



The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development

**DCED Workshop on
Results Measurement in PSD projects in Fragile and Conflict Affected States**
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, The Hague
November 5-6, 2014

Summary of Key Issues and Next Steps

18 November 2014

Participants

Anouk Aarts, NL MFA	Luba Shara, IFC
Birgit Seibel, BMZ/GIZ	Ted Volchok, Mercy Corps
Chaoying Liu, IFC	Thomas Morgan, Institute for Economics and Peace
Charu Bist, UNDP	Ralf Lange, FAKT Consulting (for BMZ/GIZ)
Fia van der Klugt, NL MFA	Steven Schoofs, Clingendael CRU
Irma Keijzer, NL MFA (5 Nov only)	Jim Tanburn (facilitator) and Melina Heinrich, DCED
Jon Kurtz, Mercy Corps (5 Nov only)	Secretariat

This workshop, initiated by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, brought together agencies with an active interest and practical experiences in results measurement of PSD in conflict-affected environments (CAEs). It aimed to stimulate knowledge sharing based on case studies and practical examples, including on conflict analysis and theories of change linking PSD, job creation and stability, and appropriate measurement and management practices. The DCED Standard for Results Measurement¹ as well as the Practical Guidelines for Implementing the Standard in CAEs² were used as a framework and basis for the discussions. The workshop concluded with recommendations of next steps to further advance results measurement of PSD in CAEs.

Presentations

- The workshop started off with an [introductory presentation](#) by Melina Heinrich providing an overview of key elements and principles of the DCED Standard for results measurement and, in particular, the DCED's Practical Guidelines for using the Standard in CAEs. It included advice on how to incorporate do no harm or peacebuilding in the development of results chains, 5 examples of theories of change linking PSD and peace/ stability, and practical recommendations on defining, measuring and managing indicators.
- Ted Volchok and Jon Kurtz presented [experiences from Mercy Corps](#), including lessons from results measurement of peace and conflict interventions in Uganda and Indonesia focused on the outcomes and impacts of combined economic development and conflict programming, the operational challenges of implementing such programs, and on effectively measuring results against Theories of Change in such a context. They also presented a case study on the INVEST programme in Afghanistan examining the link between vocational training and support for political violence including insights on how to measure impact in active conflict environments; and insights into how to apply a conflict lens to sector selection and results chain development in the context of a market systems development (or M4P) program being implemented in Liberia.
- Ralf Lange and Birgit Seibel presented case studies on the social and economic integration of young people after conflict and conflict-sensitive value chain promotion supporting youth co-operatives as business start-ups, based on BMZ programme experience (implemented by GIZ) in [DRC](#) and [Timor Leste](#). These covered aspects such utilizing the results of conflict assessment as operational entry points for

¹ <http://www.enterprise-development.org/page/measuring-and-reporting-results>

² <http://www.enterprise-development.org/page/download?id=2098>

PSD programmes; human resource implications for programmes wishing to ‘do no harm’; a conceptual approach which assumes that young people who are both socially and economically integrated are less likely at risk to return to violent conflict; indicators on the reduction of conflicts along value chains; and data collection methods to measure social integration and cohesion.

- Luba Shara presented [experiences from IFC’s CASA programme](#), including lessons on moving from conflict blind to ‘do no harm’ approaches in CASA II, and insights into results achieved based on a recent evaluation of 24 investment climate projects in 5 post-conflict countries.
- Charu Bist gave an overview of the New Deal and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) processes and indicators. The [New Deal Indicators](#) are linked to SDG 16 on ‘promoting peaceful and inclusive societies,’ and will be linked to the final discussions on the Sustainable Development Goals. Further, there is the opportunity to initiate the country level implementation of some of the relevant New Deal indicators in practice. Participants discussed that the New Deal indicators provides wider political statements and/or possible objectives to be considered in programming. As indicators to be measured at the national or programme level requires further discussions and agreement at the country level. Further details on the New Deal process can be found at <http://www.newdeal4peace.org/peacebuilding-and-statebuilding-goals>.

Key issues and next steps

- **Sharing of workshop presentations:** Participants will send their presentations to Melina Heinrich (heinrich@enterprise-development.org). All presentations, unless containing confidential information, will be made available via a suitable online platform
- **Additions to the DCED Practical Guidelines on Measuring Results in CAEs:** The discussions highlighted several aspects that could be illustrated further or articulated more clearly in the Practical Guidelines. Where additional information can be obtained from participants, **the Secretariat will therefore incorporate the following aspects in the Guidelines** and share the revised version with the group for comments:
 - The Guidelines could better articulate different categories of conflict and what kinds of theories of change linking PSD and peacebuilding are likely to be relevant for them. It was also noted that peace and stability objectives can often not be achieved with PSD interventions alone but only if these are complemented with ‘social’ development activities – with implications for possible theories of change.
 - Different agencies have different starting points and approaches for PSD in CAEs. For example, investment climate reforms will follow very different logics than value chain or market development interventions. The Guidelines could distinguish better between examples of theories of change that may be relevant for these different types of approaches.
 - A clearer distinction could be made between approaches that aim to actively promote peace in a conflict context, approaches that primarily aim to mitigate the negative impacts of conflict, and approaches that seek to maintain peace in a stabilized situation.
 - Several examples and case studies on theories of change presented during the workshop could be used to further illustrate existing recommendations in the Practical Guidelines (e.g. how CASAII moved towards a conflict-sensitive approach; on measuring social and economic integration/social cohesion; or on how Mercy Corps/ Afghanistan tested the widespread assumption that vocational training and employment will promote stability). Similarly, further indicator examples, such as in the area of social reintegration, could be incorporated.

- The Grow Liberia programme applied a novel approach to sector selection in its design phase by combining both economic and peacebuilding criteria. This could be included as an example of how a programme chose peacebuilding as a starting point (as opposed to do no harm or a conflict blind approach).
 - The workshop discussions highlighted that a programme focus on peacebuilding / social and economic integration/social cohesion and working with certain target groups often does not go hand in hand with interventions aimed at achieving broader economic development objectives and scale (horizontal versus vertical program objectives). The Guidelines could highlight this trade-off.
 - The examples given by the participants of the workshop of triangulation of results, using both qualitative and quantitative methods for measuring results, can illustrate the Guidelines on this particular aspect. It was highlighted that results of programs in CAEs may only be visible after a longer period of time. Thus, doing an evaluation three years after project completion, may be a sensible thing to do.
 - The importance of staff training as well as organisational culture vis-a-vis conflict-sensitive approaches was frequently mentioned. It would be of interest to incorporate examples of how agencies go about promoting greater skills and awareness among their staff for conflict-sensitivity if adequate information can be gathered. Meanwhile, the Guidelines could provide some key arguments making the case to implementers for measuring conflict sensitivity.
- **Usage and/or expansion of the DCED Key Resources for PSD Practitioners in CAEs:** Several participants noted concerns that traditional conflict or political economy analyses are often too abstract to yield operational entry points for PSD programmes, and to be used by staff on a regular basis. IFC is currently working with Clingendael to develop a more operational, PSD-focused conflict analysis methodology. This is of interest in the context the [DCED's Key Resources for Practitioners of PSD in CAEs](#) (2010), which suggest ways to adapt traditional conflict analysis tools for PSD interventions; it also has practical suggestions on how to incorporate a conflict lens into common PSD assessment and design tools. **The Secretariat will liaise with Clingendael** to see if the Key Resources could be relevant to their current work, or if a new methodology could be referenced or incorporated in the Key Resources.
 - **Interviews with programme managers in the field:** The group recognised that so far, there has been limited feedback from the field on their actual usage and that there was a risk of making the Practical Guidelines a headquarter-driven document. It was therefore agreed to get a better sense of what PSD programmes in CAEs are actually doing in terms of results measurement. This would be a 'neutral' exercise, **implemented by the DCED Secretariat**, to take stock of the realities in the field and summarise them in an anonymised way. It was agreed that **participants will send contact details of programme managers to the Secretariat**. To inform the development of the questionnaire, **IFC will also share a recent internal survey among their programme managers with the Secretariat**.
 - **Sharing of conflict analyses:** Workshop participants were keen to share conflict analyses (if possible as it contains sensitive information) by their agency in confidence with others in the group, to minimise duplication and learn from each other's' work.
 - *Appropriate costs of results measurement in CAEs* as a share of the overall programme budget were a topic of repeated discussion. While participants would appreciate guidance

on this, it was concluded that it would be difficult to develop general rules or even collect data on this from ongoing programmes. This is because results measurement budgets depend a lot on the size and geographical spread of programmes; moreover, activities that may be part of the 'measurement' budget in some programmes, may be part of the general implementation and management budget in others.

- *Various other potential follow-up actions* were discussed that may not translate into any immediate action but will be kept in mind for the future and partly be informed by the findings of the interviews; they include:
 - The module on results measurement in the [DCED training course on PSD in FCAS](#) could be expanded.
 - The DCED could organise a webinar on the topic, or a regional workshop in the field.
 - The DCED could compile practical information on how to use ICTs for data collection in CAEs.
 - The Guidelines could flash out more clearly the definitions of 'contribution' and 'attribution' and how to measure each.
 - Conference side events could be used to further promote awareness of the Guidelines.