

**Results Measurement Working Group (RMWG)**  
**Meeting Minutes, Hännösand, Sweden, 14 June 2016**

22 June 2016

**Participants**

Anette Andersson (Sida)	Mónica Peiro-Vallejo (EC)
Peter Beez (SDC)	Birgit Seibel (GIZ)
Jim Downey (DFAT)	Marcos Vaena (ITC)
Asa Heijne (Sida)	Johan Veul (NL MoFA)
Wei Huang (DFID, by phone)	Claudio Volonte (IFC, by phone)
Kenji Mishima (JICA)	Mark Wang (IDRC)
Elisabet Montgomery (Sida)	Jim Tanburn, Donna Loveridge, Melina
Irma Keijzer (NL MoFA, by phone)	Heinrich-Fernandes (DCED Secretariat)
Markus Pilgrim (ILO)	

**Indicator Harmonisation exercise**

Claudio Volonte noted that the [final report of phase 1](#) of the Indicator Harmonisation exercise is now published on the DCED website. It proposes a harmonised set of 25 outcome and impact indicators that can be used to report on results from technical assistance operations for private sector development. He also presented a mapping of those indicators onto the SDGs.

It was agreed that this was a very useful and much appreciated exercise, but that the DCED as a whole needed to consider how its work fed into achievement of the SDGs. It was agreed that the Secretariat will draft a statement on how the DCED's different work streams contribute to the SDGs. This will be prominently linked from the DCED website and shared with members. Mónica Peiro-Vallejo will forward a document by CGAP linking financial inclusion indicators to the SDGs, for information.

Phase 2 of the Indicator Harmonisation exercise was also discussed; Claudio agreed to draft ToR by the end of June, for consideration by the Group. It was agreed that the ToR will focus on enhancing the definitions, identifying possible methodologies to measure a selected indicators, and identifying further opportunities for linking these indicators to the SDGs. Nonetheless, it should be mentioned that the harmonised indicators are intended for use in monitoring the results of donor investments, rather than looking at the macro or national level (as the SDGs generally do).

The Group agreed that the work should focus on a few (e.g. 5) indicators; the work should

start with a poll of members to see which are of most interest. Any work on methodologies for measuring changes in indicators should take into account the [existing DCED Standard implementation guidelines](#) (e.g. on assessing attribution).

### **Update on the DCED Standard for Results Measurement**

Jim Tanburn provided an update on recent developments regarding the DCED Standard. Four audits were held during the last year and have required extensive attention from the Secretariat and auditor panel. More audits are in the pipeline. The Global DCED Seminar on Results Measurement in March 2016 was very successful, and with 130 participants. Donors increasingly encourage the use of the Standard in calls for proposals.

Some agencies have been exploring how to integrate the good practice elements of the Standard into their own processes. Most recently, SDC [published a paper](#) on how the Standard fits into SDC's project cycle in order to support programme managers in helping implementing partners to work towards compliance. Previously, GIZ had produced a paper outlining synergies and differences between the Standard and its own monitoring system. ITC is now working on internal documents explaining how to implement the Standard.

Several agencies expressed an interest in learning more about training opportunities. [Upcoming training courses are advertised on the DCED website](#), including an online training course. More specific requests for information about advice and support can be directed to the DCED Secretariat.

### **Mapping of Results Measurement in the Impact Investment community**

The main objective of this assignment is to increase DCED members' understanding of results measurement practices and innovations in the area of impact investment, particularly in relation to what impact investors are measuring, how they are measuring it and the quality of measurement practices. It will be implemented by a consultant who is experienced in results measurement systems of both donor-funded programmes and impact investment funds. The following comments were made on the draft ToR:

- While it will be important to consider the vast literature on results measurement systems and frameworks in impact investment, the emphasis should be put on what these funds actually measure in practice
- It might be useful to consider the experiences of European impact investment institutions, such as the European Investment Bank.
- Practices in big impact investments funds and small social enterprises should be clearly distinguished, as they are likely to be different. The initial work should focus on large investment funds.

### **Date of next meeting**

A teleconference will be held in early October. A doodle poll will be used to finalise the date.