

Results Measurement Working Group (RMWG)

Online meeting, 18 March 2025

Draft minutes

Participants

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Rens Twijnstra (Chair, NL MoFA) | 8. Angela Van Den (RVO) |
| 2. Hitomi Ho (FAO) | 9. Artur Pokrikyan (SDC) |
| 3. Quiller Brooke (Gatsby) | 10. Peter Beez (SDC) |
| 4. Jonas Bolzen (GIZ) | |
| 5. Lea Richard (ILO) | |
| 6. Na Eun Mun (ILO) | |
| 7. Marianne Schmitt (ITC) | |

DCED secretariat

Nabanita Sen Bekkers, Muneeb Zulfiqar

Agenda Items

1. **Member Updates:** Members update on key priorities, shifts, or major developments in results measurement within their organizations.
2. **Assessing System Change in Private Sector Development (PSD):** Presentation by Rens, Jonas & Nabanita on the work item. Discussion on the ToR shared for engaging a consultant and for planning next steps.
3. **Shaping the Agenda for DCED Annual Meeting in June 2025:** Planning the next annual meeting, budget considerations, proposed work items.
4. **Discussion:** How (and should) we measure donor country economic benefits of PSD interventions?

1. Member Updates

Key updates shared by members are as follows:

FAO updated the group on results measurement for two ongoing MSD projects, both funded by SIDA. One focuses on strengthening internal MSD capacities within FAO, and the other aims at improving youth employment opportunities within agriculture value chains.

Gatsby recently completed its annual strategic review meetings to assess organizational progress and performance. The meetings focused particularly on evaluating systemic impacts, emphasizing the need to analyze broader sector-level changes beyond immediate project outcomes.

v. 25th March 25



GIZ reported minimal changes in activity on the results measurement front due to recent general elections in Germany. A new government is currently being formed, which might lead to the appointment of a new Minister for Development Cooperation and potential strategic shifts affecting future activities.

ILO provided an update on their MSD programmes. The organization is investing heavily in strengthening their internal MRM capacities. Additionally, they are currently testing new software tools, such as Paths, to improve data management. They are interested in learning from other organizations using similar tools. They also have ongoing work focused on productivity measurement and plan to conduct mini-assessments to evaluate the quality and usefulness of productivity data collected so far. The effort aims to refine data collection processes and improve subsequent analyses.

ITC shared that the organization has undergone significant internal adjustments in recent months, primarily aimed at harmonizing monitoring and measurement practices within tighter budget constraints. They are navigating the challenge of balancing high-quality data collection against decreasing resources, noting that the organization aims to maintain robust internal monitoring systems while seeking cost-effective methods.

NL MoFA highlighted recent political changes in the Netherlands, including a new government and a new policy direction shifting the focus from traditional development cooperation towards development aid aligned more closely with national economic interests. This approach prioritizes food security, water management, and healthcare, which may require adjustments in the existing results measurement systems to accurately monitor and report contributions to these sectors.

RVO is piloting a new methodology for assessing systemic change, primarily employing desk studies and pragmatic analysis approaches. Within the Centre for the Promotion of Imports (CBI), they have developed a structured format for assessing systems change, focusing on examining structural shifts, behavioral changes, sector performance, and overall impact.

SDC highlighted that the organization's strategic direction headquarters remains unchanged, with a continued emphasis on private sector development, particularly within Market Systems Development and social entrepreneurship initiatives. The South Caucasus region is developing a new strategic focus which will likely influence future programming and results measurement efforts in the area. They shared recent relevant publications that can be useful for other members:

- ⇒ [Guidance paper on measuring productivity](#)
- ⇒ [Slide deck on employment creation](#)
- ⇒ [Slide deck on roles and responsibilities of donor staff to achieve system change and measure impact](#)

DCED Secretariat updated the group on plans to continue the DCED RM webinar series which build on the success of previous webinars covering topics such as using artificial intelligence (AI) in RM, qualitative research methods, good practices in data analysis, and systemic change measurement. Feedback indicated strong appreciation among participants for these thematic discussions, and the webinars will continue to be offered.

2. Assessing System Change in PSD

A TOR was shared in advance to the meeting and the task team explained the proposed work which will be undertaken in three phases. The current work item covers the first phase of the work where a consultant(s) will be engaged to conduct interviews and gather data from member agencies to understand how members target specific systems change in their portfolio or policy and identify specific systems which multiple donors

v. 25th March 25

are targeting. This information will serve as a preliminary step to identifying specific systems which can be further assessed in Phase 2 to see how they have been impacted through the donors' work. A phase 3 is anticipated to use the learnings from the exercise and develop a practical guidance and/or a framework for donors on how to measure their contributions towards systems change at a larger portfolio or policy level.

Members discussed the importance of accurately mapping donor efforts to effectively understand systemic impacts. They emphasized the need to prioritize these mapping efforts clearly and suggested broadening the scope beyond agriculture to include other key sectors, such as manufacturing and vocational training. Members also discussed that to execute the assignment in a practical way, Phase 1 will need to develop common definitions and boundaries on how systems will be selected.

Action Plan:

- 1) Members to nominate relevant person(s) within their agencies to connect with the consultant for the study.
- 2) Members to think about priority sectors for the case studies.

Once published, the ToR for the consultant to be shared with the RMWG for circulation along with a brief explanation on the task.

3. Shaping the Agenda for DCED Annual Meeting:

The group discussed planning the agenda for the upcoming DCED Annual Meeting scheduled for June 17th, 2025. It was agreed that this year's annual meeting would span a full day to sufficiently address different topics including a portion of the day dedicated to discussing the systems change work item.

The group can request up to \$45,000 USD from the trust fund to fund any work items in the next fiscal year. Work items can also be funded through direct contributions from individual donors. Ideally, each proposed work item would require the active involvement of at least three members. The group would need to decide whether to request a budget to cover the second phase of the current year's work item on assessing system change. It was agreed that members will write to the WG chair and/or DCED secretariat if they want to share ideas on new work items. This would ideally need to be decided by the next month.

The current chair of the WG will transition to a new role, indicating the need to identify and elect a new RMWG chair for the next full year.

Action Plan:

- 1) Plan a full-day session for the annual meeting to comprehensively cover all agenda items.
- 2) Finalize and submit proposals for any other work items, considering the maximum annual limit of \$45,000 USD from the trust fund.
- 3) Elect a new chair for the RMWG following Rens' departure.

4. Measuring domestic economic effects alongside impact on recipient firms and beneficiaries

The topic was introduced on whether donors should measure the economic benefits that donor countries derive from their PSD interventions and aid in general. It was noted that particularly under PSE models, donor-country firms often play leading roles, creating a need to measure both domestic economic returns and impacts

v. 25th March 25



on recipient firms and beneficiaries. An example was shared from the Ukraine Partnership Facility (UPF) where funding rules require that Dutch firms link the PSD efforts with national economic interests. The group was invited to share examples or methodologies that go beyond firm-level tracking to understand the broader domestic effects of PSD interventions, especially in a development landscape increasingly influenced by transactional and interest-based Official Development Assistance (ODA). A concern was raised on whether such practices could fall under “tied aid” and entering a model where aid is explicitly linked to the economic gain of donor countries. The group also discussed that with increasingly limited donor budgets, the governments are pushing the private sector to co-invest, especially when there is a clear business case. The group discussed that while this approach may help fill funding gaps, it should not come at the cost of developmental objectives.

v. 25th March 25



