



The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development

Results Measurement Working Group Meeting Minutes
Danida Copenhagen, Tuesday 16th June 2015

8th July 2015

Participants

Lars Christian Oxe, Danida (host)
Peter Beez, SDC
Jim Downey, DFAT
Irma Keijzer, Netherlands MoFA
Ivan Lukáš, CzDA
Kenji Mishima, JICA
Elisabet Montgomery, Ola Pettersson, Sida

Markus Pilgrim, Merten Sievers, ILO
Birgit Seibel, GIZ
Katharina Spiess, BMZ
Nilgün Tas, UNIDO
Helen Bradbury, ALCP
Jim Tanburn, DCED Secretariat

Joining by VC for part of the meeting:

Claudio Volonte, Victoria Chang, Ugo Amoretti, IFC; Christopher Calvin, IFC consultant

One aim of the meeting was to review progress with the Indicator Harmonisation Project. As it came just before the Annual Meeting, the group also considered the Work Plan, although time did not permit consideration in any detail.

DCED Private Sector Development Indicator Harmonisation Project

Claudio Volonte and Christopher Calvin presented the current state of play with the indicator harmonisation process; 689 indicators had been slimmed down to 25 or so, with inputs from 15 DCED members. This was achieved for example by removing qualitative indicators, and those used at country level. Indicators in common use and considered SMART were given preference. Indirect effects had been added back, following the view of the group at the Frankfurt meeting (20th May).

The work done so far on this topic was appreciated by the group; nonetheless, there were many comments on individual aspects. On cross-cutting indicators, the group questioned the change to talking of "jobs supported" rather than "created"; Claudio noted that IFIs use that expression, but some felt it was vague. There was concern that gender was not sufficiently prominent across the whole range; it was explained that gender indicators had been found to be mainly qualitative, so had been removed in this round.

On Business Environment Reform, there was concern to include indicators for both imports and exports. Now that Market Development is a transversal theme, having Value Chain as a vertical theme would be a duplication for some agencies. Otherwise, there was some confusion as the presentation included some errors, and the video link broke down, so it was agreed that the comment period be extended at least until June 29.

The group felt that formalising the indicator set through, for example, a Memorandum of Understanding with each agency, was not appropriate at this stage. Several reasons were given; for

example, some felt that such indicators should be suggested to partners, rather than mandated. Others felt that not all of the current indicators had full support. Yet others were concerned about the time required to finalise and sign an MoU, not least because of the involvement of multiple departments and lawyers.

Internal marketing of the eventual list within each agency was nonetheless considered important. Messaging needs to be consistent with the [DCED Standard for results measurement](#), which proposes that most indicators should be selected, based on the results chain or logic of the individual programme.

In a possible Phase 2, consideration of inclusive business and innovation were mentioned as promising. Similarly, additional qualitative indicators could be very useful, particularly as a list of ideas. Gender and job quality concerns should be prominent. However, again care should be taken if methodological guidance is included, that it not duplicate or contradict the DCED Standard.

Member updates

ILO recently had its first DCED audit, of the SCORE programme in India; the [audit report](#) and a [note on lessons learned](#) by ILO are on the DCED website. The audit motivated the team to get organised, and showed donors that the ILO was serious about results measurement. ILO is implementing a programme with SECO called [the Lab](#) which now has several publications relevant to results measurement.

BMZ: GIZ is using the Standard framework in three countries, although it probably will not go for formal audits. BMZ and IADB are reviewing good practice in impact assessment by private companies, focusing on how they measure social impact, under the P4P umbrella. The study will include a mapping of instruments, and 3 case studies.

Netherlands MoFA: to meet the challenge of concise but comprehensive reporting to Dutch parliament, the Ministry now has chosen 10 indicators for aggregation of results across six areas of PSD. The Ministry is also keen to see IATI more widely adopted, to enhance transparency in aid achievements and to ensure better use of data.

Sida: The current government is not focusing as much on aggregation of results, but rather on strategy. Qualitative indicators are being emphasised. While the Department focusing on M4P suggests the use of the DCED Standard (and associated indicators), another Department within Sida is responsible for tools. Sida has found the DCED guideline on results measurement in challenge funds particularly useful.

DFAT is distinguishing between Private Sector Development and Private Sector Engagement in its new strategy documents. They should be available publicly in the next month or so. DFAT will encourage the use of common indicators.

Danida noted that there is no trend at present towards the use of headline indicators, although the forthcoming election might see a change in that approach. The latest Danida guidelines encourage

use of Theories of Change; two Danish-funded programmes are currently using the DCED Standard, and one has been audited.

SDC found the use of common indicators quite complicated, so is currently engaged in an internal e-discussion on ways forward. A training event is proposed for later in the year, to share approaches agreed during this e-discussion.

CzDA has many new projects and is now addressing the issues of methodology and evaluation.

Voice from the field

Helen Bradbury, Team Leader of the Mercy Corps [Alliances Lesser Caucasus Programme](#), spoke about her experiences in using the DCED Standard for results measurement. She mentioned that her programme had been through a [DCED audit](#), and had found the experience very useful. She also noted that her programme included elements of BDS, Business Environment Reform and value chain development (relating it back to the indicators discussion).

She highlighted the results being achieved by the programme, as published in the latest ALCP [Annual Report](#); the Standard and audit give these results greater credibility. They also allow for a more open-ended logframe. She stressed that the Standard is not costly to implement, but does require more thought. Above all, it enhances the effectiveness of field programmes through greater clarity, representing a 'whole different approach' to programme management.

Action points:

- Members of the group to provide further feedback to IFC on the proposed indicators by June 29.
- The list could be finalised around October 2015, following internal consultations in participating agencies.
- Phase 2 will be considered, to focus on more challenging PSD themes (IB, JQ etc.) and qualitative indicators.