the participants of the workshop, and to make sure that this community would remain intact, and grow.

1. Background

On 23–24 June 2014 the Democracy and Development Programme at International IDEA organized a round table, 'Democracy Assistance and Results: Debates and Constructive Reflection' to facilitate open and forward-looking discussions on the challenges (and opportunities) of applying results management to democracy assistance.[1] Building on the key takeaways from this event, a follow-up workshop was organized on 1–2 December 2015, entitled 'Democracy Assistance and Results Management: from Upward Accountability and Control to Ownership and Learning'.[2] Both events form part of International IDEA's project Democracy in the Development Agenda, one of the objectives of which is to contribute to knowledge and debates about democracy assistance and results management. The purpose of the second event was to explore how the democracy support community and its partners could carve out more space for the learning dimensions of results management (as opposed to the current tilt towards the control dimensions) by using combinations of methods which can fulfil donors' need for results, as well as partners' needs for reflection, analysis and continued improvement. During this workshop a format called 'Open Space' was used, inspired by the fact that extensive coffee-breaks are the most appreciated aspect of many conferences. The workshop had no formal lectures or invited speakers but was truly open ended and collaborative.

After the second workshop in Stockholm, a survey was sent out to participants. The most common comment in the survey was that there is need for a structured way of sharing the variety of alternative practices, followed by more open and participatory discussions. This inspired the current workshop's format, which featured one day of formal sharing of experiences on learning and ownership in results management, and one action-oriented day of activities which was more open ended.

1 The 'Democracy Assistance and Results: Debates and Constructive Reflection' workshop report can be accessed online: <http://www.idea.int/resources/analysis/democracy-assistance-and-results-debates-and-constructive-reflection.cfm>.

2 The 'Democracy Assistance and Results Management: from Upward Accountability and Control to Ownership and Learning' workshop report can be accessed online: <http://www.idea.int/development/upload/DD-Democracy-Assistance-and-Results-Management-2015-Workshop-Report.pdf>.

2. Day One: Formal sharing of experiences on how to foster learning and ownership in results management

The purpose of the first day was to allow for those who have tried alternative ways of evaluation, results management and planning to share their experiences. They did this in four groups throughout the day in 'chains' of actors—for instance, a donor, evaluator and local partner working on the same project/programme—presented their experiences of using an alternative PME approach, from different perspectives. The individuals who have succeeded in introducing and institutionalizing alternative ways of thinking about and managing democracy assistance in their organizations spoke about the processes of change that they have contributed to, and the results of these processes.

Opening of sessions

Many of the participants at the workshop had also attended the first and second workshops. Setting the tone, Helena Bjuremalm, Senior Programme Manager with the Democracy and Development Programme at International IDEA explained that, while this would be the final workshop hosted by International IDEA, the work and the conversation should continue. Rather than ending the race, International IDEA is merely handing over the baton to the next runner in the relay. She encouraged all participants to consider ways in which they can continue the work started by these workshops. Further putting impetus into continuing this movement, one participant claimed that these are crucial times for democracy as well as democracy assistance. The marketization of our societies, increasing inequalities around the globe, and the climate crisis are great political challenges. To face them we must revert to thinking about democracy as a goal in its own right rather than merely a tool; and economic issues need to become part of the political space again. This will necessitate rethinking how we view outcomes of the democratic system, the participant said. Learning and ownership in evaluation could be helpful in creating much needed new economic theories placing the citizen at the centre rather than profits, new theories of change, and new global governing structures which will be needed to tackle these problems.

Anna Godfrey of BBC Media Action presented a short 'appetizer' meant to set the tone and get the participants' minds going. BBC Media Action's work focuses on using media and communication to support development. She explained that over the past 10 years, they have developed a strong focus on embedding research and evaluation into delivery, and now have approximately 100 researchers worldwide. This team also has a strong focus on sharing research with external audiences through research briefings, policy briefings, events and blogs. Despite this effort, much of the ongoing iterative learning you gain during projects was getting lost: the 'learning from doing'. They sat on top of an untapped resource. To capture and share that knowledge they created 'practice briefings' which aim to capture reflections of and learnings from practice in using media and communication to deliver development outcomes. They made one of the briefings in the form of a video about bonded labour in India, and she showed a short clip from that.[3] The next briefing, a written report will focus on learning on the role of media and communications in supporting the response to Ebola in West Africa.

NED and NDI: Principles and practice of democratic evaluations—perspectives from a donor and a practitioner

The purpose of this session was to share concrete examples from a donor–practitioner chain, highlighting their approaches to evaluating democracy assistance programming. The presentation demonstrated how an aligned approach and set of principles for democratic evaluation not only emphasizes strategic learning in evaluation, but engenders innovative methodologies and empowers local partners in the evaluation. Starting the session was Rebekah Usatin, Manager for Program Monitoring and Evaluation at the National Endowment for Democracy (NED). She shared NED's approach to cumulative assessments which are long-term assessments meant to facilitate learning.

Rebekah began by underlining the importance of aligning the values of democracy in evaluation of democracy assistance. Evaluation is fundamentally about values and therefore NED has attempted to align its values in evaluation with their values as a democracy assistance grant maker. The values presented were:

1. *Evaluative learning*. There is a constant battle between learning, ownership and accountability. NED's evaluation policies and procedures attempt to draw out the learning and create evaluative thinking. Rebekah repeatedly mentioned that NED's approach to evaluation emphasizes thinking rather than anything else.

2. *Bottom-up evaluation.* Like NED's overall approach to grant making, its approach to evaluation is bottom-up. NED does not issue requests for proposals on pre-identified subjects but instead accepts grant applications on a rolling basis that are developed by the prospective grantee organization. NED does not use or ask for log frames, asking instead for an evaluation plan wherein the grantees share their goals and what would constitute a success, as well as how they would measure the level of success.

3. *Innovation and flexibility.* NED recognizes that in order to learn you must be willing to risk failure. Trying new things carries an inherent risk that NED has been willing to take.

---

3 The film, titled 'Using design thinking to prevent bonded labour in India: Majboor Kisko Bola!', can be accessed on YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RHOZfmDkNKg>

One example that demonstrates how these values have been translated into practice is NED's change from requiring annual evaluation reports from grantees to cumulative assessments every 3–5 years. Due to their funding arrangements, most grants were given on a year-by-year basis. They were rarely satisfied with their end-term evaluation reports as you often do not see change within a year. Therefore they were looking for a way to capture evaluative learning over a longer period, as well as avoid the stress of predetermined outcomes. When constructing cumulative assessments, they made sure to be flexible in terms of what methods would be used, and let evaluations run through several projects with the overarching goal of achieving evaluative and strategic thinking. Instead of an end of year report, they started doing broader cumulative assessments over periods of 3–5 years.

They began doing cumulative assessments with the discretionary grantees. She discussed the challenge of making it work initially; it required the partners to substantially change their way of thinking. It was also challenging for the program officers, who were the chief communicators but did not always manage to facilitate the information. Yet, she stressed that even when the reports did not turn out very well, the relationship between program officer and grantee is still valuable. Cumulative assessments are not only about the report, but the process as well.

Speaking next was Linda Stern from the National Democratic Institute (NDI), who was invited to speak about NDI's approach to democratic evaluation in different parts of the world. She began by explaining that NDI does not prefer one methodological approach over another. Rather, the Institute believes that the right evaluation methods are those best-suited to answer the evaluation questions being posed. As a consequence, NDI uses diversified methods—from randomized controlled trials (RCTs), to fully participatory evaluations in partnership with local democratic actors such as Roma political activists in Slovakia.

Linda Stern briefly reviewed the inherent challenges in evaluating democracy assistance programs. For example, in difficult contexts the nature of change is often non-linear with many actors and factors affecting the democratic process. Moreover, their programs are often short-term and geographically focused, making it difficult to capture the long-term, down-stream effects of the work. In addition, the incentive structures and alliances of voluntary political associations such as political parties, caucuses and coalitions, are often hidden and therefore difficult to assess. Lastly, sensitive issues such as gender and ethnic inclusions are not easy to evaluate beyond establishing parity in participation.

Linda Stern went on to share some promising methods NDI has developed to evaluate inclusive democracy assistance. She explained that participatory methods can be placed on a continuum of 'instrumental' to 'transformative' participation. That is, fully participatory methods are transformative and empowering for those closest to the issue under evaluation. On the other side of the spectrum, participatory methods that tend to be consultative and extractive of data are instrumental for the evaluator or programme 'owners', but not necessarily for those people closest to the issue under evaluation.

Linda presented the four key principles of NDI's Deliberative Evaluation Methods for data collection and analysis:

1. Methods should be inclusive of those closest to the issues under evaluation.

2. The instruments should be user appropriate.

3. Data should be generated in real-time.

4. Participants should co-construct knowledge with the evaluator.

The rest of the session Linda shared four methods that NDI has used in different contexts, beginning with discrete participatory methods (instrumental) to fully participatory methods (transformative).

The first deliberative method presented that Linda has developed was the matrix ranking tool. This method was used in Cambodia as part of a mixed-methods randomized controlled trial (RCT) that attempted to measure the impacts of large town hall meetings with parliamentarians on rural citizens' knowledge, attitudes and behaviour. NDI also wanted to evaluate if there would be a differential impact on citizens who also had the opportunity to deliberate on their problems and solutions before the town hall meetings. Therefore they introduced the matrix ranking tool to a random group of citizens the day before the town hall meeting. Participants first brainstormed on the issues they faced in their villages, then voted on which issues were the most important to address. These were placed in the matrix. The second step was to identify two solutions to each problem:

1. An internal solution that they could take action on themselves.

2. An external solution that they could advocate for in the town hall meetings.

The last step was to vote for the top solutions to act upon. Lastly, participants reflected on why these problems and solutions emerged as group priorities. Linda pointed out that the matrix ranking tool was an example of the participatory principles of inclusion, user-friendly instruments and the generation of data in real time.

The second method presented was participatory social network analysis. A survey based method, social network analysis (SNA) maps and measures the relationships and interactions within a network, creating a visual and mathematical analysis of an organization. Linda shared how NDI made SNA more participatory in Burkina Faso, using it with a women's rights coalition during a midterm evaluation. After visualizing the SNA data, the evaluation team facilitated an interpretation session with the coalition membership to discuss the coalition's effectiveness, as well as the level of collaboration and sustainability of the network. This not only put into practice the principles of the co-construction of knowledge, but facilitated evaluation utilization and learning within the partner network.

The third method Linda developed was participatory story analysis which NDI used in Guatemala and Burkina Faso to capture the voice of local councilwomen and engage them more fully in the evaluation of their programmes. NDI's programme was a training of trainers approach for local councilwomen (Burkina Faso) and civic activists (Guatemala), who would return to their communities to mobilize other women around issues of interest. However, the isolation of these communities as well as low levels of literacy made it difficult to assess the downstream effects of these projects. Therefore, at the beginning of the evaluations, the NDI evaluation team trained the participants in visual storytelling and armed them with disposable cameras to return to their communities to document the context, the problems, the actions they took and the solutions they created for their communities. Toward the end of the evaluation, the women returned from their communities to tell their stories to each other through photographs. The women then analysed their narratives, identifying common and divergent themes in their stories. Linda pointed out that Participatory Story Analysis was an example of all four DEM principles of inclusion, appropriate instruments, real-time data and the co-construction of knowledge.

The last approach Linda presented was community-based participatory research (CBPR) that NDI is doing in partnership with Roma activists in Slovakia. NDI's program had worked with Roma political activists for over ten years and wanted to implement a retrospective evaluation of its work. The CBPR evaluation is fully participatory and local Roma partners are involved in a ten step process, with each step involving more and more Roma stakeholders. This includes working with a Roma Advisory Committee and Roma Research Assistants to develop the evaluation questions, identify the communities, co-design the evaluation methods and collect and analyse community data, using many of the participatory methods outlined above.

Linda highlighted a method called 'transect walk' in which two Roma research assistants walked along a pre-determined line or transect with a community guide, documenting what was on the right and left sides of the transect line. During the transect walk Roma Research Assistants invited people to take part in participatory matrix ranking and timeline exercises where they would analyse changes in Roma voice, political space and public accountability over the last 10 years in their communities. The research assistants also kept reflection journals about their experiences. Going forward, NDI will hold data interpretation sessions with the Roma representatives from the 10 communities and identify ways to use the findings for advocacy. Linda noted that the goal of the Roma CBPR evaluation was transformative, meant to empower Roma partners as joint owners in the evaluation and to promote 'downward accountability' between NDI and its Roma partners.

During the Q&A session Rebekah was asked how actual evaluations are done at the NED. She reiterated that with the discretionary grants they ask the grantees how they want to evaluate, and go from there. There are guiding questions to clarify their expectations, but there is a lot of freedom.

Further, Linda was asked whether the tools she discussed were developed top-down, and where the ownership of the tools resides. She answered by first clarifying that no evaluation process should begin with the methods. Rather, evaluation design begins with evaluation questions. She said that you never lead with a method, and if it is truly participatory you design the evaluation questions and methods together, as in the Roma example. However, she also added that the level of participation can be set on different points of the continuum.

The Program for Young Politicians in Africa (PYPA): using 'learning evaluations' perspectives from funders, practitioners and evaluators

This session featured funders, practitioners, and evaluators sharing their experiences doing on-going and learning evaluation of the Program for Young Politicians in Africa (PYPA). Presenting were Annika Rigö, coordinator for PYPA on behalf of four Swedish political party foundations and Deputy Secretary General of the Christian Democratic International Center (KIC); Emmy Otim, East Africa Manager of PYPA; and Monica Johansson and Elin Ekström, evaluators of PYPA.

PYPA is a capacity-strengthening program aiming to contribute to a more democratic, representative, and non-discriminatory political system in ten program countries, with the specific objective to increase the participation and influence of young people in politics. PYPA uses on-going and learning evaluation because KIC were unsatisfied with the evaluations they had commissioned previously. While the evaluation process included an interview with someone from the main office and perhaps someone in the field, KIC did not learn much from that process. Most of the findings were already known, and the rest were often not very helpful as the project was already over.

Learning and on-going evaluations replaces the traditional mid – and end term evaluations and is a parallel process aimed at creating conditions for continuous learning. By conveying and spreading empirical findings to the actors involved in the implementation of the program, the joint learning is enhanced through exchange of reflections and knowledge thus improving the program implementation.

Malin Stjernström, the moderator, opened by asking what benefits they saw with using on-going and learning evaluations over more traditional results based approaches. They answered that the most significant benefit was the way in which it facilitates effective learning. They had scheduled reflections continually, including time where the Swedish organizations met with local implementers. Given the specific contextual needs of each country of operations and the changing dynamics of democracy support, learning in a flexible way is imperative.

It was noted that having on-going evaluations lead to a better relationship between implementer and evaluator. The method builds trust and comfort in interaction. This is also true for participants. When using other methods it is common that people do not feel comfortable reporting problems for fear of losing funding, which hampers learning.

The relationship created and the reflection sessions allowed for on-the-fly changes to the program. It was possible to handle problems immediately as they come up. This also created a sense of ownership for the participants. When facilitators change the content of a training due to feedback, participants can see that the program is shaped by their needs. This creates an understanding that evaluation is meant to make the program better for them, not only to show the donors that they are active. Emmy Otim, who is a facilitator of the program, described it as an important step in combating 'evaluation fatigue' amongst the participants creating ownership.

The presenters also underlined the capacity for capturing results that were previously missed. The method allows for reporting unexpected results as well as anecdotes and behavioural change that the implementers knew had happened but previously could not report in a structured way. It also allowed them to capture results that seemed negative at first but turned out to be positive. Monica Johansson, one of the evaluators took gender discrimination as an example. When asked more participants reported feeling discriminated against than before the program started. Initially they were disappointed by the results but soon they understood that it was a by-product of increased awareness of discrimination.

The next question was related to the challenges with doing on-going and learning evaluations. The group said that the most pressing difficulty were the resources required. Working with different methods and having evaluators in the countries requires significant resources that are not always available. It is therefore very important to have the funders on board with the process.

They also noted that it is difficult to move away from logical framework analysis, for funders and implementers alike. It can be difficult to not think in set patterns. Annika Rigö, the coordinator of PYPA called it a 'culture shock' of sorts. It was difficult to avoid approaching the project in the usual ways and expecting to get clear-cut answers of what was good or bad, whereas the evaluators focused on the learning processes. The evaluators underlined that learning and ongoing evaluation also deals with results and although focusing on more on qualitative methods it is still scientifically rigorous.

The last question from the moderator was what tips they could give an organization considering doing on-going and learning evaluation. The first advice was an enthusiastic: 'Go for it!' and the others were more practical. Elin Ekström, one of the evaluators put emphasis on trusting the evaluations methods, because change takes time and results may be not be immediate. They also spoke of the importance of respecting the participants, having a joint understanding of the project between implementers and evaluators as well as having the funders be a part of the process.

A lively Q&A concluded the session. It delved into the processes in a more practical manner with questions regarding the time spent on reflections, how findings were presented and how much time evaluators spent with participants. The session also explored the more theoretical matters, for instance, what is fundamentally meant by the word 'evaluation'. A participant asked if this is a method of evaluation or implementation and the differences were discussed in detail.

During the Q&A session, consequence of using on-going evaluation came up, PYPA participants themselves feel much more comfortable with the evaluators. Since the evaluators interact with participants directly in relaxed settings, such as by the campfire, they feel more secure. This openness breeds better and more honest evaluations.

PYPA representatives were also asked about their analytical frameworks. They answered by talking about the value of coming from different academic backgrounds including sociology and political science. But even though they came from different backgrounds and are used to thinking in different ways they are all still learning just as much.

Learning-based management in practice: examples from a Sida outcome-mapping initiative with CSOs in Rwanda

This part of the agenda began with a pre-recorded video interview with Joakim Molander, Head of the Unit for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation at the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) followed by a Skype discussion with Kevin Kelpin, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) specialist at Lucid Collaborative.

In 2012–15 the Embassy of Sweden in Rwanda introduced Outcome Mapping as an alternative to logical frameworks to their civil society partners within the areas of democracy, human rights and peacebuilding. Outcome Mapping is a project management method focusing on changes in behaviours, relationships and activities among organizations, groups or individuals. Outcome Mapping builds on the assumption that change processes are complex and non-linear.

Joakim started the session by saying that the main reason they started using outcome mapping was that they had numerous projects that aimed to achieve behavioural and complex change. Outcome mapping is specifically designed to evaluate behaviour change and changes in relationships. The starting point was seeing that the planning model was fit for purpose. Outcome mapping, he explained is a project planning model which begins with considering what change of behaviour/relationship you wish to achieve. You design the indicators based on the objectives you set up at that point. Due to the difficulty of quantifying these changes, the projects used a mixed method approach with quantitative and qualitative indicators.

The main difference from LFA is the focus on behaviour change; an outcome is defined as a change in behaviour. It forces focus on tangible results, rather than grand-scheme outcomes or simply measuring what is quantifiable, such as the number of activities or similar. It is also more iterative, you can change both the objectives and indicators as you go along. When asked how they tracked changes in behaviour, Joakim started by clarifying that the method does not specify how to measure changes in behaviour, it is rather about a method of identifying progress markers.

He was then asked what concerns donors and partners had when confronted with outcome mapping. He spoke about how it was difficult to get a donor to find a compromise between outcome mapping and LFAs, even though it was easier for a donor, such as Sida, speaking to a co-donor to get them to try something new then it would have been for a NGO, it was still difficult. After long discussions the two donors agreed to use outcome mapping for daily purposes while retaining some strict indicators for reporting purposes. When it came to partners: the main challenge was partners being unaware of outcome mapping. Sida does not force methods upon partners, and many partners had little experience working with comparable methods or in some cases even qualitative data. Sida used consultants to build this capacity.

The last question to Joakim was what he would have done differently in this project, if he had the chance. He started by saying that he had used outcome mapping before in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that his main take-away from that was the need to have a consultant who took significant time to help with designing the outcome mapping systems—the consultant was not there for a for just a workshop or two but for years, albeit not fulltime. One thing he would do differently is making sure that partners spend enough time designing their outcome mapping, especially at the outset of the project.

The session ended with Joakim asking Kevin Kelpin, the next speaker in line, if he could elaborate on how he worked with partners when it came to challenges in introducing outcome mapping. Kevin Kelpin answered that it is somewhat of a paradigm shift in thinking—it is not something you do frantically at the end of the project cycle but as part of the work on an everyday basis. It is a shift away from the traditional end of term reporting of quantitative results, and towards an approach geared more towards transformative change over time. Another change is that evaluation is no longer someone else's job; all staff do it on an ongoing basis. He underlined the importance of the reflective period that all must be a part of and the learning created.

When asked about the benefits of outcome mapping, Kevin started by discussing the reflective sessions. They bring in not only the implementers but the community members as well to make sure that what they do actually works. This also had the effect that community members could see that implementers were working for them and not for the donors. It also allows for a better understanding of the effects of outputs rather than focusing on the outputs themselves. Rather than focusing on (for instance) how many workshops were held and how many attended them, outcome mapping allows for focusing on the effects of the workshops. He said it is imperative to have a strong management team to get the most out of outcome mapping.

The moderator then shifted focus and asked him what advice he would give to anyone considering doing outcome mapping. For donors he recommended that they prioritize capacity strengthening to make sure that there is a strong monitoring process. He also reiterated what Joakim Molander said earlier in the session that is very useful to have someone working on this throughout the whole process.

For partners he recommended to consider that there is a steep learning curve. Consider whom you need to work with, why those groups and what you actually want to achieve; this will be more meaningful in the long run. It is about evaluative thinking rather than pure monitoring and evaluation. Partners should also be consider that it is important to combine quantitative and qualitative data.

The presentation was followed by a Q&A session with Kevin Kelpin. The first question was phrased from a donors perspective; donors often prioritize questions on 'how the money is spent', so how do you handle that? He answered that he dreams of the day when all donors agree and use the same log frame. He then reiterated that outcome mapping does not forego qualitative data. It is a mixed method wherein the two approaches together enhance each other.

He was also asked if the log frame approach is still suitable for its purpose of monitoring the outcome of projects and if it is in line with outcome mapping methods. He answered that the log frame is still relevant and should be kept in mind. One of the reasons is that donors require reporting in the form of log frame. However, learning based management is at the core of the work and is what is used for monitoring and thinking. It is afterwards that you put the information gathered into the correct boxes.

Building institutional resilience through behaviour change: experience from the Iraqi Parliament by Global Partners Governance

Greg Power, director of Global Partners Governance (GPG) was the sole speaker in this session. He presented GPG's KAPE (knowledge, application, practice, effect) approach to project design and measurement, particularly drawing on their experience of support to the Iraqi parliament in 2008–16 to explain the method.

KAPE is a method of achieving long-term changes to the performance of political institutions, by focusing as much on behaviour as structure. In the past too much programming has focused on structures, processes and resources. Yet in most political institutions (and especially parliaments) there is a gap between what the institution should do in theory and what it does in practice. In places like Afghanistan or Iraq, while the institutional architecture looks sound, the operation of politics is very different. The key is to understand why that gap exists, and then work out how to narrow it.

Greg began by saying that the KAPE approach was born out of necessity. Log frames do not capture all the relevant factors in GPG's projects in places like Iraq, Jordan or Libya. So they had to come up with something different which captured outcomes as much as processes, performance as much as institutional structure, and enabled flexible delivery and adaptation to often volatile political situations.

Citing GPG's previous paper on log frames and football, he highlighted the weakness of log frame in terms of linear progress, and their dependence on accurate predictions of what would happen in a project.[4]

Using the football analogy, logical frameworks assume a direct route towards the opposition's goal. In reality, a match will involve running back and forward, side to side and passing in complex and unexpected patterns, just as happens in project delivery. You cannot predict this in advance. A log frame or other project document should set the strategy and the tactics, but not be asked to predict every movement of the ball. Greg described it in this way: 'KAPE aims to break the myth of implementer omnipotence—the idea that the person writing the proposal knows all the solutions in advance. That is not how policies work, and is completely at odds with the idea of local ownership.'

He then set out three principles underpinning KAPE. First, behaviour is as important as structure. It is no good giving a parliament more powers, unless MPs have the understanding, will and incentive to use them. Second, you do not learn how to do the job by being trained. Training can help, but you learn ultimately by doing. In parliaments, as in most organisations, you watch what other people are doing for accepted custom and practice, and you try to fit in by copying them. Instead of simply training, programming should aim to create such behavioural norms where they can. Third, the most innovative institutional change tends to start small, within one part of the organization experimenting or doing things differently. Programmes should aim to create these pockets of good practice, and then aim for a ripple effect across the organization.

4 See 'The logframe and the beautiful game: Project logic v football logic', <http://www.gpgovernance.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Politically-Agile-Programming-paper-1.pdf>.

Image: workshop participants (International IDEA/Lisa Hagman)

KAPE has four stages and utilizes both quantitative and qualitative measurements in all stages:

1. *Knowledge*. In this stage, knowledge is gathered and supplied. In measuring progress the questions to ask are 'Was knowledge supplied?', 'What knowledge was supplied?' (quantitative measurements) and 'was it useful?', 'Were stakeholders satisfied?' (qualitative measurements).

2. *Application*. In this stage, activities are designed to help stakeholders apply the knowledge (measured quantitatively). It is measured by if the application has changed behaviour (a qualitative measure).

3. *Practice*. At this stage activities encouraging repeated use of good behaviour, new patterns of behaviour and new practices are carried out and measured quantitatively. This is followed by the qualitative question whether the new practices had any impact on performance.

4. *Effect*. Effect can then be measured first by seeing which activities have been embedded in institutional culture (quantitative) and its impact on performance which will need to be measured both quantitatively and qualitatively.

He explained that in 2008, when GPG started working with the Iraq parliament, it faced huge problems. There was a lack of trust and political culture, little common sense of purpose and continual disagreement about what the rules meant. Over the next few years, GPG worked with several committees and succeeded in turning them into pockets of good practice. They then also worked with the Speaker's Office and key parliamentary directorates to ensure that these lessons were disseminated and emulated across the parliament.

So, working with a parliamentary committee using KAPE meant:

1. *Knowledge*: Understanding what project interlocutors want to achieve, help to understand the nature of the problem, and collectively identify solutions. For these committees it started with basic advice on process, practice and procedure, ranging from job descriptions for staff, to planning committee enquiries to implementing an annual strategy.

2. *Application*: The next phase is to find ways of implementing these new skills and techniques to manage daily problems or change existing practices. It means being able to utilise opportunities as they arise to find practical application for new skills and processes. The project thus worked with the Committees to improve internal organisation, deliver enquiries and question ministers.

3. *Practice*: The third phase in the KAPE process is where GPG seeks to entrench new ways of working for the long-term by repeating and refining the reforms, processes and techniques so that they become standard practices. With parliamentary committees in Iraq, this involved reflecting with MPs and staff, developing core guidance and repeating the processes, so that the committee was establishing a standard way of working and accepted norms.

4. *Effect*: The final phase is looking for wider effect. Although the KAPE model often relies on targeted support to individual offices or committees, the intention is to ensure a ripple effect across the institution to have a much wider impact on practice and performance. This 'replication' is achieved in many ways, but in Iraq involved working directly with the Speaker and Parliamentary Directorate to establish central guidance and institution-wide standards for all committees, which was based on GPG's work with individual committees.

During the Q&A session, a participant asked how you achieve lasting change in volatile political environments. Greg mentioned that in many new parliaments turnover of MPs can be as high as 70 per cent or 80 per cent each election, and the problem for many traditional programmes was that all the work invested in MPs was lost at each election. The key to GPG's KAPE approach was to find 'self-sustaining' reforms that apply to all MPs, so that reforms play to the incentives of politicians and they are the ones that they embed the changes. Projects should also be creating institutional memory by working with key staff and offices such as that of the Speaker to entrench these changes in the rule or guidance coming from the centre. Successful committees should be encouraged to highlight their success, and simply ensuring that they wrote down their procedures in a Committee handbook meant that they were starting to build that institutional memory.

Ending the day was a reflective session were all participants had a chance to briefly give their impressions of the day. Many commented that they were inspired and would need to take some time to digest all the days' impressions.

3. Day Two: On paradigm shifts and four action labs

The second day started with a surprise: two classical musicians from the Royal Opera and the Swedish Radio Symphony Orchestra, respectively, were invited to perform, opening the day in the creative spirit. After the music, participants began recapping the first day, trying to find the through lines between the disparate concepts. Reconnecting with the opening of the first day, a participant talked about the term ‘results-based management’ and its interconnectedness with a larger neo-liberal project. The participant said that there are a few assumptions that underpin the term, including that change is technical and can be controlled; that all share a common understanding of change; that informal relationships are unimportant; that people are rational actors; and that knowledge is easily available and can be quantified and captured without problem. It was argued that these assumptions kept coming up the day before, in all the presentations. The day before included presentations of alternative assumptions that may avoid the problems associated.

The facilitators discussed the nature of a paradigm shift: how we need to continually work in the old paradigm while creating the new. They said that it is difficult because there is so much evidence of the old method’s efficiency not yet enough evidence that the new will work—therefore, we must believe in what we do, work together and learn from one another.

Action Labs

The goal of the second day was that every participant would leave with a sense of accomplishment and a clear vision of the way forward. To do this, the participants spent the whole day creating plans of action, in so-called Action Lab sessions. This part of the workshop saw participants collaborating in groups to achieve tangible outputs. The over-arching goals of these sessions is to spread the word beyond the people attending the conference, documenting alternative strategies as well as creating channels to keep the network created by these workshops alive.The participants divided themselves into four groups:

- Group 1 created a first draft of an op-ed on the case for PME approaches that promote ownership and learning;
- Group 2 drafted their best advice to peers on evaluation principles and guidelines;
- Group 3 drafted a joint action plan on how to initiate and sustain strategic debates on how to change policy and practice with regards to ownership and learning, including how to sustain the network; and

Image: workshop participants (International IDEA/Lisa Hagman)

- Group 4 formulated ‘dos and don’ts’ for evidence based adaptive management and learning. All the group’s drafts are included as annexes.

The groups began by creating a first draft, a one-page document based on the assignment. One person on each table had a laptop and all took part in the discussions. This had the function of sharing the ownership of the documents and bringing in feedback from multiple directions. After the first drafts were done, they were printed in a large format and put up around the room for people to read and comment on, with participants writing on the paper directly to indicate ideas and give feedback. After the draft ‘vernissage’ the groups went back to their tables to finalize a second draft with the input gained.

The plans the groups had constructed were then presented to all workshop participants. Group 1 was tasked with writing an op-ed promoting ownership and learning in evaluation. Many participants were interested in helping with the further drafting of this document in the future but there was worries about the difficulties of making the op-ed relevant for democracy assistance specifically.

Group 2 changed its topic slightly from what was on the agenda, focusing instead on ‘Principles and guidelines for evidence based adaptive management and learning: formulation of dos and don’ts’. The group discussed the need to cater the text to the specific needs of democracy assistance, that there are backlashes such as a regime striking back and so on.

Group 3 was tasked with making a plan for sustaining the network created by these workshops, given that International IDEA will no longer act as the host. The group decided that a steering committee would be created with members from the room, and that for the time being anyone could join.

Group 4 wrote a list of arguments for using adaptive programming in democracy assistance. The group members began by considering what donors would find important and constructed their arguments from that base.

The next step in the Action Labs methodology is agreeing on plans of action for the future. This involved agreeing on specific actions and who to take them. It was agreed that Cathy Shutt would be the first person to work on fixing the op-ed which began its life in Group 1. It would then be circulated within the group and then shared with the rest for comments.

Group 2 agreed that Annika Rigö would finalize the draft about adaptive learning and that it would then be shared for comments with the rest of the participants.

Group 3 had been tasked with keeping the network alive and had decided that a steering committee would be set up and that anyone could join in the beginning if they choose. During this session, in the plenary, it was decided that the first members of the steering committee would be Anna Godfrey of BBC Media Action, Emmy Otim from PYPA, Helena Bjuremalm of International IDEA, JoAnn Sneddon of the Westminister Foundation, Linda Stern from NDI, Norah Babic from the IPU, Per Nordlund from Sida and Rebekah Usatin from the NED. It was also decided that the network would be allowed to grow but would be limited to the democracy assistance community.

Group 4, which had written a list of arguments for donors, decided that its document would be better suited as a living document in which people could look at the arguments and add new ones as they wanted, rather than a formally decided-on document. Therefore it was decided that it would be uploaded to Google Docs and remain there as a resource for the group.[5]

5 The document can be edited by anyone at <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1jqhxqLxW5L-3pKyvI2NplkAUAfj-UIWuu_bggLWVGWM/edit?usp=sharing>.

4. Conclusion: next steps

The day ended with a reflection by all participants. One participant had gone from 'confused' to 'excited with a very large dose of realism' and referenced the first day's discussion of reclaiming democracy as a goal. The same participant said that it is time for people in the democracy-assistance community to solve their terminological problems. It was argued that, if it is unclear to the people within the room what some terms mean and how they differ from each other, how would anyone outside the room ever understand.

All participants were invited to share, in one sentence, their main takeaways from the workshop. The recurring theme was that people were 'inspired and ready to take action', either by bringing new learning back to their workplaces or by keeping the movement alive. The group could move on in confidence, knowing that they had a joint action plan for the future which included the following:

1. Continued drafting of the op-ed arguing for PME approaches that promote ownership and learning, which will be started by Group 1 (which created the first draft) and then shared for comments with the rest of the participants.

2. The draft for principles and guidelines for evidence based adaptive management and learning will be uploaded to Google Docs and be kept there as a living document to be expanded continuously and inspire people.

3. The newly founded steering committee will coordinate any upcoming workshops and events, based partially on the themes suggested by the participants in the survey (the suggested themes can be found in Annex E).

4. International IDEA will produce a Discussion Paper and a Policy Brief partly based on what has been said at this workshop, as well as an audio collage made from interviews with workshop participants.

5. The group agreed to keep in contact, either via email or in the newly formed LinkedIn group 'Innovations in Results Management of Democracy Assistance'.[6]

Formally concluding the workshop, Helena Bjuremalm said that all participants should be proud of what they are achieving. She reiterated that all participants are part of a movement which is quite likely to influence policy and practice towards more locally-led and learning-oriented approaches to results management in democracy assistance. While International IDEA's part as a host of the relay is over, the next step and the steps after promise to be even more successful. The prospects for the movement look bright.

6 The LinkedIn group can be accessed online: <https://www.linkedin.com/groups/8528584>.

Annex A. Action Lab drafts

Group 1: Op-ed on PME approaches that promote ownership and learning

This version of the document was created during the workshop, and is currently being worked on by participants in the group. A newer version will soon be sent around for comments by all participants. The current version can be found on Google Docs.[7]

Add where we are, what we mean by ‘learning’, PME and other key concepts, including references to the danger of ‘marketization of democracy support’

Add an argument to ‘reclaim the agenda’

1. Everyone in democracy assistance wants their work to contribute to results defined in terms of locally owned transformative ……. change
2. However there are debates about the most effective ways to monitor evaluate and learn about whether democracy approaches used are effective
3. This op-ed makes the case that planning monitoring and evaluation approaches that are
4. effective approaches for managing, learning and adapting in unpredictable democracy assistance programmes
5. consistent with values that can help to contribute to:
6. Local ownership and learning that enhances sustainable impact
7. Data available for evaluating impact (note assumption this is one data source and others would be needed)
8. PM&E definition: approaches vary and can be
9. extractive used to increase accountability to donors
10. or transformative to increase our accountability to enhance citizens learning and ownership
11. Examples/evidence:

7 Access the draft on Google Docs: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1BPJtzbgPkiYUyoR2kGu-YIU2uql29lXVLaDvpHYriKc/edit?usp=sharing>.

12. NED – is this documented?

13. Is there a VFM argument that is evidenced?

14. Implications:

15. Programme planners need to budget and plan to integrate (adaptive) PME processes in normal/everyday practice

16. Donors need to be prepared to fund and support.

17. …

Add argument for a better balance in programming between pre-assessment and log-frames and continuous monitoring and adaptation to changes in environment and performance.

Add more on the 'what': what is that 'utopian PME' approach that we are promoting? Needs to be identified and articulated. If we did X what would this entail?

Add why it is important to institutionalize the practice of more flexible PME with existing structures for planning and decision making to build ownership and capacity through PME.

Strive to move away from the donor-centred purposes

Our purpose should be to strengthen democratization and one way of doing that could be to support partners' planning functions so that they can own, reflect and learn.

Group 2: Principles and guidelines for evidence-based adaptive management and learning: formulation of 'dos and don'ts'

Do:

- Create a mutual understanding on objectives and terminology of the programme between all actors.
- Identify who the recipient is and for what purpose you are doing the programme.
- Make the recipients of the learning as those closest to the issue of the evaluation.
- Establish an ongoing dialogue, via a good communications system, between donors, practitioners, local actors and evaluators at an early stage.
- Think of the log frame as a hypothesis to be continually tested as oppose to list of deliverables or a checklist.
- Recognize a power relationship between donors, actors, implementers and beneficiaries. As donors recognizing their authority, accountability and responsibility.
- Recognize the strengths and limitations in such as accountability mechanisms.
- Recognize strengths and limitations in the LFA system.
- Recognize the downward accountability as well as upward accountability.
- Embed the M&E officer for the programme in collecting and packaging data for programme discussions.
- Document the learning and decision making.
- Allocate sufficient resources (in terms of time, people and money) for evidence-based adaptive management and learning processes.
- Be aware of people's competing priorities in terms reality.
- Be aware of respondent fatigue because that can create bias.
- Recognize criticism as part of the process. Create a safe space for it.
- Be aware of competing agendas that can come up during the processes.
- Protect the integrity and confidentiality of the participants.
- Allow new questions to emerge in the monitoring process.

Don't:

- Use the LFA too simplistically. Treat it as a holistic system. It is more than just framework.
- Forget about monitoring critical assumptions and risks in an operative environment for each level of change.
- Overburden staff or partners. Do be sensitive to time constraints of staff and partners.

Group 3: Action plan for sustaining the network

There is enough momentum from these three workshops that it would be bad to not create something organized from it. We will need to maintain a collective responsibility for what to do next. We agreed that meeting face to face is very important for the network to be maintained in the future. To lessen the burden on any given organization we propose that the leadership can move from organization to organization. Perhaps we can have overlapping leadership, where all have two years and one year is a 'handover year'. We also propose having a steering committee. So while logistics will be handled by host/leadership the steering committee can help handling the content. The host would be part of the steering committee, or could not take part in the planning of the content. In the beginning, anyone who is willing to be part of the steering committee can take part. We must also leave space for those not part of the steering committee to take part. It is important to get ownership for the next event to make it sustainable. We need to get everyone on board.

As for the conferences/workshops. We propose having different themes for each year. The first day focusing on sharing on the theme and the second being more open and workshop-like. Some proposed themes included 'What is evidence?', 'Learning/ ownership and the SDGs', 'Ethics of evaluation' and 'For whom do we do evaluation?'

It is a strategic move to tie our workshops to other big conferences such as the PPPer network. We must rely on our organizations. We need to identify those who have strong standing in M&E community, OECD DAC and PPPer network. On a sub-theme perhaps. Or, on the State of Governance flagship report. While we can find other places to keep the discussions going, there is a value in keeping the network up.

We hope for this group to be more than a workshop/conference every other year. We discussed several different objectives and ways of achieving them. We would like to have a discussion about what has worked, what has failed and setting the agenda by asking what we not know yet. There is a lack of places to go to for getting to know what works.

A start of the activities could be a series of blog posts written by different members of the network. This would of course need to be facilitated but having them together in the same format would make for very interesting reading as well as a good product in the public domain.

There is also a lack of spaces for a more practical places to discuss these matters in general. We all know it is complex and we need to be adaptable, but how do we handle it in a more practical way? We discussed having virtual working groups who can work together to produce outputs. Though logistically demanding, they could be very rewarding.

The people we wish to be involved in the network is people who are involved in the democracy assistance evaluation community. We aspire to have implementers and donors involved as well. Each layer of the process involved to have the discussion, similar to how the first day of the conference worked. Having the beneficiaries would be very beneficial group to have involved as much as possible. Getting everyone there is the best solution, using technical solutions like Skype or video interviews is a good option for getting people together.

Group 4: Arguments for adaptive programming in democracy assistance

We agreed that the arguments should answer to what is important to donors. We should therefore formulate arguments that show how adaptive programming contributes to:

1. Impact and sustainability

- Indicators show some of what we have achieved, but not why. Indicators/log frames don't facilitate learning.
- It's about being honest. Truth needs tweaking in order to fit into a log frame.
- It's common sense: When realising that what you're doing at the moment isn't working out, you need to be able to adapt your programming. That's our best chance of getting impact.
- Something that is a failure in the short term might be a success in the long term.

2. Quality assurance and efficiency

- It's about trust. Trust that people are professionals, and that we will do good practice and be rigorous. Don't make us guess. If we pick the wrong indicators we will end up doing the wrong things.
- Donors get a lot of results, but adaptive programming provides a deeper understanding of the results.

3. Ownership

- Some changes (e.g the human rights-based approach) were not based on evidence We should try something different because it's the right thing to do.

4. Innovation

- Donors say: 'I want to see examples of innovative methods, but I can't find any.' Well, that's because you're not funding them.
- The political and social contexts are ever-changing—we need to constantly re-adapt and come up with new ways of managing democracy assistance programs that are sensitive to context.

5. Managing risk and strategy

- Adaptive programming is about having a theory of change, but constantly revising and adapting it. It's about constant learning and reflection.
- Doing nothing is worse than taking a risk.
- Active risk management would be saying that you accept a certain amount of risk (say 15%), rather than only going for projects that you don't think implies any risk

(because, actually, all projects do).

- Once you start a program/project, the context/incentives immediately change. That needs to be taken into account.

Annex B. Literature review: planning, monitoring and evaluation

This literature review presents a non-comprehensive list of articles, books and reports from 2010–16, first and foremost relating to the topics of planning, monitoring and evaluating democracy assistance projects and programmes, and, in some cases, the broader field of international development. It also includes texts on democratic or participatory forms of evaluation, and on the political nature of democracy and development aid.

Abraham-Dowsing, K.; Godfrey, A. and Khor, Z., 'Reframing the evidence debates: a view from the media for development sector', BBC Media Action Working Paper No. 7: Bridging theory and practice research dissemination series, July 2014, <http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/rmhttp/mediaaction/pdf/research/working_paper_reframing_the_evidence_debates.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'Donors, policy-makers and practitioners need evidence to inform their policy and programming choices, resource allocation and spending decisions, yet producing high-quality research and evidence and making use of it is not straightforward. This is particularly the case in sectors that do not have a long history of research or evaluation, those that are operating in fragile states with low research capacity and those that are trying to bring about complex change. The media for development sector is one such example. This working paper is designed to identify what evidence is being used in practice and to highlight what is now needed to move the media for development evidence base forward. It aims to be used as the start of a sectorial conversation to inform an "evidence agenda" for media for development.'

Agrawal, R., 'Results in Evaluations: Some Practical Issues', Norrag News, 47 (2012), pp. 98–99

'In the recent past, there had been a growing interest and increased emphasis upon impact of various developmental interventions across the globe leading to a change in conception of evaluations of such interventions both in terms of evaluation philosophy as well as practice. The present discussion raises some practical issues linked with impact evaluations in terms of methodology, ethics, the intention and compulsions of end users, and problems of developing economies. It argues that while impact evaluations are the need of the time, a flexible approach is needed.'

Arkesteijn, M.; van Mierlo, B. and Leeuwis, C., 'The need for reflexive evaluation approaches in development cooperation', *Evaluation*, 21/1 (2015), pp. 99–115, <http://www.norrag.org/fileadmin/Full%20Versions/NN47.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'Within development cooperation, development issues are increasingly recognized as complex problems requiring new paths towards solving them. In addition to the commonly used two dimensions of complex problems (uncertainty and disagreement), we introduce a third dimension: systemic stability; that is, stability provided by rules, relations and complementary technology. This article reflects on how development evaluation methodologies and especially those introducing a complexity perspective address these three dimensions. Inferring that this third dimension deserves more attention, we explore the characteristics of reflexive evaluation approaches that challenge systemic stability and support processes of learning and institutional change. We conclude that reflexive evaluation approaches may well complement current system approaches in development evaluation practice.'

Bamberger, M., Rao, V. and Woolcock, M., 'Using Mixed Methods in Monitoring and Evaluation: Experiences from International Development', World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5245, March 2010, <http://hummedia.manchester.ac.uk/institutes/gdi/publications/workingpapers/bwpi/bwpi-wp-10709.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'This paper provides an overview of the various ways in which mixing qualitative and quantitative methods could add value to monitoring and evaluating development projects. In particular it examines how qualitative methods could address some of the limitations of randomized trials and other quantitative impact evaluation methods; it also explores the importance of examining process in addition to impact, distinguishing design from implementation failures, and the value of mixed methods in the real-time monitoring of projects. It concludes by suggesting topics for future research—including the use of mixed methods in constructing counter-factuals, and in conducting reasonable evaluations within severe time and budget constraints.'

Bamberger, M., Tarsilla, M. and Hesse-Biber, S., 'Why so many "rigorous" evaluations fail to identify unintended consequences of development programs: How mixed methods can contribute', *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 55 (2016), pp. 155–62, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0149718916000021>, accessed August 10 2016

'Most evaluation designs are intended to determine whether there is credible evidence (statistical, theory-based or narrative) that programs have achieved their intended objectives and the logic of many evaluation designs, even those that are considered the most "rigorous", does not permit the identification of outcomes that were not specified in the program design. We take the example of RCTs as they are considered by many to be the most rigorous evaluation designs. We present a numbers of cases to illustrate how infusing RCTs with a mixed-methods approach (sometimes called an 'RCT+' design) can strengthen the credibility of these designs and can also capture important unintended consequences. We provide a Mixed Methods Evaluation Framework that identifies 9 ways in which UCs can occur, and we apply this framework to two of the case studies.'

Barder, O., 'Evidence-Based, Politically Savvy Ways of Doing Development Aid', *Norrag News*, 47 (2012), pp. 25–30

'This piece identifies four good reasons why it is important to get better at measuring results, seven common criticisms of the so-called "results agenda", and proposes steps to resolve the tension between its proponents and critics.'

Bester, A., *Results-Based Management in the United Nations Development System: Progress and Challenges* (New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2012)

'The application of results-based management in the development field has gained currency and national governments and public institutions increasingly are adopting this approach. Further impetus for improving results-based management comes from demands from both programme and donor countries for the United Nations development system to demonstrate that it is achieving its objectives, that it does so efficiently and that its activities are relevant to the needs and priorities of programme countries and contribute to improved and sustainable development outcomes.'

The Big Push Forward, 'The Politics of Evidence Conference Report', Brighton, 23–24 April 2013, <http://bigpushforward.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/BPF-PoE-conference-report.pdf>, accessed 13 August 2016

'Trying to generate and understand cost-effectiveness and demonstrate results over-rides questioning why development efforts were initiated and whom these were intended for. Losing sight of the critical questions is compounded by the tendency of people to latch onto specific favoured tools. Uncritical use of preferred tools can short-circuit thinking and obscure the lack of clarity of what exactly it is you are trying to understand.'

Bridoux, J. and Kurki, M., *Democracy Promotion: A Critical Introduction* **(New York: Routledge, 2014), chapter 5**

'In Chapter 5 we ask the question: is democracy promotion reflective of contextual sensitivities and differences? We argue that in the last ten years great attempts have been made to make democracy promotion more context-sensitive. However, these efforts, from a critical perspective, are shown to be somewhat limited and incomplete. For true context-sensitivity to be implemented, more willingness to open up the conceptual black-boxes of democracy promotion are necessary, as well as movement away from standardized delivery mechanisms which depoliticize democracy promotion and make dialogue on multiple meanings of democracy more difficult.'

Bryson, J. M.; Patton, M. Q. and Bowman, R. A., 'Working with evaluation stakeholders: A rationale, step-wise approach and toolkit', *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 34/1 (2011), pp. 1–12, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/45439872_Working_with_evaluation_stakeholders_A_rationale_step-wise_approach_and_toolkit>, accessed 10 August 2016

'In the broad field of evaluation, the importance of stakeholders is often acknowledged and different categories of stakeholders are identified. Far less frequent is careful attention to analysis of stakeholders' interests, needs, concerns, power, priorities, and perspectives and subsequent application of that knowledge to the design of evaluations. This article is meant to help readers understand and apply stakeholder identification and analysis techniques in the design of credible evaluations that enhance primary intended use by primary intended users. While presented using a utilization-focused-evaluation (UFE) lens, the techniques are not UFE-dependent. The article presents a range of the most relevant techniques to identify and analyze evaluation stakeholders.'

Carden, F., 'Whose Development Results Count?', *Norrag News*, 47 (2012), pp. 59–60, <http://www.norrag.org/en/publications/norrag-news/online-

version/value-for-money-in-international-education-a-new-world-of-results-impacts-and-outcomes/detail/whose-development-results-count.html>, accessed 10 August 2016

'The unit of analysis in development programming should not be the aid program or aid effectiveness, but development itself, that is improving the lives of all people in a society and doing so in as equitable a manner as possible. To do this, we must learn and track the values and socio-political interests of both those who make decisions and those who live with the consequences of decisions taken.'

Carothers, T. and de Gramont, D., *Aiding Governance in Developing Countries: Progress amid Uncertainties* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2011), <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/aiding_governance.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'Even as governance assistance progresses, it struggles with several continuing uncertainties. The empirical case that improved governance is necessary for development progress is less straightforward than many aid practitioners would wish. The increasing pressure faced by most aid organizations for rapid, clearly measurable results sometimes works against sophisticated governance assistance. Larger international aid trends, especially the rise of new donors with other priorities, threaten to weaken the governance agenda. Fully operationalizing these insights and overcoming the uncertainties will be hard. But the central promise of governance assistance—finally getting to the heart of the development challenge—is great enough to justify the effort and to ensure that even partial success will be worthwhile.'

Carothers, T. and de Gramont, D., *Development Aid Confronts Politics: The Almost Revolution* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2013)

'This book seeks to explain and assess the unfolding movement in development aid to think and act more politically. We aim to clarify what these changes consist of, why they are occurring, and what their implications are for aid providers and recipients alike. The title gives away at least part of our conclusion—the revolution is not complete. But it leaves open many questions that we believe deserve close attention and that we try to answer, including how far mainstream aid providers have come in integrating political goals and methods into their work, why they have met with resistance, and whether this agenda is likely to continue moving forward or instead stagnate or retreat.'

Casey, K., Glennerster, R. and Miguel, E., 'Reshaping Institutions: Evidence on Aid Impacts Using a Pre-Analysis Plan', National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 17012, May 2011, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17012.pdf>, accessed August 10 2016

'Although institutions are believed to be key determinants of economic performance, there is limited evidence on how they can be successfully reformed. Evaluating the effects of specific reforms is complicated by the lack of exogenous variation in the presence of institutions; the difficulty of empirically measuring institutional performance; and the temptation to "cherry pick" a few novel treatment effect estimates from amongst the large number of indicators required to capture the complex and multi-faceted subject. We evaluate one attempt to make local institutions more egalitarian by imposing minority participation requirements in Sierra Leone and test for longer term learning-by-doing effects. In so doing, we address these three pervasive challenges by: exploiting the random assignment of a participatory local governance intervention, developing innovative real-world outcomes measures, and using a pre-analysis plan to bind our hands against data mining.'

Chouinard, J. A. and Cousins, J. B., 'The journey from rhetoric to reality: participatory evaluation in a development context', *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 27/1 (2015), pp. 5–39

'To provide a more focused and detailed understanding of participatory evaluation in international development contexts, in this paper we augment our initial sample to a total of 40 studies on participatory evaluation in development published over the past 16.5 years. Based on an analysis of this research and related theoretical and conceptual contributions we identify and discuss eight emergent themes: multiplicity of relationships, consequences of stakeholder selection, characterization of participation, contextual complexity, methodological requirements, cultural influence, politics and power and learning and capacity building.'

Chouinard, J. A. and Cousins, J. B., *Participatory Evaluation up Close: An Integration of Research-based Knowledge* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2012)

'In this book, we seek to capture and make sense of what is empirically known about the nature, antecedent contexts and consequences of participatory evaluation and to situate the state of the art of research on this domain of practice. Based on a conceptual framework developed and revised over a number of years, we provide a comprehensive description and analysis of the knowledge that has been generated through research on participatory evaluation within the past 15 years.'

Chouinard, J. A. and Milley, P., 'Mapping the spatial dimensions of participatory practice: A discussion of context in evaluation', *Evaluation and Program Planning*, vol. 54 (2016), pp. 1–10, <https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/elsevier/mapping-the-spatial-dimensions-of-participatory-practice-a-discussion-plJ97HkMPE>, accessed 10 August 2016

'In participatory or collaborative evaluation practice, context is considered a complex, relational and social phenomenon that frames the parameters of the inquiry process in profound ways. To help us expand upon our understanding of context, we borrow the concept of "space" from the critical geographers, as it provides a bridge between the social and geographic complexities of context, enabling us to more fully capture the social and relational dynamic that fundamentally defines participatory evaluation. Our focus is on understanding context and relationships as two interconnected, dynamic and constituent parts of evaluation practices that feature participatory spaces. We then turn to a comparative analysis of participatory practice across two published reviews of distinct sets of empirical studies as a way to extend our understanding of participatory evaluation in relation to its practical, and frequently complex, contextual expressions in the field. This comparative analysis enables us to develop a set of five dimensions (epistemic, temporal/historical, cultural, economic/organizational, political) that we believe captures the spatial and contextual characteristics and contours of participatory practice.'

Danish Institute for Parties and Democracy (DIPD), *Study on Results Frameworks: Political Party Assistance* (Copenhagen: Danish Institute for Parties and Democracy, 2013), <http://dipd.dk/wp-content/uploads/

Resultsframeworks-Political-Party-Assistance.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'This study was identified as needed by the Global Political Party Assistance Providers Peer Network and initiated and produced by DIPD. The study set out to review how result frameworks are designed and used by the party assistance community, and to identify the primary programme areas (i.e. multiparty dialogue, policy development, women's empowerment, among others) from both a party system and individual party level perspective. To the extent possible, the study also sought to identify common trends associated with the frameworks, and offer recommendations to the community on moving forward in this area.'

Ellerman, D., 'Do we Need an Institute for the Study of Development Fads?', *Norrag News*, 47 (2012), pp. 30–32, <http://www.norrag.org/en/publications/norrag-news/online-version/value-for-money-in-international-education-a-new-world-of-results-impacts-and-outcomes/detail/do-we-need-an-institute-for-the-study-of-development-fads.html>, accessed 10 August 2016

'As we think about value for in the development business, we should keep in mind how this impacts on the extrinsic and intrinsic motivations of giving aid.'

Eyben, R., 'The Risks of a Results Agenda', *Norrag News*, 47 (2012), pp. 47–48, <http://www.norrag.org/en/publications/norrag-news/online-version/value-for-money-in-international-education-a-new-world-of-results-impacts-and-outcomes/detail/the-risks-of-a-results-agenda.html>, accessed 10 August 2016

'Aspirations to use development financing for transformative change in the lives of people in poverty are put at risk by the current push to deliver results in relation to narrow and mechanistic Value for Money criteria.'

Eyben, R., 'Uncovering the Politics of "Evidence" and "Results": A Framing Paper for Development Practitioners', Background paper to the Big Push Forward Conference, 'Politics of Evidence', Brighton, 23–24 April 2013, <http://bigpushforward.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/The-politics-of-evidence-11-April-20133.pdf>, accessed August 2016

'Hard evidence, rigorous data, tangible results, value for money—all are tantalising terms promising clarity for the international development sector. Yet, behind these terms lie definitional tussles, vested interests and contested world views that this background paper to the Politics of Evidence Conference aims to make explicit and question. The aim is to encourage development practitioners to strategize in expanding the politico-bureaucratic space to make room for flexible and creative support of locally-generated and transformative change.'

Eyben, R., Guijt, I., Roche, C. and Shutt, C. (eds), *The politics of evidence and results in international development: playing the game to change the rules?* (Rugby: Practical Action Publishing, 2015)

'The Politics of Evidence and Results in International Development critically examines the context and history of the current demands for results-oriented measurement and for evidence of value for money. The book looks at how organizations and individuals embrace, resist, adapt or comply with these demands. Practitioner case studies illuminate different sets of relationships in the aid chain, examining the impact of the demands for results and evidence on the pursuit of rights-based approaches and enquiring into whether the growing emphasis on upward accountability is trumping mutual learning. The book's challenging conclusion identifies power-aware strategies for development practitioners, enabling them to generate and use results and evidence for transformational ends.'

Garmendia, E. and Gamboa, G., 'Weighting social preferences in participatory multi-criteria evaluations: A case study on sustainable natural resource management', *Ecological Economics*, 84: The Economics of Degrowth (2012), pp. 110–20, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800912003667>, accessed 10 August 2016

'The use of multi-criteria evaluation tools in combination with participatory approaches provides a promising framework for integrating multiple interests and perspectives in the effort to provide sustainability. However, the inclusion of diverse viewpoints requires the "compression" of complex issues, a process that is controversial. Ensuring the quality of the compression process is a major challenge, especially with regards to retaining the essential elements of the various perspectives. Based on the lessons learned during a case study that assessed sustainable management options for the Urdaibai Estuary (Basque Country-Southern Europe), we propose a process in which the explicit elicitation of weights (the prioritisation of criteria) within a participatory multi-criteria evaluation serves as a quality assurance mechanism to check the robustness of the evaluation process. The results demonstrate that diverse individual priorities can be grouped in a reduced set of social preferences by means of cluster analysis reinforced with a deliberative appraisal among a wide variety of social actors. The approach presented retains relevant information regarding extreme and sometimes irreconcilable positions, allows an explicit social sensitivity analysis of the MCE process, and enables participants to learn from and reflect upon diverse social preferences without forcing their consensus.'

Glennie, A., Straw, W. and Wild, L., 'Understanding public attitudes to aid and development' (London: Institute for Public Policy Research and Overseas Development Institute, 2012), <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7708.pdf>, accessed 13 August 2016

'Encouragingly, the discussions across all the deliberative workshops conducted for this project revealed considerable appetite for greater understanding of development and for more complex stories of how change and progress happens. Instead of a simple reassurance that "aid works", people would like to hear about how and why it works, why it doesn't always work and the reasons aid alone cannot achieve development targets. Process and progress stories will both be core to winning sustainable public support for aid and development in the future.'

Global Partners Governance, 'The Logframe and the Beautiful Game: Project Logic v Football Logic', Global Partners Governance, London, 2014, <http://www.gpgovernance.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Politically-Agile-Programming-paper-1.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'[T]he problems of the logframe are less about inherent strengths or weaknesses, than the way they are currently being used. Logframes can describe a project logic and theory of change, but they are terrible as a measurement of progress or project effectiveness.

At present, logframes are being asked to carry a load they were not designed to bear. Project implementers need to be more creative in their arguments, providing new ways of helping donor agencies to interpret logframes and providing measures of progress that combine both quantitative and qualitative indicators, so that donors do not turn to logframes as a default option simply because there is an absence of any other, more suitable means of measuring project impact.'

Guerra-López, I. and Hicks, K., 'The participatory design of a performance oriented monitoring and evaluation system in an international development environment', *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 48 (2015), pp. 21–30, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0149718914000998>, accessed 10 August 2016

'This article illustrates the application of the impact monitoring and evaluation process for the design and development of a performance monitoring and evaluation framework in the context of human and institutional capacity development. This participative process facilitated stakeholder ownership in several areas including the design, development, and use of a new monitoring and evaluation system, as well their targeted results and accomplishments through the use of timely performance data gathered through ongoing monitoring and evaluation. The process produced a performance indicator map, a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework, and data collection templates to promote the development, implementation, and sustainability of the monitoring and evaluation system of a farmer's trade union in an African country.'

Gulrajani, N. and Honig, D., 'Reforming donors in fragile states' (London: Overseas Development Institute, 2016), <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/10479.pdf>, accessed 25 July 2016

'This paper identifies ways in which donors can be more effective in fragile and conflict affected states by exploiting theories and concepts drawn from public management. Fragile contexts demand donors look beyond blueprint solutions and work with greater sensitivity to local environments, adaptation to local contexts and enhanced organisational flexibility. Public management theory can help donors organise themselves to put these principles into practice. This paper hopes to widen the options donors have at their disposal to support organisational reform and advance more effective ways of working in fragile states.'

Hayman, R., 'The Impact Agenda and NGOs: Results for Whom and for What?', *Norrag News*, 47 (2012), pp. 84–85, <http://www.norrag.org/de/publications/norrag-news/online-version/value-for-money-in-international-education-a-new-world-of-results-impacts-and-outcomes/detail/the-impact-agenda-and-ngos-results-for-whom-and-for-what.html>, accessed 10 August 2016

'INTRAC (the International NGO Training and Research Centre) works with hundreds of large and small NGOs and civil society organisations around the world. For twenty years the organisation has trained and advised NGOs on their monitoring and evaluation systems. This article reflects on the changing expectations and demands regarding results which we see emerging amongst civil society organisations.'

Hughes, K., 'NGOs and the Results Agenda: Unrealistic Expectations or a Blessing in Disguise?', *Norrag News*, 47 (2012), pp. 80–82, <http://www.norrag.org/cn/publications/norrag-news/online-version/value-for-money-

in-international-education-a-new-world-of-results-impacts-and-outcomes/detail/ngos-and-the-results-agenda-unrealistic-expectations-or-a-blessing-in-disguise.html>, accessed 10 August 2016

'The latest wave of enthusiasm for results and "Value for Money" is pushing international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) like Oxfam GB to significantly up their game in both understanding and demonstrating their impact. Whilst this is, in itself, a good thing, it is quite challenging to successfully implement in practice. There is a danger that it could lead to a situation where we are praised and reinforced for doing mediocre and even wrong things really well.'

Hummelbrunner, R. and Jones, H., 'A Guide to Managing in the Face of Complexity', Overseas Development Institute, 2013, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8662.pdf>, accessed 25 July 2016

'The challenges to economic, social and political development are complex and unpredictable (Ramalingam and Jones 2008). To respond to these challenges, governments, NGOs and international development agencies need to rely less on rigid implementation structures built on pre-chosen outputs and targets. Instead they need to manage policies, programmes and projects in more flexible and adaptive styles that take account of new threats, opportunities and the lessons learned during implementation. How then can development interventions be steered towards intended goals? Is it possible—and feasible—to manage interventions faced with so many influences and uncertainties?'

Hyde, S. D., 'Experimenting in Democracy Promotion: International Observers and the 2004 Presidential Elections in Indonesia', *Perspectives on Politics*, 8/2 (2010), pp. 511–27, <http://susan.hyde.co/Hyde_Indonesia_9.16.2009.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'Randomized field experiments have gained attention within the social sciences and the field of democracy promotion as an influential tool for causal inference and a potentially powerful method of impact evaluation. With an eye toward facilitating field experimentation in democracy promotion, I present the first field-experimental study of international election monitoring, which should be of interest to both practitioners and academics. I discuss field experiments as a promising method for evaluating the effects of democracy assistance programs.'

Jabeen, S., 'Do we really care about unintended outcomes? An analysis of evaluation theory and practice', *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 55 (2016), pp. 144–54, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0149718915001342>, accessed 10 August 2016

'In this article, shortcomings of existing theoretical developments to evaluate unintended outcomes are identified. Current evaluation practices in international development are then analysed to demonstrate ways in which unintended outcomes remain peripheral. Reasons for neglect are discussed and the need for a stronger re-focusing on unintended effects of development interventions is advocated.'

Janes, J. E., 'Democratic encounters? Epistemic privilege, power, and community-based participatory action research', *Action Research*, 14/1 (2016), pp. 72–87, <http://arj.sagepub.com/content/early/2015/04/14/1476750315579129>, accessed 10 August 2016

'The literature suggests that community-based participatory research holds the potential to democratize and decolonize knowledge production by engaging communities and citizens in the research enterprise. Yet this approach, and its associated claims, remain under theorized, particularly as to how power circulates between and among academic and community knowledge work/ers. This paper puts forth a postcolonial analysis of participatory techniques that sustain academe's epistemic privilege through producing, subordinating and assimilating difference; claiming authenticity and voice; and dislocating collaborative knowledge work from the historical, political, social and embodied conditions in which it unfolds.'

Janzen, R., Seskar-Hencic, D., Dildar, Y. and McFadden, P., 'Using Evaluation to Shape and Direct Comprehensive Community Initiatives: Evaluation, Reflective Practice, and Interventions Dealing with Complexity', *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 26/2 (2011), pp. 61–88, <http://seachangecop.org/sites/default/files/documents/2012%2009%20CES%20-%20Using%20Evaluation%20to%20Shape%20and%20Direct%20Comprehensive%20Community%20Initiatives.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'The purpose of this article is to discuss how evaluation can be used to shape and direct Comprehensive Community Initiatives in an ongoing way. It does so by offering a case example of the Waterloo Region Immigrant Employment Network (WRIEN). The article begins by reviewing how participatory action research can encourage reflective practice. After the WRIEN case example is presented, we consider this example in light of collaborative evaluation literature and five facilitators of reflec-tive practice: (a) be location-based, (b) value experiential and practical knowledge, (c) provide ongoing feedback, (d) facilitate democratic dialogue, and (e) focus on a vision for the common good. The article ends by discussing contributions to the broader evaluation knowledge base, particularly developmental evaluation.'

Kleinfeld, R., *Improving Development Aid Design and Evaluation: Plan for Sailboats, Not Trains* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2015), <http://carnegieendowment.org/files/Brief-Kleinfeld_Development_Aid_Design.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'The development field increasingly looks to sophisticated metrics to measure impact. Simultaneously, practitioners are recognizing that most development programs must engage with politics and policy. Unfortunately, the measurement techniques gaining popularity are those least able to determine how to implement political reforms. Effective reform efforts require planning for and measuring change that is nonlinear and nonincremental. Complexity, or systems, theory offers insights for improving program design and evaluation.'

Klingebiel, S., *Results-Based Aid (RBA): New aid approaches, limitations and the application to promote good governance* (Bonn: German Development Institute, 2012), <https://www.die-gdi.de/uploads/media/DP_14.2012.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'Possibilities for identifying measurable and quantifiable results are rather good in social sectors and several (basic) infrastructure-related topics. The governance sector is, in general terms, less favourable in this regard. "Political governance" issues such as political freedom or human rights do not seem to be suitable for RBA approaches. However, some other governance areas have the potential to be included; this applies especially to public financial management and fiscal decentralisation.'

Kumar, K., *Evaluating Democracy Assistance* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2013)

'The underlying premise of the book is that caution is necessary in applying to the democracy domain the evaluation concepts, models, and approaches that have paid rich dividends in the evaluation of development programs. There are significant differences between development and democracy programming. While these differences are of degrees—it is a matter of lighter versus darker gray—they are nonetheless significant and should not be ignored.'

Lennie, J., Tacchi, J., Wilmore, M. and Koirala, B., 'A holistic, learning-centred approach to building evaluation capacity in development organizations', *Evaluation*, 21/3 (2015), pp. 325–43, <http://evi.sagepub.com/content/21/3/325.abstract>, accessed 10 August 2016

'There is growing pressure on development organizations to improve their evaluation systems and capacities. This presents considerable challenges for time- and resource-poor organizations in developing countries. Evaluation capacity development (ECD) approaches are needed that are appropriate and effective for such organizations. We argue that this requires a long-term, holistic, participatory, learning-centred approach that aims to develop learning organizations and build the capacity of whole organizations and their stakeholders. It also needs to incorporate local knowledge and ideas and ongoing meta-evaluation of ECD activities. We describe this approach and how it was applied in a four-year action research project with a non-governmental organization in Nepal.'

Leroy, M., 'The Aid Industry is Threatening Partner Countries with its ROD . . . Results Obsession Disorder', *Norrag News*, 47 (2012), pp. 55–56, <http://www.norrag.org/en/publications/norrag-news/online-version/value-for-money-in-international-education-a-new-world-of-results-impacts-and-outcomes/detail/the-aid-industry-is-threatening-partner-countries-with-its-rod-results-obsession-disorder.html>, accessed 10 August 2016

'By excessively focusing on measurable results, the aid industry ignores the essence of the development process and thus undercuts the very objectives it pretends to pursue: ownership, accountability and participation.'

Maxwell, S., 'Results and Value-for-Money: from Results 1.0 to Results 2.0', *Norrag News*, 47 (2012), pp. 52–54, <http://www.norrag.org/en/publications/norrag-news/online-version/value-for-money-in-international-education-a-new-world-of-results-impacts-and-outcomes/detail/results-and-value-for-money-from-results-10-to-results-20.html>, accessed 10 August

'Focusing on the results of aid is a political and operational imperative. However, a narrow interpretation of results can over-simplify, and misdirect resources. Better is an approach which is country-led, recognizes the need to invest in institutions, and looks at the programmatic impact of all national and donor contributions taken together. This is Results 2.0.'

Moehler, D. C., 'Democracy, Governance, and Randomized Development Assistance', *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 628/1 (2010), pp. 30–46, <http://ann.sagepub.com/

content/628/1/30.abstract>, accessed 10 August 2016

'Can field experiments be productively employed to study the impact of development assistance on democracy and governance (DG) outcomes? A small but growing number of practitioners and scholars, often working in partnership, are inventing a new research domain at the intersection of evaluation and political science. The article reviews recent and ongoing DG field experiments, and it offers lessons about the prospects and obstacles to the future development of a useful body of experimental evidence on the political economy of development.'

Noske-Turner, J., '10 Years of Evaluation Practice in Media Assistance: Who, When, Why and How?', *Nordicom Review*, 36 (2015), pp. 41–56 <http://nordicom.gu.se/sites/default/files/kapitel-pdf/nordicom_review_36_2015_special_issue_pp._41-56.pdf>, accessed 10 August

'Evaluating the impact of media assistance is challenging for several reasons. Primary among them is that these kinds of initiatives operate in a complex political, social, and cultural environment. Although there has been increased attention to evaluation of media assistance, with a series of international conferences, funded research projects, and publications ad dressing this topic, it remains a problematic area of practice. This paper provides a survey of recent media assistance evaluation practices through an analysis of 47 evaluation documents of programs and projects from 2002-2012, identifying trends in methodology choices, and critiquing the quality of the evidence enabled through different evaluation approaches. It finds clear patterns in how, when and by whom evaluations are undertaken, but finds that these practices rarely generate useful, insightful evaluations.'

Nzewi, O., 'Participatory monitoring and evaluation of governance in Africa: lessons from the civil society African Peer Review Mechanism monitoring project (AMP) in South Africa', *Africa Insight*, 41/4 (2012), pp. 36–52

'This article focuses on a civil society governance monitoring and evaluation process of the African Peer Review Mechanism (ARPM), launched in July 2010 by the Centre for Policy Studies and the South African Institute for International Affairs, especially with regard to government commitment to good governance made in the National Programme of Action (NPOA). Although the project covered South Africa and Lesotho, the article focuses on the South African process. Using a basic process model, the article attempts to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the monitoring process methodology regarding its articulation of known and tested participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) principles. It also gives guidance for improved systemised processes in participatory monitoring and the evaluation of governance in Africa.'

Patton, M. Q., *Developmental evaluation: applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use* (New York: Guilford Press, 2010)

'Developmental evaluation (DE) offers a powerful approach to monitoring and supporting social innovations by working in partnership with program decision makers. In this book, eminent authority Michael Quinn Patton shows how to conduct evaluations within a DE framework. Patton draws on insights about complex dynamic systems, uncertainty, nonlinearity, and emergence. He illustrates how DE can be used for a range of purposes: ongoing program development, adapting effective principles of practice to local contexts, generating innovations and taking them to scale, and facilitating rapid response in crisis situations.'

Patton, M. Q., McKegg, K. and Wehipeihana, N. (eds), *Developmental evaluation exemplars: principles in practice* (New York: Guilford Press, 2015)

‘Responding to evaluator and instructor demand, this book presents a diverse set of high-quality developmental evaluation (DE) case studies. Twelve insightful exemplars illustrate how DE is used to evaluate innovative initiatives in complex, dynamic environments, including a range of fields and international settings. Written by leading practitioners, chapters offer a rare window into what it takes to do DE, what roles must be fulfilled, and what results can be expected. Each case opens witincisive introduction by the editors. The book also addresses frequently asked questions about DE, synthesizes key themes and lessons learned from the exemplars, and identifies eight essential principles of DE.’

Picciotto, R., ’Democratic evaluation for the 21st century’, *Evaluation*, 21/2 (2015), pp. 150–66, <http://evi.sagepub.com/content/21/2/150.abstract> accessed 10 August 2016

‘The evaluation discipline has long been put at the service of liberal democratic values. But contemporary evaluation practice is threatened by vested interests, western democracy is under stress and internationalization has propelled evaluation towards illiberal and patrimonial states. What is to be done in contexts where democracy is absent and/or evaluation has been captured by powerful interests whether globally, within countries or within organizations? Are existing democratic evaluation approaches still relevant? Is it time to try something new? This article reviews the evidence and recommends adoption of a progressive evaluation model designed to complement, update and renew existing democratic and social justice evaluation approaches.’

Plottu, B. and Plottu, E., ‘Participatory Evaluation: The Virtues for Public Governance, the Constraints on Implementation’, *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 20/6 (2011), pp. 805–24

‘Participatory evaluation relies on the principle of active participation by major stakeholders, including the least organised groups, as being fundamental to good evaluation practice. This process presents a number of advantages which can nonetheless become crippling if certain prerequisites are not fulfilled. The goal of our paper is to weigh up the advantages and disadvantages of participation and to examine the conditions necessary for participatory evaluation to achieve its objectives.’

Power, G. and Coleman, O., *The Challenges of Political Programming* (Stockholm: International IDEA, 2011), <http://www.idea.int/resources/analysis/the-challenges-of-political-programming.cfm>, accessed 10 August 2016

‘If [donors] are serious about achieving meaningful political change projects should be driven by outcomes rather than process. Programmes need to adapt to changing political circumstances and implementers need to be astute enough to identify the synergies between party and parliamentary support. A flexible and genuinely outcome-oriented form of programming would mean that donors take greater responsibility for the results of their interventions, but ultimately exercise less control over the way they are implemented.’

Power, G., T*he Politics of Parliamentary Strengthening: Understanding political incentives and institutional behaviour in parliamentary support strategies* (London: Westminster Foundation for Democracy/Global Partners and Associates, 2011), <http://www.gpgovernance.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Politics-of-Parliamentary-Strengthening.pdf>, accessed August 10 2016

‘The ultimate purpose of parliamentary support work should not just be to change the structure of the institution, but to change the behaviour of the politicians within it. The technical approach is based on the assumption that given the right structure and resources politicians will automatically behave in a way that ensures an effective parliamentary democracy. … In practice, this rarely occurs. Programmes need to understand how parliaments operate in practice, and why a gap exists between the formal powers that the institution holds and how they are used in reality. In short, they need a rounder analysis of the factors influencing political behaviour. The next two chapters provide the basis for analysing these, by looking at institutional dynamics and incentive structures.’

Pritchett, L., Samji, S. and Hammer, J., ‘It’s All About MeE: Using Structured Experiential Learning (“e”) to Crawl the Design Space’, Center for Global Development Working Paper No. 322 (2013), <https://www.princeton.edu/rpds/papers/Hammer_Its_All_About_Me.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

‘Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) has always been an element of the accountability of implementing organizations to their funders. There has been a recent trend towards much greater rigor in evaluations to isolate causal impacts of projects and programs and more ‘evidence-based’ approaches to accountability and budget allocations. Here we extend the basic idea of rigorous impact evaluation—the use of a valid counterfactual to make judgments about causality—to emphasize that the techniques of impact evaluation can be directly useful to implementing organizations (as opposed to impact evaluation being seen by implementing organizations as only an external threat to their funding). We introduce structured experiential learning (which we add to M&E to get MeE) which allows implementing agencies to actively and rigorously search across alternative project designs using the monitoring data that provides real-time performance information with direct feedback into the decision loops of project design and implementation.’

Ramalingam, B., *Aid on the Edge of Chaos: Rethinking International Cooperation in a Complex World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

‘Many thinkers and practitioners in science, economics, business, and public policy have started to embrace more “ecologically literate” approaches to guide both thinking and action, informed by ideas from the “new science” of complex adaptive systems. Inspired by these efforts, there is an emerging network of aid practitioners, researchers, and policy makers who are experimenting with complexity-informed responses to development and humanitarian challenges. This book showcases the insights, experiences, and often remarkable results from these efforts.’

Renger, R., Foltysova, J., Becker, K. L. and Souvannasacd, E., ‘The power of the context map: Designing realistic outcome evaluation strategies and other unanticipated benefits’, E*valuation and Program Planning*, 52 (2015), pp. 118–25, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0149718915000488> accessed 10 August 2016

‘Developing a feasible evaluation plan is challenging when multiple activities, often sponsored by multiple agencies, work together toward a common goal. Often, resources are limited and not every agency's interest can be represented in the final evaluation plan. The article illustrates how the Antecedent Target Measurement (ATM) approach to logic modeling was adapted to meet this challenge. The key adaptation is the context map generated in the first step of the ATM approach. The context map makes visually explicit many of the underlying conditions contributing to a problem as possible. The article also shares how a prioritization matrix can assist the evaluator in filtering through the context map to prioritize the outcomes to be included in the final evaluation plan as well as creating realistic outcomes.’

Root, H., Jones, H. and Wild, L., *Managing Complexity and Uncertainty in Development Policy and Practice* (London: Overseas Development Institute 2015), <http://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/events-documents/5191.pdf>, accessed 25 July 2016

‘Development policy and practice has been challenged in recent years to take better account of uncertainty and complexity in policy reforms. This paper draws together thinking on working with uncertainty, focusing on collective action mobilisation, networks and specific features of change. A key insight is that complex systems are not capable of being isolated from their environment, which makes them subject to random influences beyond the control of individual project managers. This highlights strategies for responding to this, and changes for dominant approaches in planning, programme design and monitoring. Implementing these also requires building a more cohesive evidence base on applying adaptive principles as well as better sharing of emerging experience in adaptive programming.’

Shah, R., ‘Assessing the ‘true impact’ of development assistance in the Gaza Strip and Tokelau: ‘Most Significant Change’ as an evaluation technique’, *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 55/3 (2014), pp. 262–76, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/apv.12062/abstract>, accessed 10 August 2016

‘Drawing on two different evaluations—one, of a comprehensive economic sector assistance package to the Government of Tokelau, and the other of a psychosocial and academic support intervention for pre-adolescent children in conflict-affected regions of the Gaza Strip—the paper provides evidence of how [Most Significant Change (MSC)] can capture unexpected outcomes, act as a tool for real-time formative learning, and expose the competing theories, logics and values behind programme activity. The examples within the paper also provide evidence of how MSC begins to redistribute traditional power relationships in assessing the merit and worth of observed impacts by increasing the legitimacy of local programme knowledge, and engaging all parties in evaluative decisions. By doing so, MSC, the paper argues, better serves the purposes of learning, improvement and mutual accountability which should sit at the core of good development practice.’

Torrigiani, C., ‘Evaluation and Social Capital: A Theory-Driven and Participatory Approach’, *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 7/1 (2016), pp. 248–58, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285417552_Evaluation_and_Social_Capital_A_Theory-Driven_and_Participatory_Approach>, accessed 10 August 2016

‘Basing on the concept of social capital, the article analyzes the links between public policies evaluation processes, knowledge production, and social betterment in complex and multi-actors systems. The relational and cognitive dimensions of social capital are identified as the most relevant, on which evaluation processes should focus to build useful knowledge and to achieve organizational and collective learning. The argument is then oriented on the methodological plan, to identify the most suitable approaches for this purpose.'

United Nations Development Programme, 'Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results', Knowledge Innovation and Capacity, UNDP, 30 September 2013, <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/capacity-development/English/Discussion%20Paper-%20Innovations%20in%20Monitoring%20&%20Evaluating%20Results%20%20%285%29.pdf>, accessed 10 August

'Countries are increasingly using innovative approaches to manage the performance of public policies, programmes and service delivery. These approaches are fostering more inclusive, collaborative and responsive processes across the development cycle: from planning, to implementation, to monitoring and evaluation.'

Vallejo, B. and Wehn, U., 'Capacity Development Evaluation: The Challenge of the Results Agenda and Measuring Return on Investment in the Global South', *World Development*, 79 (2016), pp. 1–13, <http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0305750X15002739/1-s2.0-S0305750X15002739-main.pdf?_tid=ccbcfcec-6076-11e6-8fc8-00000aacb35e&acdnat=1470997584_ce2297fa62e051641afc117caac89dda>, accessed 10 August 2016

'This study reviews the evaluation of capacity development, identifying capacity development (CD) modalities and the schools of evaluation currently in place. The research joins the results agenda debate, arguing that in dealing with CD interventions, pre-defined indicators fail to represent the process and the key elements that take CD recipients toward patterns of change. The study highlights the fact that CD deals with projects that, by their nature (consisting of change processes designed to initiate change in people, organizations, and/or their enabling environment), rely more on non-planned changes than on the pre-defined indicators and results to contribute to livelihood improvements and social transformation. The study recognizes the difficulty of evaluating CD under straightforward mechanisms. It concludes that the existing approaches are not adequate to truly capture or measure impact, as CD projects, restricted by previously agreed budgets, resources, and time frames, are usually not designed to evaluate the sustainability of change and its impact over the medium or long term. As resources are scarce, donor agencies and policy-makers need to know the value of CD in order to best prioritize their investments. However, due to the nature of these projects, measuring the return rate between the project cost and its impact remains a difficult task. There is a need for new, multi-path approaches to capturing changes in capacity in order to serve as a basis for decision-making regarding CD investments.'

Van Ongevalle, J., Huyse, H. and Van Petegem, P., 'Dealing with complexity through actor-focused planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME)', *Evaluation*, 20/4 (2014), pp. 447–66, <https://www.ncdo.nl/sites/default/files/PSO_Dealing%20with%20complexity%20PME.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'This article reports on the results of a collaborative action research project (2010–12) in which 10 development organizations (nine Dutch and one Belgian), together with

their southern partners, explored different actor-focused Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) approaches with the aim of dealing more effectively with complex processes of social change. A major challenge that organizations were trying to address during this action research pertained to the demonstration of observable results in complex contexts where such results are not always easy to measure or to quantify and where causal links between cause and effect cannot always be predicted. Drawing from recent literature, the article presents an analytic framework to assess the effectiveness of a PME approach in dealing with complex social change. This framework is then used to explore how actor-focused PME approaches can help international development programmes to manage complex processes of social change by stimulating processes of real-time results-based learning.'

Vähämäki, J., Schmidt, M. and Molander, J., *Review: Results Based Management in Development Cooperation* (Stockholm: Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, 2011), <http://www.sida.se/globalassets/global/rbm-review-120105-final.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'The paper provides a brief historical overview of where and when Results based management was introduced to development cooperation, some lessons and experiences that can be drawn from evaluations and reviews on challenges and successes in its implementation, as well as a synopsis of the global initiatives that have arisen during the latest years in support of or as a response to the agenda.'

Whitty, B., 'Experiences of the Results Agenda: Draft Findings for Discussion from the Crowd-Sourcing Survey', Background paper to the Big Push Forward Conference, 'Politics of Evidence', Brighton, 23–24 April 2013

'The study discusses the day-to-day practice of small-e evidence –results and targets in management of specific projects—rather than large-E evidence of establishing theories of change or broader development policies. The stories are about the nuts and bolts of the development processes and artefacts—the theories of change, results frameworks, reporting requirements and value for money rubrics. It is about what 'e' is being collected, how it is used, and to what effect.'

Wilson-Grau, R. and Britt, H., *Outcome Harvesting* (Cairo: Ford Foundation, 2012), <http://www.outcomemapping.ca/download/wilsongrau_en_Outome%20Harvesting%20Brief_revised%20Nov%202013.pdf>, accessed 10 August 2016

'Outcome Harvesting is a utilisation-focused, highly participatory tool that enables evaluators, grant makers, and managers to identify, formulate, verify, and make sense of outcomes they have influenced when relationships of causeeffect are unknown. Unlike some evaluation methods, Outcome Harvesting does not measure progress towards predetermined outcomes or objectives, but rather collects evidence of what has been achieved, and works backward to determine whether and how the project or intervention contributed to the change.'

Woolcock, M., 'Using case studies to explore the external validity of "complex" development interventions', UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research, WIDER Working Paper No. 2013/096, October 2013, <https://www.wider.unu.edu/publication/using-case-studies-explore-external-validity-%E2%80%98complex%E2%80%99-development-interventions-0>, accessed 10 August 2016

‘Rising standards for accurately inferring the impact of development projects has not been matched by equivalently rigorous procedures for guiding decisions about whether and how similar results might be expected elsewhere. These “external validity” concerns are especially pressing for “complex” development interventions, in which the explicit purpose is often to adapt projects to local contextual realities and where high quality implementation is paramount to success. A basic analytical framework is provided for assessing the external validity of complex development interventions.’

Wolff, J., ’Power in Democracy Promotion’, *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 40/3–4 (2015), pp. 219–36, <http://alt.sagepub.com/content/40/3-4/219.abstract>, accessed 10 August 2016

‘This article critically discusses the literature that does explicitly deal with power in democracy promotion and proposes a multidimensional perspective as a way to improve our understanding of the international politics of democracy promotion. First, the typology of power proposed by Barnett and Duvall is applied to systematically conceptualize the power dimension of democracy promotion. Second, the article revisits the two main attempts to theoretically grasp the role and relevance of power in democracy promotion that draw on the Realist concept of relative power and the neo-Gramscian theory of hegemony, respectively. In both cases, the article argues, a multidimensional concept of power is analytically useful, as it enables an understanding of the complex nature of democracy promotion that goes beyond interstate relations and includes the attempt to change the very constitution of the recipient or target country from within.’

Annex C. Participant list

Name	Organization
Alexandra Wilde	UNDP
Anna Godfrey	BBC Media Action
Annika Rigö	Program for Young Politicians in Africa (PYPA)
Cathy Shutt	Big Push Forward
Elin Ekström	Program for Young Politicians in Africa (PYPA)
Emmy Otim	Program for Young Politicians in Africa (PYPA)
Greg Power	Global Partners Governance
Hanne Lund Madsen	Danish Institute for Parties and Democracy (DIPD)
Helena Bjuremalm	International IDEA
Helle Willumsen	European Endowment for Democracy (EED)
Hermenegildo (Gil) Mulhovo	Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD)
Ingrid Wetterqvist	European External Action Service (EEAS)
Jo-Ann Sneddon	Westminster Foundation
Karol Balfe	Christian Aid
Linda Stern	National Democratic Institute (NDI)
Malin Stjernström	International IDEA
Marie Demel	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
Martin Schmidt	SPM Consultants
Monica Johansson	Program for Young Politicians in Africa (PYPA)
Norah Babic	Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU)
Per Nordlund	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
Rebecka Kitzing Ivarsson	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
Rebekah Usatin	National Endowment for Democracy (NED)
Thiyumi Senarathna	International IDEA
Veronique Choquette	International IDEA
William Sjöstedt	International IDEA

Annex D. Agenda

Thursday, 2 June

Time	Programme point	Speakers
10.00–12.00	Introductory session This session includes a round of introductions, a recap of previous workshop, purpose and expectations of thie workshop. Appetizer: 'Reflections on developing learning films and building an organisational culture of research and learning'	Hosts and facilitators: Helena Bjuremalm, Malin Stjernström, Anna-Eva Lohe, Marie Kaufmann Anna Godfrey, Head of Evidence, BBC Media Action
12.00–12.45	Lunch	
12.45–13.00	Introduction to experience-sharing sessions and learning dialogues	
13.00–14.20	'Principles and practice of democratic evaluations: perspectives from a donor and a practitioner' This session shares concrete examples from a donor–practitioner chain, highlighting their approaches to evaluating democracy assistance programming. The presentation demonstrates how an aligned approach and set of principles for 'bottom-up evaluation' not only emphasizes strategic learning in evaluation, but engenders innovative methodologies and empowers local partners in the evaluation. The National Endowment for Democracy (NED) shares its approach to Cumulative Assessments with its core institutes and local partners, while the National Democratic Institute (NDI) illustrates the use of Deliberative Evaluation Methods (DEM) with its local democracy partners across an array of programming funded by the NED. The presentation will be followed by a short Q&A as well as a reflection session.	Linda Stern, Director, Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning, National Democratic Institute Rebekah Usatin, Manager for Program Monitoring and Evaluation, National Endowment for Democracy
14.20–14.50	Coffee and speakers' corner	

14.50–16.10	'What we learned from using 'Learning evaluations' in the Program for Young Politicians in Africa, PYPA: perspectives from funders, practitioners and evaluators' In this session, we will see funders, practitioners, and evaluators from the Program for Young Politicians in Africa (PYPA) and their experience with 'Learning evaluations'. PYPA is a multiparty, transnational African capacity-strengthening program aiming to contribute to a more democratic, representative, and non-discriminatory political system in ten program countries, with the specific objective to increase the participation and influence of young people in politics. PYPA is implemented by four Swedish party affiliated organisations together with two partner organisations. Ongoing and learning evaluation is a flexible form of evaluation, which runs throughout the program, replacing the traditional mid and end-term evaluations. Opposed to more traditional forms of evaluations, the ongoing evaluation is a parallel and organic process aimed at creating conditions for continuous learning. By conveying and spreading empirical findings to other actors involved in the implementation of the program, the joint learning is enhanced through exchange of reflections and knowledge thus creating opportunities for more effective program implementation. The evaluators, become sounding boards and provide continuous input, critical questions, advice and recommendations based on empirical findings and relevant theories. By continuously returning the findings and observations to the program, the researcher co-create knowledge and build reliable support for decisions taken in the process. Compared to traditional end-evaluation methods, the ongoing evaluation not only captures the accountability aspect of evaluation, but also, to a greater extent, the learning facets. The presentation will be followed by a short Q&A as well as a reflection session.	Annika Rigö, chair of the Steering Committee of the Program for Young Politicians in Africa, PYPA Emmy Otim, East Africa Manager of PYPA Monica Johansson, evaluator of PYPA Elin Ekström, evaluator of PYPA

16.10–16.50	Learning Based Management in practice: examples from an outcome mapping initiative with CSO's in Rwanda (pre-recorded audio interview) Outcome Mapping is a project management method focusing on changes in behaviours, relationships and activities among organisations, groups or individuals which the project interacts with. Outcome Mapping builds on the assumption that change processes are complex and non-linear. In 2012–15 the Embassy of Sweden in Rwanda introduced Outcome Mapping as an alternative to logical frameworks to their civil society partners within the areas of democracy and human rights and peacebuilding. Over these years four civil society partners to Sweden switched to Outcome Mapping: Norwegian People's Aid, Aegis Trust, Interpeace and RCN Justice. These international CSO's cooperated with more than 25 local CSO's that also adopted Outcome Mapping. The total annual budget of the projects were around 10 million USD. Sweden also introduced Outcome Mapping to the One UN Family in Rwanda and some of the UN organisations have an interest in using the method. The presentation will be followed by a reflection session.	Joakim Molander, Head of Unit, Unit for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) Kevin Kelpin, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) specialist (joining on Skype)
16.50–17.30	'Building Institutional Resilience through Behaviour Change: Experience from the Iraqi Parliament' The session will discuss the 'KAPE' approach (knowledge-application-practice-effect) developed by Global Partners Governance across many projects, most frequently in difficult political environments. It was originally created to provide a logic that would underpin project design, delivery and measurement, providing i) a framework for the theory of change, ii), a change management strategy, and iii) a tool for measuring progress. It emerged partly in response to funders wanting some sense of progress in volatile political environments like Iraq. Greg Power will discuss how this logic has been applied in GPG's work with the parliament in Iraq, and how it enables GPG to alter activities according to the context, but without losing sight of the longer-term strategic goals. The presentation will be followed a reflection session.	Greg Power, Director, Global Partners Governance
17:30–18:00	Summary: New approaches – What have we learned today?	
18:30	Joint dinner	

Friday 3 June

Time	Program point	Speakers
08.30–09.15	Welcome, recap and individual reflections from previous day	
09.15–09:45	'Action labs' in four groups working in parallel: The concept of Action labs and the topics for discussion will be presented and people will choose their group. The avenues of action are: 1. Op-ed: production of first draft arguing the case for PME approaches that promote ownership and learning 3. Collect and draft your best advice to peers on evaluation principles and guidelines: formulation of 'do's and don'ts' 4. Draft joint action plan on how to initiate and sustain strategic debates on how to change policy and practice with regards to ownership and learning, including how to sustain our network, 5. Open group, task to be decided by participants. Production of draft for sharing.	
09.45–10.30	Action labs, initial discussion The four groups will begin with discussing what can be achieved and what they aspire to do with this time.	
10.30–10.50	Coffee break	
10.50–12.00	Action Labs, production of first draft The five groups will produce a first draft related to their topic of choice. Laptops will be available.	
12.00–13.00	Lunch	
13:00–13:30	Draft 'vernissage' and feedback session The groups will show their drafts to the rest of the participants and get feedback from the other groups.	
13:30–14:05	Production of second draft The groups will utilize the feedback from the previous session and write a second draft	
14:05–14.25	Coffee break	
14:25–14.45	Presentations from the groups	
14:30–15:00	Next steps Responsibility for finalizing and sharing the papers will be decided	
15:00–15.10	Summary: New approaches – what have we learned today?	
15.10–15:30	Looking ahead and next steps	

Annex E. Topics/themes for future events on results management

If someone hosts a workshop/seminar on results management and democracy assistance in the future, what themes/topics would you like to see addressed?

- Tactics of how to shift policy and practice within your own organization, as well as of your funders
- Hearing from the 'Donor–practitioner evaluator chain' on evaluation implementation in democracy assistance . . . what's working and what's not?
- more detail on monitoring and evaluation
- I would like to learn how other organizations work with M and E and prefer when the topic is very hands on rather than theoretical.
- How to learn from the implementing partners experiences and practices
- More on the experiences of different actors involved in chain of adaptive approaches, perhaps teasing outcome key issues
- How to include RBM in real planning
- Problem Driven Iterative Adaption (PDIA) in practice for better results
- other practical examples
- From big to small: why does this make sense in the grand scheme of things - to lessons learnt from different methods in practice
- more thematic specific i.e. look at approaches within only parliamentary strengthening programs or only political parties, election support and so on
- The costs of accountability: how much money is (or should be) spent measuring results?
- Academic-Practitioner partnerships

- Streamlining PME into our day to day work
- More experience sharing related to learning-centred PME approaches: how to get the feedback loop working (planning-implementation-learning-and then planning again, based on lessons learned)
- What constitutes 'rigorous' evaluations and good evidence in DA/governance programming
- Causality
- More detailed reflection on learning processes who is learning what exactly and how
- How to support the planning function of partners
- Combining quantitative and qualitative approaches in practice
- distinguishing between monitoring and (learning) evaluation
- examples of different purposes/emphasis through different approaches
- Donor approaches: not just Sida but a larger spectrum
- innovative evaluation methods
- Experiences with innovative M&E tools
- using evaluation to advocate for democracy and social justice programs
- further develop the list of 'best arguments in convincing different types of actors' that learning-centred options are more useful (building on the list of one of the Action Labs)
- Sharing examples of alternatives to and within RBM approaches ....
- Measuring results from democracy assistance in relation to Agenda 2030
- maintenance and continuous energy to the network that has just been created

Annex F. Survey results: op-ed targets

Can you suggest some possible audiences for a Policy Brief or Discussion Paper to be drafted by International IDEA? (names of individuals, organizations or initiatives)

- the Governance Network of OECD-DAC
- DFID RED, USAID evidence teams, GSDRC, eGap
- Irish Aid
- Would be interesting for donors such as Sida, DFID etc
- Foundation for Community Development
- Brussels bureaucrats
- Expertgruppen för Biståndsanalys (EBA), UD.
- UNDP - Patrick Keuleers / WB - WDR 2017 team and implementation
- I suggest the group that attended are asked to spread it among their own organisations
- kengodfrey@epd.eu
- donors (USAID, DOS, NED)
- the thinking and working politically on line community (twp.org)
- Donors e.g. SIDA, DFID, EU
- the PPPeer Network
- OSISA
- Other donor bureaucrats
- Govnet/Incaf OECD/DAC
- paola.gessi@ec.europa.eu
- democracy assistance practitioners (too many to mention)

- CESC – Mozambique
- OGP
- jb@ecdpm.org (Jena Bousseyt)
- decision-makers (parliaments, ministries)

Annex G. Survey results: general questions

What is your general opinion of the workshop?

Answer Options	Per cent	Count
Very positive	73,7%	14
Somewhat positive	26,3%	5
Somewhat negative	0,0%	0
Very negative	0,0%	0
Comments:	6	
answered question	19	
skipped question	0	

Comments: sharing experiences on alternative evaluation approaches was very useful/ It was very useful/ good for exchange of ideas, building networks and reflecting on alternative evaluation methods/ genuine build-up from the first to the last seminar; this one felt like it generated results/ Really appreciated the presentations of various participatory and learning based evaluation methods./ Although folks are still working through 'action labs' I gained much more clarity on what is being done by others, as well as the issues they are grappling with.

How did you find the format of the workshop? (one day of experience sharing, one day action labs)

Answer Options	Per cent	Count
Very good	73,7%	14
Somewhat good	15,8%	3
Somewhat poor	10,5%	2
Very poor	0,0%	0
Comments	9	
answered question	19	
skipped question	0	

Comments: Day one morning could have been used more for presentations as afternoon was a little rushed (esp on Q&A). Nonetheless, day 1 was hugely valuable./ The first day was excellent- the action labs involving writing by committee did not work for me/ I really enjoyed hearing from others and learning from their experiences./ It was interactive/ Enjoyed hearing from people with different positionalities, though I am not sure there was adequate time to tease out some of the implications./ Very good planning, although I found the experience-sharing sessions somewhat too short, and perhaps day 2 came out a little bit too long/ very dynamic, does not permit being bored or falling asleep :-)/ the second day labs were diffuse and too much text drafting processes/ I liked the concrete examples, 'chains' and conceptual frameworks.

Did you find the experience sharing sessions (first day) useful?

Answer Options	Per cent	Count
Very useful	84,2%	16
Somewhat useful	10,5%	2
Not very useful	0,0%	0
Not useful at all	0,0%	0
No opinion/did not attend	5,3%	1
Comment	4	
answered question	19	
skipped question	0	

Comments: Great experiences/ Several important reminders of issues I tend to forget about because I usually operate at a theoretical level/ put everything in context and made it real/ However, several of the presentations were repetitions of presentations shared recently at similar venues

Did you find the action labs (second day) useful?

Answer Options	Per cent	Count
Very useful	15,8%	3
Somewhat useful	63,2%	12
Not very useful	10,5%	2
Not useful at all	5,3%	1
No opinion/did not attend	5,3%	1
Comments	6	
answered question	19	
skipped question	0	

Comments: Perhaps not enough time to really deliver on these within the time but really looking forward to seeing the outputs./ I like the concept of an action lab but I think it was not enough time to accomplish all we wanted to./ Very insightful/ I wasn't so keen on the way the day was organised and found that the need to share and get several rounds of comments too early interrupted the flow./ less useful for me, still good idea/ The challenge was that we had not fully agreed on terms so a lot of time was spent clarifying the problem

How would you assess the workshop as a learning opportunity?

Answer Options	Per cent	Count
Very good	73,7%	14
Somewhat good	26,3%	5
Somewhat poor	0,0%	0
Very poor	0,0%	0
Comments	5	
answered question	19	
skipped question	0	

Comments: Yes, I have learned a lot/ brought me new perspectives, much appreciated/ Could easily be improved - also the two facilitators did not add much/ Based on day 1 only (I did not attend day 2), I think the workshop was an excellent opoprtunity to learn about alternative approaches to results assessment in democracy support, to complement or substitute traditional RBM logframes... However, most presentations lacked a discussion on practical considerations related to each of the alternative methods (such as timelines, costs, amount of training needed, etc.). This made it harder to form an opinion on whether or not we could realistically consider applying them in our own work./ Terminology used by participants was sometimes problematic with same terms being used but having different meanings

In your view, what were the three most important lessons learned/shared at the workshop?

Comments: there is a growing body of alternative (learning focused) PME approaches out there in the democracy assistance community/ Alternatives within and to RBM under democracy assistance do exists, but not in abundance and not widely shared. IDEA struggled to identify examples of locally-led and learning orientated approaches to PME within democracy assistance projects./ There are many promising alternatives for PME instead the traditional logframe./ Experiences from other programmes/ Keep participatory methods in mind/ That other organizations is working with participatory method/ Be innovative/ View of the Brussels result/neo lib bubble and need to reclaim democracy/ Disregarding the control function, RBM is an opportunity for leaning and strategic planning/ knowledge on concrete models that exist for more adaptive and participatory evaluation methods/ more alternatives to traditional evaluation methods in my toolbox/ that there is a shift from straight jacket RBM to more realistic approaches/ Many different approaches to use to supplement limited value of RBM and logframe/ longitudinal evaluation is inspiring/ There are paths to accountability beyond the traditional logframe approach./ democracy as 'the beautiful game' model/ But they are not (yet) properly documented and shared broadly - this remains to be done/ Existing evaluation and results frameworks perhaps aren't keeping apace ... Need to work more collaborative to address/ For making the case for innovative PME approaches in democracy assistance, we need to focus on the particularities of this field and not on M&E in general/ Participatory monitoring is valuable/ I am strengthened in my opinion that M and E has to be properly budget for/ Use participatory tools/ Useful reminders: continuum of participatory approaches/ greater clarity on intersection PDIA and participatory evaluations/ building national and international networks in the field/ that evaluation can take place in parallel to activities/ Bottom up/participatory and learning centred methods are resource intensive - esp. requires donor mindset change/ the need to bring fourth generation evaluation methods into Dem Ass/ All results assessment methods require work, time and money - there is no such thing as zero-cost accountability./ the need to separate a bit ‘planning, monitoring, reporting’ from ‘evaluation’ as they are not the same thing.

Please share ideas for actions that you are likely to undertake as a result of the workshop

Comments: draft and publish an opinion piece/ Offered to participate in Steering Group/ Reflect on participatory monitoring/ Participate as member of working group/ Allow M and E to cost/ Use some of the experiences to improve my programs/ Support NN in her work as she seems to be situated in a location where there is more of a need for influencing than perhaps other places?/ Discussion/policy paper drafting/ share experiences with colleagues in method and evaluation depts./ borrow ideas from some of the practical examples from Day I/ EPD in Brussels are interested in taking this further/ Stimulate debate within my own organisation/ attach external evaluator from start of programme/ participating on the steering committee for the network/ Cumulative assessments/ try to convince my own organization to dare to make use of more innovative PME methods/ Offer to host a series of blogs on our new Policy and Learning website which share the case studies discussed in the workshop./ Keep in better touch with new colleagues/ Keep networking with some actors/ Applying some of the approaches shared to current practice/influencing work with a group that have not engaged with these debates/ pilot more adaptive programming/ Contact some of the newfound friends and ask for advice or reflections/ I will write up the examples to use in programming and for policy-making, your reports will be very helpful/ publishing the participatory evaluation manual/ recipients of support carrying out own assessments-NDI example/ share findings of the workshop broadly as soon as the ws report is out/ We are scoping a possible governance evidence event towards the end of the year/ early 2017. Could be a good place to invite attendees from this group to discuss what constitutes good evidence from governance programming. (TBC)/ Possibly publish something about my organizations work on evaluation/ I'm much more conscious of different assumptions of those involved in the programme I'm working with than I would have been otherwise and it is really influencing the approach I'm taking to supporting the development of M&L and M&EL plans/ Pilot more participatory ways in which to do evaluations/ I think a new IDEA publication would make a lot of sense/ drafting a thought piece

How did you find the quality of the facilitation of the workshop?

Answer Options	Per cent	Count
Very good	47,4%	9
Somewhat good	42,1%	8
Somewhat poor	10,5%	2
Very poor	0,0%	0
Comments	6	
answered question	19	
skipped question	0	

Comments: Very open and inspiring/ Wasn't so keen on the organisation of the second day as noted above/ very relaxed and down-to earth facilitation, excellent!/ coaching and working WITH not against the energies in the room/ the two external facilitators did not understand the field of work and thus did not add much- they were preoccupied with their facilitation methods and lost focus on what dynamics and interests were really at play in the group/ It was clear that people wanted to discuss in plenary, not just in small groups. However, there needed to be a balance between those and also the coffee breaks.

Thank you kindly for your feedback! Is there anything else you would like to add?

Comments: Thank you, Helena, William and Malin!/ No/ Let me know if you want further clarification - I can't see complete fields and may have made mistakes./ Thank you very much for arranging the workshop! Excellent arrangement and very important discussions!/ Good job! :-)/ Results management and democracy assistance is a theme with a internal contradiction and future initiatives be better convened under a better heading, i.e. planning and evaluation in making democracy work. also good idea to combine methods used nationally in Europe and in aid contexts.

About International IDEA

The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) is an intergovernmental organization that supports sustainable democracy worldwide. International IDEA's mission is to support sustainable democratic change by providing comparative knowledge, assisting in democratic reform, and influencing policies and politics.

What does International IDEA do?

In the fields of elections, constitution-building, political parties, gender in democracy and women's political empowerment, democracy self-assessments, and democracy and development, we undertake our work in three activity areas:

1. providing comparative knowledge derived from practical experience on democracy building processes from diverse contexts around the world;

2. assisting political actors in reforming democratic institutions and processes, and engaging in political processes when invited to do so; and

3. influencing democracy building policies through the provision of our comparative knowledge resources and assistance to political actors.

Where does International IDEA work?

International IDEA works worldwide. Based in Stockholm, it has offices in Africa, the Asia-Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean. International IDEA is a Permanent Observer to the United Nations.

On 2–3 June 2016 International IDEA hosted a workshop, entitled 'Democracy Assistance and Results Management: Ownership and Learning in Action' at its office in Stockholm. The purpose of the workshop was to share experiences of locally led and learning-oriented approaches to the planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME) of democracy-assistance projects and programmes.

The long-term objective of this workshop series is to contribute to further movement towards PME approaches that are less focused on upward accountability and control only, and more focused on learning and local ownership. Partner countries' capacities to drive and own democratization and development is crucial, in particular in light of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

International IDEA
Strömsborg
SE–103 34 Stockholm
Sweden
Phone + 46 8 698 37 00
Fax + 46 8 20 24 22
info@idea.int
www.idea.int