Institutional Evolution (Kleine Veerzaal)

Monitoring and evaluation in multilateral development banks. Is gathering lessons learned leading to institutional innovations? Fredrik Korfker (consultant) and Elsa de Morais Sarmento (ADB)

Bridging stakes and converging focus. Are we undertaking M&E for responsible innovation in PPP context? Marlene Roefs and Simone Vugt (CDI)

Title: Monitoring and evaluation in multilateral development banks – Is gathering lessons learned leading to institutional innovations?

Presenters: Fredrik Korfker/Elsa Sarmento

Function: Fredrik Korfker, consultant, and before retirement Chief Evaluator of the EBRD, London. He also leads the EES thematic working group on Private Sector Evaluation. Elsa de Morais Sarmento, lecturer at the University of Aveiro (Portugal) and an expert evaluator.

Relevance of the paper for the conference theme

In multilateral development banks (MDBs), evaluation policies and practices are aimed at increasing accountability and learning. Learning, in particular, is at the heart of innovation in these institutions, which is also able to lead to an improved organizational effectiveness and aid the fulfillment of an institution’s objectives. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in MDBs is part of these institutions drive for enhanced learning, accountability, but also has a role in the innovation process, through lessons learned made available from projects, strategies and policies’ M&E processes.

Further, a characterization of the innovation process within the MDB’s context during the last 20 years would not be complete without an account of the developments taking place in the Evaluation Cooperation Group (ECG1). The ECG was created to enhance collaboration among different MDB’s evaluation functions and ease learning. One of its initial objectives was to develop a wide range of good practice standards for public sector evaluation, private sector evaluation, evaluation of country’s strategies, amongst others. Further details will be presented on ECG recent developments, thereby describing the process of preparing evaluation good practice standards, in particular those for the private and public sector evaluation.

Abstract

During the workshop several themes will be presented:
(a) The evolving experience of the ECG and MDBs evaluation systems and whether this has enhanced innovation within these institutions;
(b) Examples of good practice standards and how relevant they are for other development finance institutions;
(c) ECG benchmarking exercises of good practice standards, its importance in assuring that innovation takes off at the level of evaluation functions;
(d) Performance rating systems for public as well as private sector evaluation, driving institutional learning and the importance of holding MDBs accountable.
(e) The enhanced focus on learning lessons and how this has driven change and innovation in MDBs.

---

1 The ECG is the working group among the multilateral development banks (MDBs) in which the heads of evaluation of these institutions and some other IFIs collaborate. For more information on the ECG the website [www.ECGnet.org](http://www.ECGnet.org) can be visited.
Title: Bridging stakes and converging focus - Are we doing M&E for responsible innovation in PPP context?

Presenters: Marlene Roefs and Simone van Vugt

Institution: Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen UR

About the presenters:
Marlene Roefs is a Monitoring and Evaluation specialist. She has research and consultancy experience in poverty, food security, economic and sustainable development, governance, basic services, and renewable energy. Main areas of expertise include survey research, M&E systems and frameworks, strategic planning, logic models (ToC), and evaluations.

Simone Vugt is a capacity building and development and institutional change specialist. She focuses on facilitating multi-stakeholder processes and monitoring & evaluation for learning. Simone implements organisational and institutional development processes and coaches the stakeholders involved. These processes concern value chain development in Food systems.

Abstract
Are you already involved in a public private partnerships (PPP)? How do you support responsible innovation? Shared costs of or risk taking in development and often innovative initiatives though PPPs is becoming common practice. Interest of the partners converge in terms of inputs, but often less strongly in terms of results or innovative and responsible development. What do we mean with this and how can we use M&E to support responsible innovation? Building meaningful M&E systems in the PPP context requires bridging a development perspective with an economic or production one. We would like to share our experiences and insights with setting up M&E systems for and with PPPs. Responsible Innovation is linked to the Why, What, How, Who, When, and for Whom to M&E. Do you have some smart answers? Please join our conversation!
**Shifting mindsets and cultures in complicated partnership based systems** (Hoevestein)

Learning Partnerships: Current Realities and Future Prospects. *Bethany Davies (Clear Horizon) with Brian Belcher (CIFOR) and Julien Colomer (IUCN)*

Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation of Systems Innovation; Case Humidtropics, a CGIAR Research Program. *Eric Koper (International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Nigeria).*

**Title:** Learning Partnerships: Current Realities and Future Prospects

Type of session:
Participatory, practitioner led reflection on M&E partnerships

**Organisers:**
1. Brian Belcher, Professor, Faculty of Social and Applied Sciences, Royal Roads University and Senior Associate Scientist, Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
2. Julien Colomer, Monitoring and Learning Officer, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
3. Bethany Davies, Senior Consultant, Clear Horizon

**Lead person:**
Bethany Davies

**Function:**
Senior Consultant

**Institution:**
Clear Horizon

**Street name, town/city, country:**
129 Chestnut St, Cremorne, Victoria, Australia

**Focus of the session:**

The session will discuss the cooperative partnership between three international organizations working in the fields of environmental conservation and development, a common donor and an inter-organization team of M&E practitioners aiming to improve their effectiveness in contributing to transformative innovation.

Through the lens of grounded experience, the session will explore the way a multi-institutional initiative is using M&E to drive improvements in organization effectiveness and learning capability.

The case study will explore efforts by the partnership to:
- find appropriate M&E solutions to fit their complex operating contexts and reflect their unique contributions to broader global challenges
- embrace emergent design principles within confines of existing organizational processes
- develop evaluative, learning cultures within large institutions
- make a combined contribution to the global ability to use the best of cross-disciplinary knowledge to protect our planet’s natural resources.

The session will then engage in a future-focused conversation about the systemic drivers that are influencing the achievement of desired global outcomes. This will encourage participants to reflect on the role of design and learning focused M&E in facilitating this and demonstrating its value.

**Relevance of proposed session for the conference theme ‘M&E for Responsible Innovation’:**

The ability of key actors to find solutions and address the pressing challenges facing humanity are increasingly constrained by systems and processes designed to meet the needs of a different time. As the drivers for change accelerate, and with viable alternatives to existing models yet to mature, large institutions need to adapt and change.

This session will explore the disjunctions between progressive, innovation-focused conversations in M&E and the organizational and institutional realities facing many key players in the sustainability space. It will highlight the positive steps organizations are taking to bridge the gaps between what is and what might be.

It will also look at the way the existing rules of engagement between key actors in the development space need to change in order to create an environment in which responsible innovation can occur.
Format and session approach:

Presenting a multi-organizational case study as an entry point, the session will then lead participants through a facilitated conversation regarding institutional and systemic drivers for responsible innovation and the key steps different actors need to take to realize a future state. Participant’s reflections will be sought on the ideal future for partnerships in M&E, the roles M&E stakeholders would be playing to facilitate this and what tangible steps can be taken to progress this vision.

The session will draw on participatory force-field analysis and people-centred program logic mapping methodologies to structure the conversation. Participants will have the chance to discuss their ideas and experiences in smaller groups before bringing these together in a facilitated plenary to look for themes and convergence.

Title of the presentation: Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation of Systems Innovation; Case Humidtropics, a CGIAR Research Program

Name: Eric Koper
Function: Chief Officer Management Humidtropics
Address: International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Oyo Road, Ibadan, Nigeria

Relevance to the conference theme 'M&E FOR Responsible Innovation' & abstract of the presentation

Humidtropics, a CGIAR Research Program led by the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) started in July 2012 and seeks to transform the lives of the rural poor in tropical Americas, Asia and Africa. It uses integrated systems research and unique partnership platforms for better impact on poverty and ecosystem integrity. Core program partners are: AVRDC, Bioversity International, CIAT, CIP, FARA, icipe, ICRAF, IITA, ILRI, IWMI, and WUR.

Integrated systems are complex, dynamic and vary from location to location. The Theory of Change of Humidtropics is based on the hypothesis that the region’s inherent potential is best realized through an integrated systems approach, built around sustainable intensification and diversification, involving participatory action across stakeholder groups. Humidtropics addresses this by enhancing the capacity to innovate at farm, institutional and landscape levels thus contributing to delivering on the CGIAR System Level Outcomes (SLOs) related to poverty, nutrition and environment.

Innovation Platforms and other change coalitions help to identify and prioritize systems problems and opportunities, supported by systems analysis, to identify entry points that require social and technical innovations. The main entry points are poverty status and ecosystem integrity status to determine social and technical intervention pathways where changes in systems productivity, natural resources management, and institutions and markets will improve the status of these entry points. Integrated systems research embraces the complexity of the system. Its multiple intervention pathways display trade-offs and synergies between competing use of resources and benefits based on different entry points and priorities. The program uses an overarching Impact Pathway incorporating all Intermediate Development Outcomes (IDOs) as basis for more detailed and quantified site specific Impact Pathways that result from priorities and entry points established for each research location. In 2014 we introduced a Platform Research Fund to which change coalitions could write proposals that would include a strong M&E component subject to Results Based Management (RBM) principles. In 2015 this fund has significantly increased as a better pathway to mainstreaming RBM over all Flagship Projects and Clusters of Activities.

Innovation is at the essence of Humidtropics. The CGIAR is undergoing a further reform where a results and performance culture needs to be developed and nurtured. The traditional logframe approaches, especially in relation to research programs that traditionally focus on delivering research outputs in terms of technologies (such as new seeds, pest control, value chains, etc) and publications (preferably Thomson rated), fail to be explicit about what the research programs do in relation to “selling” this research output to next users such as seed multiplication organisations or extension services so that they will be used as a development input that lead to development outcomes and impact. Furthermore taking a systems approach that considers trade-offs and synergies between a range of social and technical interventions by systems actors from farmers to institutions adds a layer of complexity that implies the need for reflexivity and dynamic management implementation. As such Humidtropics has embarked on a change program that embraces results based management and related M&E principles where reflective loops will not only adjust the targets but also complex dynamics of interventions on the systems through
learning. The presentation and discussion will include what Humidtropics has done so far and what the considerations for the core conference questions are.

**Key challenges**

We work in four main Action Areas: East and Central Africa, West Africa, Central Mekong and Central America and the Caribbean. Core funding was about $40m since June 2012 and including mapped bilateral projects such as N2Africa, CIALCA, AfricaRISING this is estimated to be $120m to date. The key areas are sustainable intensification, institutional innovation and nutrition based on social and technical interventions at farm, institutional and landscape levels. Beyond the core partners mentioned there is large engagement and funding of additional partners at local (universities, NGOs, etc), national and international levels. As such we form a so called formalized knowledge network which has some interesting challenges for M&E. For example how do you plan together? How do you account together when the partners mainly manage their own affairs with funds received to contribute to the whole? How do you create a common M&E culture? How dealing with multiple cultures, languages types of organizations can you get things done, account for them and learn from each other’s experiences across the globe and physical, cultural and mental boundaries?

I will try to demonstrate through the case study how this plays out on the ground, how this can be managed and what progress we are making. Meanwhile I will encourage the conference participants to help think through some of these scenarios and challenges and come up with ideas that may help to deal with the realities on the ground.

**Background on Humidtropics RBM&E**

**Results Based Management**

Results-Based Management (RBM) is a management strategy that is performance-based culture focused on results as supported by the CGIAR Consortium Office in pursuit of delivering value for investment.

Implementing a result based management system (RMBS) is a logical way to manage and account for Humidtropics as a multi-partner complex program operating at multiple locations. Moving towards RBMS implementation is a transformative process where “existing” investment mechanisms, partnerships and output delivery approaches need rethinking and change. Delivering research outputs is just not good enough if no clear links are made between implementation (inputs -> activities -> outputs) results (outcomes -> impacts) and value (investments). RBMS outlines the anticipated processes involved in planning, implementing, monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on results throughout the lifecycle of Humidtropics and will:

- respond to demands for accountability;
- help formulate and justify budget requests;
- help make operational resource allocation decisions;
- Trigger examinations of what performance problems (with the theory of change or implementation) exist and what corrections are needed;
- help motivate partners to continue making program improvements;
- monitor the performance of grantees;
- provide data for special, in-depth program reviews and evaluations;
- help track output delivery against precise outcome targets (are we doing things right?);
- support strategic and other long-term planning efforts (are we doing the right things?), and;
- communicate with the stakeholders and others to build investor and public trust.

Most systems will focus on the following RBM principles:

- Ensure a clear and logical program design that ties resources and activities to expected results;
- Describe roles and responsibilities for partners involved in implementation;
- Make sound judgments on how to improve performance on an ongoing basis;
- Demonstrate accountability and benefits to stakeholders; and,
- Ensure reliable and timely information is available to CGIAR and key stakeholders.

**Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBM&E)**

The RBM&E requires strong results-based monitoring and evaluation based decision-making on fund allocations based on performance measures.

The RBM&E System:

- uses data to describe a problem before beginning an initiative;
- tracks indicators for the outcomes to be achieved;
- collects data on inputs, activities, and outputs and their contributions to achieving outcomes;
- assesses the robustness and appropriateness of the deployed theories of change;
- includes systematic reporting to stakeholders;
- is conducted with strategic partners;
- captures information on the success or failure of partnership strategy in achieving results, and;
- constantly strives to provide credible and useful information as a management tool.

Humidtropics Management is responsible for monitoring, Monitoring (supported by Consortium Office, CO) tracks the regular collection of data on inputs, activities, outputs, and research outcomes and is based on agreed indicators of progress for use by management, evaluation and for external reporting. Evaluation (supported by Independent Evaluation Arrangement, IEA) is a systematic, independent in-depth assessment that covers all evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impacts and quality of research. In the CGIAR, they mainly focus on the earlier parts of the results chain (inputs, activities, outputs and research outcomes) linked to the contribution to IDOs. It also takes into account any available results from impact assessment studies. Impact (supported by Standard Panel on Impact Assessment, SPIA) focuses on the later stages in the results chain with special emphasis on the linkages between outcomes and long-term impacts. Impact assessments are usually (a) in depth and (b) timed after farmers have already adopted processes and practices.

Implementation of RBM&E involves developing the framework and related indicator matrix (in progress), staffing and recruitment of M&E specialists (in progress) and capacity development in RBM&E at all levels of management and implementation with emphasis on management decision-makers (in progress). We use DevResults as the supporting M&E Software
Lobby and Advocacy (Room: Pomona 1)

Using M&E of Lobby and Advocacy for Responsible Innovation. Lieke Ruijmschoot (Fair Green Global Alliance) and Karine Godthelp (Context, international)

Oxfam’s Behind the Brands Campaign Yvonne Es and Monique van Zijl (Oxfam-Novib)

Session Workshop title: Using M&E of Lobby and Advocacy for Responsible Innovation

Facilitators: Lieke Ruijmschoot (Fair, Green and Global alliance) and Karine Godthelp (Context, international cooperation)

Workshop objectives and content:
The workshop is aimed to present the participants the difficulties of and possible solutions to monitoring and evaluating lobby and advocacy in such a way that it contributes to responsible innovation. More specifically, the facilitators will guide the participants through some of the monitoring and evaluation approaches adopted in the case of the Fair, Green and Global (FGG) alliance.

Setting The Stage: Responsible Innovation, Lobby And Advocacy, And M&E

Responsible innovation is defined as ‘a research, development or innovation process that takes into account effects and potential impacts on the environment and society’\(^2\). The European Commission, in a 2012 publication\(^3\), identified six principles for responsible research and innovation: engagement, gender equality, science education, open access, ethics, and governance. Taking these six principles as a basis, there is a clear link between responsible innovation and lobby & advocacy programmes, or policy influencing work, in two ways. First of all, in terms of content, or what we aim to achieve. In the case of the FGG alliance, the core aim is to pursue these same principles –and thus responsible innovation- in policy frameworks. Secondly, in terms of process, or how we try to achieve our objectives; do we apply these same principles in the implementation of our work? Do we innovate responsibly by integrating these principles in how we monitor, evaluate, and learn in our work? Lobby and advocacy present, by their nature (complex, dynamic, non-linear, beyond our control, continuous), particular challenges to monitoring and evaluation. The question is how to address the challenges posed by lobby and advocacy, in a way that supports responsible innovation, in your M&E framework?

Monitoring:
The FGG alliance observes that a number of characteristics of its M&E framework play a valuable role in this. Monitoring for responsible innovation in lobby & advocacy work needs to include both collection and aggregation of data, as well as ensuing discussions on these data for: validation; bringing in other voices; ‘making sense'; coming to an overall –forward looking- analysis. These characteristics allow for measuring for management purposes, exchange on what works and what doesn't, learning from each other, new collaborations and ideas and thereby lead to improvements of the programmes (innovation). We will also shortly go into where our M&E framework falls short of enabling responsible innovation.

Evaluation:
Using evaluation of lobby and advocacy for responsible innovation is a matter of adopting evaluation approaches that contribute to (programme / strategic / organisational) innovation both through content and form. In terms of content, evaluation that is to be used for responsible innovation goes beyond a narrow focus on the possible achievement of programme objectives; it even goes beyond an analysis of unexpected consequences, for the good or the bad. Evaluation that truly contributes to responsible innovation needs to be able to grasp change processes and take on a guiding role towards responsible innovation. In terms of form, on the other hand, evaluation should facilitate not only participation, but ownership of the evaluation process and findings; embedding of the evaluation process and findings in the wider organisation; and utilization or adoption of evaluation outcomes in organisational processes and strategies, in order to create organisational conditions required for triggering responsible innovation.

In 2014, the FGG alliance commissioned Context to carry out the Mid Term Evaluation of the FGG programme. For this evaluation, Context carried out four case studies, using a distinct methodological approach to evaluating lobby and advocacy. During the presentation, this approach will be discussed, using concrete examples from the evaluation to illustrate both the approach and the benefits for the alliance. Light will be shed on this case both from the perspective of the evaluator and the perspective of the FGG alliance, thus elaborating on how the evaluation of the FGG programme actually contributed to responsible innovation within and through the FGG alliance.


SUBGROUP DISCUSSIONS:
After the presentation, the participants will be divided into subgroups. The groups are expected to jointly
discuss and reflect upon the following questions:

1) What are the needs of programme staff in terms of M&E of lobby & advocacy that may
contribute to responsible innovation?
2) What are the opportunities / approaches that M&E can offer in order to contribute to responsible
innovation of lobby & advocacy programmes?
3) How can we match these needs and opportunities?
4) To what extent does the presented methodological approach provide guidance for using M&E of
Lobby and Advocacy for Responsible Innovation? What is useful? What could be strengthened?

It is possible that the groups will be divided according to e.g. thematic focus, function or different
existing interests in the group; to be assessed and decided in the workshop.

Plenary session:
During a brief plenary session, the outcomes of the discussions will be presented and consolidated.

Type of participant who would be interested in the workshop:
The workshop is expected to be of interest for both programme staff and PME officers of development
organisations aiming for systemic change, most particularly using lobby and advocacy strategies. In view
of the soon to be announced strategic partnerships for lobby and advocacy, funded by the Dutch Ministry
of Foreign Affairs, it is expected that various development organisations will spend the upcoming months
developing an M&E framework for their post-2015 lobby and advocacy programme. Especially for those
organisations that are exploring approaches towards monitoring and evaluating lobby and advocacy, the
workshop may provide helpful guidance and ideas for further developing M&E frameworks that help to
assess and contribute to systemic change and innovation.

Relevance of the workshop for the conference theme 'M&E for Responsible Innovation':
Responsible innovation is defined as ‘a research, development or innovation process that takes into
account effects and potential impacts on the environment and society’. As most lobby and advocacy
programmes aim to change policy frameworks to ensure they take into account the effects and potential
impacts on the environment and society, you could say that they are in fact engaging in responsible
innovation. Therefore, it is particularly relevant to take the characteristics of responsible innovation into
account when designing M&E frameworks for lobby & advocacy programmes.

Format and workshop approach:
The workshop is divided in basically three parts: a presentation, subgroup discussions and a plenary
consolidation of the subgroup discussions.

Workshop title: Oxfam’s Behind the Brands Campaign: engaging companies, public and
communities in moving towards a more just food system.

Workshop facilitators: Yvonne Es (Monitoring, evaluation and learning advisor), presentation by
Willemijn de Jongh (project coordinator Behind the Brands)

Institution: Oxfam Novib

Objectives
Share our latest insights on M & E of Oxfam’s BtB campaign and get feedback from participants on one of
our key challenges: how can we maximize openness and transparency around our learning while not
negatively impacting the effectiveness of our campaign interventions or bringing risks to communities?

Content
Oxfam’s Behind the Brands campaign was launched in February 2013 with the goal of achieving specific
improvements in the policies and practices of the world’s ten biggest global food and beverage
companies. Using a scorecard system, the campaign has pushed the ten target companies to improve
their policies and practices of across seven key development issues: gender, transparency, use of land
and water, climate change, small scale farmers and workers’ rights.

In its effort to catalyze sustainable changes within the global food chains, Oxfam pairs public campaign
activities with direct company engagement around policy formulation and impact assessments to
influence company policy and practice commitments. With almost two years and three issue-specific
campaign spikes under its belt, the Oxfam Behind the Brands campaign has achieved a series of
significant policy wins. Several companies have now introduced sweeping new policies on gender, land
rights and climate change, and committed to assess their supply chain impact and develop corresponding
action plans.
See also: https://www.behindthebrands.org/

We will discuss the topic "monitoring and evaluation" from different angles:

a. **Making the companies move:** presenting the campaign and its scorecard. Why did we choose to work with a public scorecard, how did we determine the themes, how do we monitor progress on implementation of the policy commitments? What is Oxfam’s theory of change?

b. **Oxfam’s internal mechanisms:** We will present how our internal monitoring and adjustment of campaign strategies work in practice. How do we measure the effectiveness of the campaign to reach policy commitments? What makes companies move and what makes consumers move? What are the challenges? We will be focussing on the importance of a collective responsibility and dedicated time to collect and make sense of your data and give some examples of insights gained from the monitoring of our (digital) campaigning and company engagement.

c. **The challenge:** how can we maximize openness and transparency in our learning while not negatively impacting the effectiveness of our campaign interventions or bringing risks to communities?

**Type of participant who would be interested in the workshop**

Participants interested in (monitoring and evaluation) of lobby and advocacy in private sector campaigns.

**Relevance of the workshop for the conference theme ‘M&E for Responsible Innovation’**

The BtB campaign aims to contribute to systemic change by pushing for better policies and practices of the world’s ten biggest global food and beverage companies. The campaign has multiple interventions which all have different MEL characteristics. The scorecard *itself* is an innovative mechanism to hold companies publically to account; the public campaign motivates consumers to take action and makes their consumer power visible. Applying the scorecard as a monitoring mechanism urged Oxfam to make changes to its monitoring mechanisms and introduce new, innovative ways of engaging campaign teams in M & E.

**Format and workshop approach:**

Presentation (25 minutes), followed by questions and discussion
**When existing M&E approaches prove inadequate** (Room: Pomona 2)

A pragmatic approach to measuring, monitoring and evaluating interventions for improved tuberculosis case detection **Lucie Blok and Mirjam Bakker (Royal Tropical Institute)**

Evaluating in a context of repetitive discrepancy between espoused and in-use action theories: Lessons from the fishery area of Grand-Popo, Benin **Augustin Kouevi (University of Abomey – Calavi)**

**Title: A pragmatic approach to measuring, monitoring and evaluating interventions for improved tuberculosis case detection**

**Authors:** Lucie Blok, Jacob Creswell, Robert Stevens, Miranda Brouwer, Oriol Ramis, Olivier Weil, Paul Klatser, Suvanand Sahu and Mirjam I. Bakker

**Presenter:** Mirjam I. Bakker

**Institution:** KIT Health/KIT Biomedical Research, Royal Tropical Institute

**Relevance of the paper for the conference theme 'M&E for Responsible Innovation’**

Our paper fits the theme nicely as it presents a pragmatic framework to monitor and evaluate innovative tuberculosis case finding strategies implemented in routine settings, providing evidence for what works and does not work in situations where randomized controlled trials are not feasible.

**Abstract**

The inability to detect all individuals with active tuberculosis has led to a growing interest in new approaches to improve case detection. Policy makers and program staff face important challenges measuring effectiveness of newly introduced interventions and reviewing feasibility of scaling-up successful approaches. While robust research will continue to be needed to document impact and influence policy, it may not always be feasible for all interventions and programmatic evidence is also critical to understand what can be expected in routine settings. The effects of interventions on early and improved tuberculosis detection can be documented through well-designed program evaluations. We present a pragmatic framework for evaluating and measuring the effect of improved case detection strategies using systematically collected intervention data in combination with routine tuberculosis notification data applying historical and contemporary controls. Standardized process evaluation and systematic documentation of program implementation design, cost and context will contribute to explaining observed levels of success and may help to identify conditions needed for success. Findings can then guide decisions on scale-up and replication in different target populations and settings.

**Workshop title:** Evaluating for responsible fishery management in developing countries

**Name lead workshop facilitator:** Dr. Ir. Augustin Kouévi

**Function:** Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning specialist, Lecturer, and Researcher.

**Institution:** Faculty of Agricultural Sciences (FSA), University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Benin

**Street name, town/city, country:** Abomey-Calavi, Benin

**Facilitation experience of facilitator:** PhD research on Responsive Evaluation of fishery interventions in Grand-Popo, Benin, West-Africa; Facilitation of Responsive Evaluation process in the fishery area of Grand-Popo; and others.

**Workshop length:** 45 min to 1h

**Workshop objectives and content:**

- Objectives:
  - Discuss in-depth the fishery interventions’ monitoring and evaluation case of Grand-Popo, Benin, West-Africa.
Reflect on what can be the contributions of Responsive Evaluation and other M&E approaches to the fishery case of Grand-Popo.
Propose M&E solutions to the fishery case of Grand-Popo.

Content:
Presentation of the fishery context and issues of Grand-Popo.
- The paper presented here shows that Monitoring & Evaluation approaches consisted of mainly recording data on physical and financial performances of NRM interventions with little engagement of beneficiaries and policy-makers, do not fit NRM interventions which concern of all stakeholders. It therefore suggests the design and implementation of a Monitoring and Evaluation approach that considers and engages at least major stakeholders in interactions to stimulate learning, reduce power differences, and allows effective NRM.
- The paper reveals also that engaging NRM stakeholders in information sharing about NRM issues (problems, causes, solutions, responsibilities), stimulates mutual learning and reflections on issues, and allows to understand in-depth other major, but hidden issues. It specially discusses the contribution of a double-loop learning oriented responsive evaluation to learning among fishers and interventionists.
- In all, in NRM, all stakeholders need to be committed to and effectively engaged in interventions’ design, and in M&E activities with transparent discussion of all important issues (even those which are hidden). Associating systematic audio-visual records to all intervention activities (M&E included), may stimulate more transparency, responsibility, reflexivity, learning and performance.

Group reflection on the fishery context and M&E issues.
Group deliberation on solutions to the fishery M&E issues of Grand-Popo.
Plenary restitutions of results of group discussions, and discussions of the results.
Synthesis of the workshop’s results.

Type of participant who would be interested in the workshop: Fishery/natural resource management interventionists, professionals of monitoring and evaluation, fishers/intensive extractors of natural resources.

Relevance of the workshop for the conference theme 'M&E for Responsible Innovation':
- The workshop will discuss M&E case in a NRM (fishery) intervention context, reflect on the case, and propose solutions for M&E for responsible innovation in a fishery context.
- It will also discuss the relevance of a double-loop learning oriented Responsive Evaluation for the M&E of NRM/fishery interventions in developing countries, and analyse its potential contributions to responsible NRM/fishery innovation.
SESSION 3. Thematic Roundtables 15.30 – 17.00

Innovations in M&E of private sector development interventions (Kleine Veerzaal)

Fredrik Korfker (consultant), Elsa de Morais Sarmento (ADB), with invited panellists including Hans Slegtenhorst (Director Carnegie Consult), Nico Mensink (FMO) and Simone van Vugt (CDI)

Behavioural insights in M&E for responsible innovation (Room: Hoevestein)

Marlene Roefs (CDI/M&E) with invited panellists, including Ruerd Ruben (WUR/LEI), Jan Bade (Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Behavioural Insight Team) and Hilde Bras (WUR/Sociology).

Collective sense making in M&E for responsible innovation (Room: Pomona 1-2)

Irene Guijt (Learning by Design) with invited panellists, including Joanna Monaghan (Comic Relief) and Guy Sharrock (Catholic Relief Services)

Title: Innovations in Monitoring and Evaluation of Private Sector Development Interventions

Contact person: Fredrik Korfker / Elsa de Morais Sarmento

Function: Fredrik Korfker, consultant (before retirement Chief Evaluator of the EBRD, London). He also leads the European Evaluation Society (EES) thematic working group on Private Sector Evaluation.

Elsa de Morais Sarmento, lecturer at the University of Aveiro (Portugal) and an expert evaluator.

Invited panellists: Hans Slegtenhorst (Director Carnegie Consult), Nico Mensink (FMO) and Simone van Vugt (Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen University and Research centre).

Relevance of the Roundtable discussion of the Conference

The private sector has become strategic in the development landscape. During the downturn of the past 6 years, bankruptcies in the private sector influenced the economy negatively, but during the ongoing recovery period most of new jobs were created in the private sector. This period highlighted the private sector’s importance for spurring growth and development.

In developing countries in particular, the private sector has recognizably become an important driver of development. Multilateral development banks (MDBs), other IFIs and donors can no longer ignore the private sector as a key partner in development.

Developing and applying new and more appropriate evaluation methodologies and practices for evaluating private sector development interventions is an ongoing effort. This roundtable will focus on its recent developments and on how these evaluation methodologies and practices have influenced and driven institutional innovation, thus transforming the development landscape.

Abstract of the Roundtable

The Roundtable intends to deal with the following main questions, in both a multilateral and bilateral development:

- Have outcomes of private sector evaluations fostered important innovations in development finance institutions and other development institutions?
- Which are the new issues/methodologies raised by the recent SME and public-private partnerships (PPPs) evaluations?

Other questions that can be addressed are:

- What are the differences regarding the pace of innovation in the private sector and what are bilaterals and multilaterals doing differently?
- What are the most recent financial instruments for private sector support?

The Roundtable can also serve the purpose of contributing fresh ideas and approaches to the Thematic Working Group on Private Sector Evaluation of the European Evaluation Society’s (EES). This working group focuses amongst others on financial intermediaries’ evaluation, which includes SMEs. It also deals with evaluation of PPPs and focuses on evaluation that takes place within the private sector private sector, for instance corporate social responsibility (CSR).
It is important to invite several conference participants to the Roundtable who can speak with authority about private sector evaluation, thereby contributing to the above-mentioned themes and stimulating the discussion.

**Title:** Behavioural insights in M&E for responsible innovation

**Roundtable participants:** Marlene Roefs (CDI/M&E) with invited panellists, including Ruerd Ruben (WUR/LEI), Jan Bade (Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Behavioural Insight Team) and Hilde Bras (WUR/Sociology).

**Contact person:** Marlene Roefs

**Function:** Senior M&E advisor

**Institution:** Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen UR

**Street name, town/city, country:** Droevendaalsesteeg 1, 6708 PB Wageningen, The Netherlands

**Telephone:** +31 6 23204976

**e-mail:** marlene.roefs@wur.nl

**Abstract**

The roundtable discussion looks into the relevance and (potential) use of behaviour models and theories in M&E practice both for responsible decision-making affecting the uptake of innovations and for identifying responsible innovations.

The roundtable will focus on four questions:

1. What added value does incorporating behavioural insights have in the design and evaluations of responsible innovation initiatives?
2. What specific behavioural insights might be of particular relevance for the kind of development interventions many of us are engaged in?
3. What behavioural insights might be useful in promoting responsible use of evaluation findings on innovation?
4. How to promote use of behavioural insights in M&E practice, especially in relation to responsible innovation?

The roundtable participants will address these questions from different complementary perspectives and interests. These include for example cognitive psychology, social dilemmas, behavioural economics, policy development, and M&E practice.

**Relevance of the Roundtable discussion for the conference theme ’M&E for Responsible Innovation’:**

The premise of the Conference on Monitoring and Evaluation for Responsible Innovation is that monitoring and evaluation efforts can support the kind of transformative and responsible innovation needed to tackle critical questions for society. The big questions is: How? Certainly not the only one, but a straightforward and simple answer to this is ”by making decisions better or more responsible”. But when do we or others feel or think innovation is good or bad or responsible or not? When are people prepared to change their behaviour? What makes people behave “responsibly”?

Agreement is growing (though not new) that in innovation, we are essentially talking about what makes that people change in a responsible manner; what influences people’s (ir-)responsible behaviour and how could M&E contribute to this? The latest World Development Report: Mind Society and behaviour, which is strongly influenced by the works of Daniel Khaneman and Amos Tversky on behavioural economics (see also Thinking, Fast and Slow) states that development policy is due for its own redesign based on careful consideration of human factors. This is following a trend in Europe and the US where Behavioural Insight Teams (BITs) are being set up to promote the use of insights derived from behavioural economics and cognitive and social psychology when developing and testing policies.
Within M&E circles the importance of using theory-based evaluation is widely accepted. Articulating the mechanisms that make an intervention work or the overall Theory of Change is often taken as the basis for and sometimes the result of evaluations. They concern amongst others beliefs, desires, cognitions and other decision-making processes that influence behavioural choices and actions of the various stakeholders and agencies in a system, organisation, programme or project.

Within behavioural sciences (e.g. economics, psychology, sociology) various theories and insights are developed around for instance risk taking, cooperation, or resistance to change and other individual or group behaviours. However, one seldom finds explicit references to such insights within Theories of Change, evaluations of developmental interventions, or the use of evaluation findings. Especially when trying to promote responsible innovation, it seems important to take into account knowledge about factors that influence human behaviour. Reason enough to ask ourselves how to use behavioural insights in M&E for responsible innovation.

**Title: Collective sensemaking to navigate diverse values and needs**

**Roundtable participants:** Joanna Monaghan (Comic Relief), Guy Sharrock (Catholic Relief Service), Steff Deprez (VECO)

**Contact person:** Irene Guijt

**Function:** independent

**Institution:** Learning by Design

**Street name, town/city, country:** 33 Davenport Street, Ainslie ACT 2602, Australia

**Focus of the Roundtable Topic**

The conference will offer the opportunity of roundtable discussion on how collective sensemaking in M&E practice can help support responsible innovation processes. The discussions will focus on four questions:

- What is ‘collective sensemaking’ in M&E? What forms can it take?
- What role can it play to identify when innovations are deemed ‘responsible’?
- When can we consider collective sensemaking ‘successful’ in supporting responsible innovation through M&E and what conditions are necessary to achieve this?
- Why is collective sensemaking often not (yet) part of evaluative processes? What strategies / ideas do we have to strengthen this part of M&E practice?

The roundtable will open with short theoretical insights after which the questions will be addressed from the participants’ diverse grounded experiences in largely NGO settings.

**Relevance of the Roundtable for the conference theme ‘M&E for Responsible Innovation’**

A key practice in responsible innovation is ‘societal engagement’, which allows for vetting en-route of innovation by people whose lives will be affected or are being affected. Who is benefitting in which ways and why? Are the innovations meeting widely shared societal goals? By stimulating critical reflection and dialogue around emerging evidence between critical stakeholders involved in or affected by an innovation process, additional meaning is generated of why certain mechanisms are working well (or not so well) for certain groups, and are having a significant, sustainable and equitable impact (or not). Rather than being retrospective about who was accountable or not for what outcomes, responsible innovation requires asking about who is taking care now and how to be responsive to unwanted consequences as they arise. Experiences of multi-stakeholder sensemaking date back several decades, often focusing on appraisals and designing of interventions. Much is known about these applications, as well as conditions for effective processes and where their limitations lie. Participatory M&E has been around for a couple of decades - often retrospective and accountability driven, often occurring at small scales and focusing on collaborative data collection. However, the field of M&E has paid little attention to the why and how of collective sensemaking. While there has been considerable innovation with qualitative data collection methods and analytical procedures in quantitative reasoning in M&E, innovations with analytical processes for M&E of mixed methods are lagging behind. The challenges are many. For example, the notion of collective sensemaking while perhaps central to responsible innovation jars, for some, with the importance of evaluator independence and objectivity. How can many voices on what is deemed responsible’ be heard and acted on? How does one deal with the inevitable power relationships that influence who speaks and who is heard or not – and whose values about responsible innovation counts? How can evaluative data on the innovation in question be mixed, presented and debated in ways that make wider engagement meaningful rather than tokenistic? How does one aggregate – across scales – the sensemaking processes to look at potentially detrimental effects once scaling up occurs? Deepening our understanding of this topic through these questions, can help build M&E better contribute to responsible innovation.
REFLEXIVE CAPACITY

The need for reflexive evaluation approaches for systemic change. Marlén Arkesteijn, Barbara van Mierlo (speaker) and Cees Leeuwis (Wageningen University and Research Centre)

From Aid Deliverer to Reflective Practitioner: Strengthening Evaluative Thinking Capacity Guy Sharrock (Catholic Relief Service)

Relevance of the paper for the conference theme ‘M&E for Responsible Innovation’

Reflexive evaluation is almost by definition a way to take responsibility in M&E for systemic change. The example to be described is Reflexive Monitoring in Action.

Abstract

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 and enhance taking responsibility.

Title: From Aid Deliverer to Reflective Practitioner: Strengthening Evaluative Thinking Capacity

Authors: Guy Sharrock, Tom Archibald and Jane Buckley

Presenter: Guy Sharrock

Institution: Catholic Relief Services

Relevance of the paper for the conference theme ‘M&E for Responsible Innovation’

Catholic Relief Services’ work on ‘evaluative thinking’ is nascent yet aligns well with the agency’s guiding principles based on Catholic Social Teaching. Our hunch is that the growing discourse on complexity in development provides an opportunity for all individuals engaged in development programming to view themselves not merely as “aid deliverers” but more valuably as “reflective practitioners” supporting longer-term sustainability.

Enabling program staff at all levels to pay more attention to the emergent opportunities and challenges arising from our development interventions underpins an explicit intention to be more responsive to those we are seeking to serve. Backed by donors and agency leadership who through their new strategies have made clear their desire for more collaboration, purpose-driven learning and adaptation, monitoring systems are designed to create space for staff and partners with the requisite competencies to think critically in a manner that supports more responsive management and programmatic innovation.

Abstract

The view that the challenges to economic, social and political development are complex, unpredictable, and ultimately uncontrollable is gaining ground (e.g., Ramalingam, 2013; Befani, Ramalingam and Stern,
Effective programming requires a shift away from a predominantly linear-based model of change to one that is more dynamic, reflective and responsive.

Program staff must employ a range of critical thinking skills to understand and learn what may cause unanticipated implementation “surprises” (Guijt, 2008) before generating an appropriate response. This is what lies behind Catholic Relief Services’ initiative on 'evaluative thinking' (ET) capacity-strengthening in collaboration with Virginia Tech and Cornell’s Office for Research on Evaluation.

Grounded in work on critical thinking by Brookfield (2012), ET is motivated by an attitude of inquisitiveness and a belief in the value of evidence. It involves: 1/ surfacing assumptions, 2/ posing thoughtful questions, and pursuing deeper understanding through reflection and perspective-taking, and 3/ making informed decisions in preparation for action.

Our hunch is that ET can contribute significantly to CRS’s ability to implement projects in a manner that is responsive to emerging realities. Staff and partners will be more open to testing what works and what doesn’t, and to identify emerging adaptive responses.

One author has suggested that there is already a plethora of M&E toolkits; what we need now are more “evaluation-thinking” kits (Schwandt, 2008). We are seeking to nurture and support, “…reflective practitioners who are able and willing to challenge continuously their own assumptions and the assumptions of their colleagues in a constructive way which generates new insights…” (Britton, 1998).

Enabling field practitioners to examine the assumptions that guide their thinking and actions, and to check the accuracy of those assumptions by exploring other perspectives and information sources, will help to facilitate the emergence of more informed and inclusive project management decisions and practices.
The consultant’s perspective: Approaches to evaluation and communication for innovation
Fred Zaal (Royal Tropical Institute)

Can (Evaluation) Consultants be Civic Innovators? Exploring the Shift from Auditors to Allies
Kees Biekart and Sylvia Bergh (Institute of Social Studies)

Title: The consultant’s perspective: Approaches to evaluation and communication for innovation

Author(s): Fred Zaal (presenter), Roger Bymolt
Author function: Senior Advisor(s), Sustainable Economic Development
Institution of authors: Royal Tropical Institute (KIT)
Institution address: 63 Mauritskade, Amsterdam

Abstract:
Innovation is one of the biggest buzzwords in the development sector at this moment. To some, innovation has connotations of something radically new, while to others it implies evolution of policy and practice in an ever changing world. Evaluation naturally has an important role to play here, building an evidence base for policy and programme decisions. Policy makers and programme staff should be able to make decisions based on what has worked (and to what extent) and crucially understand why. Unfortunately, often this is not the case and evaluations are at times treated as a reporting activity, rather than a genuine learning opportunity.

Monitoring and evaluation can steer interventions and policy – but whether or not this actually happens depends on the uptake of evaluation research by policymakers and programming staff. Too often policy and programming decision making remains subjected to politics, ideology or convenience, rather than evaluative evidence. This is detrimental to innovation in several ways: promising innovations are not taken further and scaled up with customisations and changes appropriate to the context; and supposed innovations which have been hyped are not subject to sufficient scrutiny regarding their actual impact and perceived value to beneficiaries.

Evaluators, like KIT, are often contracted as third party consultants, with the intention to provide expert and impartial assessments. Most evaluators are fully aware of their role to impart knowledge on what works, what does not and why. With recent changes to government subsidies to organisations in the sector, consultants working in evaluation are more demand driven than ever. The effect is that evaluating organisations are now subject more than ever to the politics of the client/donor commissioning the evaluation, and have much less time to think ‘outside the box’ of what the client demands. There is also more dependence on clients - if they are not happy with the outcome of an evaluation (say, because negative findings may affect their future funding), the evaluator risks being excluded from future tender calls. In practice, this manifests itself through a process of compromises such as long requests for changes to reports, redaction of certain points, and requests not to make explicit recommendations.

So in this context, how can evaluators respond to meaningfully support policy and innovation? KIT proposes an approach that is highly efficient and cost effective. Methodology design must be appropriate to the programme to gather the highest quality data possible within available budgets. For KIT, this typically means an emphasis on mixed-methods approaches, because this gives the best chance for not only measuring change (the what), but also describing processes of change (the why). Mixed methods must be coherent and structured – not a soup of tools just thrown together. We will discuss how mixed methods approaches can be efficiently applied to triangulate and give greater confidence in findings and attribution. We discuss qualitative PADev methods (see www.padev.nl) and how they can be customized for each assignment. For surveys, the latest technology is a game changer: digital tablets running survey software that pushes surveys to a cloud server reduces errors, speeds up data collection and allows remote monitoring.

Following on from quality data collection and triangulation in analysis, the missing link is better reporting of findings to programme staff and policy makers so that the evaluation findings are easier to digest, and the conclusions harder to ignore for scaling innovation. This means on the one hand, submitting traditional reports, laden with the data that underpins the findings, which we all know very few people ever read. And on the other, producing an additional summary, professionally designed with rich visuals such as GIS maps, infographics and photos to illustrate key findings and recommendations in a way that is easier to digest. This may require additional budget, evaluator capacities or outsourcing. But it’s worth it – rich outputs are ideal for dissemination to a wider audience, perhaps reached via social media. We contest that better communication of findings based on quality, mixed datasets is essential to realising evaluation for innovation.
**Title:** Can (Evaluation) Consultants be Civic Innovators? Exploring the Shift from Auditors to Allies

**Authors:** Kees Biekart and Sylvia Bergh  
**Institution:** International Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam  
**Presenter:** Sylvia Bergh  
**E-mail:** bergh@iss.nl

**Relevance of the paper for the conference theme ‘M&E for Responsible Innovation’**  
This is a draft book chapter that we are currently working on. We have already interviewed several (evaluation) consultants about their experiences in bringing about more systemic change (what we call ‘civic innovations’). The paper would contribute to answering the questions under core question 3 in the conference concept note: What are the prerequisites for taking responsibility for systemic change in terms of M&E professional’s roles & responsibilities; values and principles; competencies; as well as the institutional changes that would be needed in the aid industry and evaluation departments especially.

**Abstract**  
This paper aims to give substance to the discussion ‘who are the civic innovators?’ by focusing on a particular type of actor in the aid industry: development consultants. While they are often seen in a negative light (‘aid mafia’) we want to question this image by looking for real cases in which consultants may not be / have been conformist to the dominant (de-politicized) aid paradigm but are mobilizing others to bring about deep-seated political transformations, or at least question the status quo and thereby spark ‘civic energy’. We propose a typology where next to the ‘auditor’ type of consultants, we can identify the ‘ally’ (or ‘activist’) consultants with a proper change agenda. By conducting semi-structured interviews with current and former consultants as well as commissioning agents, we want to get clarity about the social motivations of consultants and examine the factors that have enabled consultants to become change agents, or factors that turn out to be obstacles. Drawing on insights from the emerging field of *aidnography*, the contribution will also test the empirical relevance of the ‘interlocutors’ concept proposed by Alan Fowler.
**Issues of scale** (Room: Pomona 1)

Evaluation in Latin America: Evaluation for Transparency, Accountability and Democracy

*Gabriela Pérez-Yarahuán and Claudia Maldonado Trujillo (CLEAR Centre for Latin America)*

Evaluation for Responsible Innovation and Responsible Scaling *Seerp Wigboldus (CDI)*

---

**Title:** Evaluation in Latin America. Evaluation for Transparency, Accountability and Democracy  
**Authors:** Gabriela Pérez-Yarahuán and Claudia Maldonado Trujillo  
**Institution:** CLEAR Centre for Latin America  
**E-mail:** gabriela.perez@cide.edu  

**Abstract**

Evaluation as a practice has developed at a speeding rate in Latin America. Most of the countries in the region have gained some experience in the last decade, and have built and institutionalized emerging evaluation systems at the national level. What explains this movement towards enriching the evaluation agenda in these countries? What factors promote that evaluation, as a practice for public expenditures, is acknowledged, recognized and used to take decisions? What is the extent of social participation in and for evaluation? This paper is based on a study of 10 Latin American countries that have different degrees of achievement in building evaluation systems. The study was promoted and supported by the CLEAR centre for Latin America. The aim for the presentation in the conference is to provide the audience with a sense of the progress as well as the difficulties that evaluation has encountered in the region. Evaluation that is meaningful and promotes responsible innovation is a complex social and political process. This complexity needs to be acknowledged and understood in order for progress to be made in this front. Our hope is that by sharing the findings of our study in the Latin American region we can engage in an edifying debate about what constitutes the building blocks for evaluation to promote responsible innovation in emerging democracies.

---

**Title:** Evaluation for responsible innovation AND responsible scaling  
**Author:** Seerp Wigboldus  
**Institution:** Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen UR  

**Abstract**

Over the past decade, we have seen increasing attention being paid to processes of scaling (up) in international development. Not only are development agencies and research groups expected to come up with innovations which make a difference; such innovations are also intended to ‘go to scale’, i.e. become more widely used/practiced. When innovations go to scale, however, they cross boundaries of systems, scales, levels and domains. What was responsible at one level or within one domain, may no longer be considered responsible at another level, or in another domain. This is where we have to start thinking about responsible innovation AND scaling. M&E needs to inform decision makers both ex ante and ex durante about what happens when (responsible) innovations scale up to ensure that what started as ‘responsible’ stays responsible e.g. at other scale levels and in other domains. It implies that if we want to extend responsibility to processes of scaling (up), design of (responsible) innovation processes needs to have future scaling up in mind. We will briefly elaborate on the above line of thinking and provide some illustrations from a case study on rubber cultivation in China. Then there will be time to discuss and/or complement the argument and agree on tentative implications for monitoring and evaluation for responsible scaling (up).
Title: Risk-Informed M&E for Responsible Development

Ms. Magda Stepanyan, MA, MSc, CIRM
1. Name lead workshop facilitator:
Risk-Informed M&E for Responsible Innovation Development Magda Stepanyan (Risk Society)

2. Function: Founder & CEO
4. Street name, town/city, country: Telephone: St Jacobstraat 29, 2512AN, The Hague, the Netherlands, +31 (0) 16499150
e-mail: info@risk-society.com
5. Facilitation experience of facilitator:
She holds an MA in Sociology (Yerevan State University), MSc in Public Administration (Leiden University), and The International Certificate in Risk Management from The Institute of Risk Management (UK). She is the Founder & CEO of the Risk Society consultancy (www.risk-society.com). Her main areas of expertise include integrated risk management, disaster and climate risk governance, capacity development, civil protection, recovery planning, and M&E. She has over 15 years of managerial and high-level consultancy experience working with organizations such as the EC, UN, WB, Red Cross, and many others. She has designed and facilitated various workshops both at national and international levels.

6. Workshop length: 1 hr 15 mins or 2.5 hours (please circle)

Workshop objectives and content:
a) Total duration: 1.5 hours
b) Workshop objectives:
   - To gain understanding of the linkages between M&E and Risk Management.
   - To discuss the dilemmas for risk-informed M&E

c) Workshop content:
   - Introductory presentation: Why risk management for responsible innovation?
   - Group discussion: Risk Informed M&E: dilemmas

7. Type of participant who would be interested in the workshop:
Those involved in designing and implementing development interventions: project managers and officers, M&E professionals.

8. Abstract
New technologies have a potential to impact our society creating either opportunities or threats for different categories of population and for the whole ecosystem. The main challenge remains in our collective ability to foresee the potential consequences, i.e. risks, of innovations by looking further ahead. Here where M&E can have an instrumental role to play through facilitating knowledge generation and providing learning loops. Without embracing risks M&E would remain rather a tool for ‘inventarization’: looking backwards to retrospectively evaluate what has already been done. Such perspective could provide little input for effective decision-making in the innovation process especially vis-à-vis the risks it faces.

By addressing risks M&E can become more powerful tool for the innovation process. This would imply
a) to broaden the focus of monitoring towards greater ‘anticipation’ beyond the retrospective overview of what is achieved;
b) to increase responsiveness to the priority risks; and

c) to build the capacities of M&E professional to address the risks.

A presentation and detailed background information will be provided during the conference.
SESSION 5. Practical Options - Methodological Workshops 11.15 – 12.45

1. Using SenseMaker as a lightweight qualitative data collection method Caroline Huyghe (VECO) (Room: Kleine Veerzaal)
2. Who's Listening? Community-led post-project self-sustainability evaluation Jindra Cekan (consultant) (Room: Hoevestein)
3. Citizen Monitoring and Evaluation of Roads in Rural India. Learning's from an Innovative Pilot Project Harish Kumar and Medura Poovaiah (Public Affairs Centre) (Room: Pomona 1)
4. Mobile Phone based M&E for Improving Programme Effectiveness: Issues of Learning and Concerns Mokhlesur Rahman Sagar (Practical Action) (Room: Pomona 2)

Workshop title: Using SenseMaker as a lightweight qualitative data collection method
Name lead workshop facilitator: Caroline Huyghe or Steff Deprez
Function: Programme Advisor
Institution: VECO
Street name, town/city, country: Blijde Inkomststraat 50, 3000 Leuven

Facilitation experience of facilitator: Caroline facilitated the workshop on Inclusive Business Models at WTO Public Forum October 2014 in Geneva. Furthermore, she has done a lot of facilitation during workshops at VECO and has teaching experience.

Workshop length: 1h 15 mins

Workshop objectives and content:
The objective is to introduce the Sensemaker methodology as applied by VECO. VECO uses the methodology to get real-time feedback on inclusive business models. During the workshop experiences from VECO will be shared.

Type of participant who would be interested in the workshop:
Experts working with smallholders in agricultural supply chains seeking to create and/or support inclusive businesses and all professionals interested in getting to know an innovative data collection method.

Relevance of the workshop for the conference theme "M&E for Responsible Innovation":
SenseMaker is an innovative methodology that requires a large amount of fragments of information to better understand complex realities. The unique characteristic of SenseMaker is that it asks people to share narratives about a concrete experience, asking them to self-signify their own stories. The methodology combines qualitative and quantitative data. VECO uses the methodology to better understand the relation between smallholder farmers and buying companies within the agricultural value chain they support. The methodology enables to measure the inclusion of smallholders in the value chain, detecting emerging opportunities and threats, offering rapid feedback loops to make real-time adjustments.

Workshop title: Who's Listening? Community-led post-project self-sustainability evaluation
Name lead workshop facilitator: Jindra Cekan, PhD
Function: founder
Institution: Valuing Voices at Cekan Consulting LLC
Street name, town/city, country: Prague, Czech Republic, and Washington DC

Facilitation experience of facilitator: has designed and led 40+ trainings, meetings, strategic processes for clients over 20 years
Workshop length: 1.5 hours

Workshop objectives and content: $1.6 billion in international development projects are unevaluated post-project since 2000. Community-led evaluation tells us what they could sustain and we should replicate - or not. Group feedback process will shape the (evaluation) approach

Type of participant who would be interested in the workshop: Evaluators, Donors, M&E Managers in NGOs, Policymakers, social innovators
Relevance of the workshop for the conference theme 'M&E for Responsible Innovation': For International development to improve, to be more sustainable and country-led we must listen to our true clients, our participants (beneficiaries). Currently we do not return to 99% of projects after closeout or ask them. Self-sustainability evaluation is the innovation, and for development to be 'responsible' and self-sustainable for communities, we must learn what they could self-sustain, do more of it, learn about unintended consequences and learn together to build country-led development.

Format and workshop approach: Three 15 minute presentations followed by 10 minute discussions on three topics: 1) how to engage donors in post-project evaluation, 2) methodologies (empowerment evaluation, Appreciative Inquiry, outcome harvesting and possibly q-methodology) and local ICT retention/ analysis/ sharing plus use of national evaluator franchise 3) how to compare community-led responses across projects and countries.

Title:
Citizen Monitoring and Evaluation of Roads in Rural India – Learning’s from an Innovative Pilot Project

Author:
Harish Poovaiah

Function of lead author:
As Head, Citizen Action Support Group @ PAC, innovate tools and techniques for the citizen to generate evidence in scale, network and empower citizen/civil society groups to put together evidence, strategise to constructively engage with the government and ultimately bring desired changes in policies and their expression on the ground.

Institution of lead author:
Public Affairs Centre (PAC) – www.pacindia.org
No.15, KIADB Industrial Area,
Bommasandra - Jigani Link Road,
Bangalore - 562 106
INDIA
Telephone: 91-80-27839918/19/20
Email: mpharish@pacindia.org, harishpoovaiah@gmail.com

Relevance of the paper to the conference theme 'M&E for Responsible Innovation':
Concept of citizen monitoring and evaluation is a phenomena in its nascent form, shaping itself in welfare programmes such as education and health in India. But it is unheard of in infrastructure projects like roads. The pilot project simplified the complex engineering process of road construction to the understanding of the rural citizen, empowered them to monitor and evaluate with a specially developed tool kit and methodology. The Indian Government has recognised the impact potential of this intervention and is piloting in 70 roads in 4 provinces; while the World Bank is piloting the concept in countries around the world. We feel it is important that this innovation is shared with varied experts from around the globe and also gain from their feedback/suggestions to improvise.

Abstract
Roads are lifelines of villages in India. They provide access to basic amenities like education & health and more importantly to markets. Socio-cultural-economic wellbeing of village revolves around road connectivity. Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana PMGSY (www.pmgsyonline.nic.in) is a Government of India project to develop rural roads. This year (2014-15) the PMGSY project has a budget of US$ 3.5 Billion. Each kilometre of PMGSY road costs close to US$ 0.1 Million. Even a little compromise on the quality and/or quantity in PMGSY road, or for that matter in any road anywhere in the world, guarantees a huge loss of people’s money. It also guarantees bad roads that don’t meet the needs of the people. Additionally, bad roads necessitate renovations and further loss of people’s money. It becomes a cycle of ‘convenient leakage’. Building roads is a complicated engineering exercise. This makes it that much more difficult for a citizen to monitor its construction and evaluate after its completion. It is easy to pass a judgement on the basis of perception whether a road as good or bad, which holds no water with the government. It is another thing to generating evidence in terms of facts and figures to say, ex: this road has 80% adherence to contracted width. This evidence is powerful and makes it easy engage with the government.

The pilot project simplified the process of road construction, developed suitable sets of simple tools and techniques to generate authentic evidence. Using a defined methodology data was collected in 70 roads on specific parameters. They were plotted against contracted values signed between the government and the contractor. The data generated is scored for performance in percentages as either good roads, average roads or bad roads. Citizen with definite sets of data on their respective roads then used them
for advocacy and help fix their roads, while aggregated scores provided the information on overall performance of PMGSY project to the government to monitor.

**Title:** Mobile Phone based M&E for Improving Programme Effectiveness: Issues of Learning and Concerns?

**Author:** Md Mokhlesur Rahman

**Function of lead author:** Leading M & E, Action Research and Impact Assessment Unit under Policy, Practice and Programme Development Department of Practical Action- Bangladesh. The position deals with conducting action research, maintaining different databases (beneficiary, consultant etc.), developing monitoring checklist and frameworks, tracking progress towards organizational goals, conducting baseline and programme evaluation and also conducting impact assessment of different projects and programmes. In addition to this, I also work as member of global gender working group at Practical Action and I do lead all gender related activities (research, assessment, evaluation, training, advocacy etc.) at Practical Action Bangladesh.

**Institution of lead author:** Practical Action, Bangladesh

**Street name, town/city, country:** House-28/A, Road-5, Dhanmondi, Dhaka-1205, Bangladesh

**Relevance** of the paper for the conference theme 'M&E for Responsible Innovation'

In recent development discourse, ICTs have been emerged as integral part of development interventions. ICTs are been used for improving programme effectiveness. This is a recent development in M & E arena to capture changes and learning better. My paper bases on experiences of two ICTs based M & E system which are being used in two programmes (one is focused on economic empowerment and other is on Urban WATSAN) of Practical Action, Bangladesh. The Paper talks about how the systems help to track the progress, learning and increase programme efficiency. Finally, it also links up with a recent attempt to develop mobile based demand generation under a project (who applies approach of social entrepreneurship) on Sludge Management in a Municipality. Thus, proposed paper not only would be relevant but also would be advantageous for many of the participants of the event.

**Abstract**

Since inception of mobile based M&E in Bangladesh, Practical Action, Bangladesh has been applying it. Since August 2010, the organization has been using CMS (Change Monitoring System) in a DFID funded project (SHIREE- Stimulating Household Improvements Results in Economic Empowerment4). Later in 2012, AKVO FLOW (another mobile based M&E system) was also adopted in Water and Sanitation project (funded by Dutch Wash Alliance). Both of the systems provide real-time data which allows managers to understand/explore how the intervention helps its target beneficiary. Additionally, it also informs whether the supports need to be revised or any special attention needs to be given to any particular working areas, household or to an individual. For example, if project manager wants to see how his/her project is helping female beneficiary, s/he can do it. Thus, the system allows not waiting till findings of mid-term or final are available rather it indicates where is what can be provided during the intervention period. Therefore, the systems are very helpful for social inclusion. The systems also help using gender lenses all through project/programme implementation. Moreover, application of mobile phone technology for such monitoring and learning works reduce time for data collection and interpretation. The data will be automatically processed,

---

4 Research component of the project, is dealt by University of Bath, UK and University of Cambridge, UK.
cleaned and can be interpreted in the way we want. Further, it gives real-time data; thus, managers sitting in the desk can take quick decision or pay a physical visit independently to any individual or household. However, working along with the above systems, some limitations have also been identified. Some of such are dealing with culture of expectation (by data enumerator) grows among poor and vulnerable people while delivering responses, setting appropriate indicators\(^5\), motivation of data enumerator and time of data collection. Due to that one of above two programmes found severe inconsistent data\(^6\) which was not corresponding to other evidences.

\(^5\) For example, if it is empowerment related. How we see empowerment (as process or as end) matters to setting indicators.

\(^6\) Findings from sample households indicated 35% graduation rate, whereas just after one year, census data indicated graduation rate as 96%.
SESSION 6. Practical Options - Methodological Workshops 13.30 – 15.00

5. The Potential for Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) in Evaluation- Theory and Practice
   Karel Chambille (Hivos), Valerie Pattyn and Astrid Molenveld (Public Governance Institute)
   (Room: Kleine Veerzaal)

6. Oxfam's World Citizens Panel: impact evaluation involving key stakeholders to enhance learning
   Peter Huisman and Anne Oudes (Oxfam Novib) (Room: Hoevestein)

   (Outcome Mapping Learning Community) (Room: Pomona 1)

Workshop title: The Potential for Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) in Evaluation- Theory and Practice.

Name lead workshop facilitator: Karel Chambille/ Astrid Molenveld & Valérie Pattyn
Function: Evaluation Manager/Researchers
Institution: Hivos/ Public Governance Institute KU-Leuven
Street name, town/city, country: The Hague, Netherlands/ Leuven, Belgium

Facilitation experience of facilitator: extensive experience with different types of audiences.

Workshop length: 1.5 hours

Workshop objectives and content:

Objective: Participants will gain an understanding of the principles behind Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and learn about an application in an evaluative study (2014) of two Hivos Media support programmes in Tanzania and Kenya.

Content:
For people working in evaluation in international cooperation DFID Working Paper 38 "Broadening the range of designs and methods for impact evaluation" (April 2012) was an important document as it indeed ‘broadened’ the scope for handling the difficult questions of attribution/contribution in evaluation. One of the promising approaches presented in this document is QCA.

More than a quarter of a century after its introduction in the social sciences, Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) found its way to the evaluation field. Attractive about QCA is its potential to systematically compare a medium number of cases in a qualitative way, in order to find necessary and sufficient combinations of conditions that can explain an outcome. Underpinning the approach is the assumption of complex conjunctural causation, that fundamentally differs from a linear, net-effect approach to causality: (1) a combination of conditions produces the outcome; (2) multiple interventions can produce the same policy impact and (3) the presence of an outcome is assumed to be driven by another path than the absence of an outcome. Considering these assumptions, it can be said that the method strongly resembles Realistic Evaluation.

Despite increased attention for QCA in the evaluation field, the number of applications is still very limited, especially in the area of development cooperation. In this paper, we share experiences of a QCA evaluation on supported journalistic products (like documentaries, articles etc.) in Tanzania and Kenya, commissioned by Hivos. The evaluation unravelled the combinations of conditions that foster or impede the accountability effects of these journalistic products. QCA being case-driven and interactive by nature, the evaluation design strongly relies on input of people active in the allocation and evaluation of these programmes.

In our contribution, we systematically discuss the added value of using QCA; but also address the challenges that a QCA evaluation brings forward. Lessons learned should help to give QCA a more commonplace position in the evaluation tools box.

Type of participant who would be interested in the workshop:
Evaluators and Evaluation commissioners, interested in methodological developments in the evaluation field and not afraid to bite a chunk of theory.
Methodological Workshop title: Oxfam’s World Citizens Panel: impact evaluation involving key stakeholders to enhance learning

Name workshop facilitators: Peter Huisman and Anne Oudes
Institution: Oxfam Novib

Objectives
Discuss the consequences, dilemmas, pros and cons of a conscious choice for involving programme staff, partners, field staff and project participants in the development and implementation of impact studies.

Content
The World Citizens Panel (WCP) measures the impact of Oxfam Novib’s programmes among people living in poverty and injustice. Information on changes in people’s lives is directly collected from people that participate in our programmes. The information is analysed and used for reporting to facilitate learning and improve the quality of Oxfam’s programmes.

The World Citizens Panel is a balanced approach of qualitative and quantitative methods with a focus on changes in people’s lives and making these changes visible in an empowering, inclusive, and rigorous way. In countries where the World Citizens Panel is implemented, each partner organisation conducts a survey among 200 – 400 randomly selected people about the changes they experienced in their lives. The standard indicators used in the survey have been developed in the past jointly with partners from various countries and programmes. The survey includes a group of people who participated in (partner’s) programmes (the target group) as well as people that did not participate in programmes (a control group). Staff of partner organisations collect the data using a smartphone app in order to interview large numbers of people in an efficient, affordable and reliable manner. The World Citizens Panel team in The Hague provides a detailed report that includes an in-depth analysis of the impact of Oxfam’s work based on advanced statistical analyses. The results of the survey are discussed with all partners that participate in the research and together lessons are drawn how programmes can be improved.

Based on the joint reflection on the outcomes of the survey, domains are selected for further in-depth qualitative research using stories of change. Partner organisations conduct in-depth interviews with participants of their projects. Participants tell their ‘story of change’, describing the most significant change they perceived in their own lives or in their community as a result of the programme. The stories of change are registered on paper or in short videos. A joint reflection is organised on these stories in order to improve the programme’s understanding about how change takes place and how change can be further stimulated. In addition, learning takes place from the unexpected changes that result from the programmes.

For further information: www.worldcitizenspanel.com

Oxfam Novib has made a conscious choice for involving key stakeholders in the impact studies, so that M&E contributes to people’s empowerment and treats project participants in a respectful way. The assumption is that stronger involvement of people living in poverty in the design, implementation AND M&E processes leads to more responsible innovations and development interventions.

Involvement of key stakeholders is a conscious choice, but there are also challenges this choice brings along. During the workshop participants will discuss the challenges that are being encountered from different angles:

d. Involvement of field staff and project participants in surveys and stories of change: how does this affect quality, reliability and independence?
   - How to reduce the influence of a confirmation bias in order to find unexpected results?
   - How to reduce the prevalence of socially desirable responses in an interaction between field staff and project participants?

e. Involvement of programme staff and staff of partner organisations in analysis and reflection:
   How to enhance ownership and optimal use of the data?
   - What capacity is needed for a local programme team to make quantitative and qualitative analyses?
   - What are effective ways of presenting research findings, so that people involved in daily implementation of activities can effectively draw lessons from the quantitative and qualitative data?
   - How to facilitate a genuine reflection where implementers do not feel the need to defend their activities or experience being judged by the researchers?
   - What are effective ways for ensuring that lessons learned are taken up?

Type of participant who would be interested in the workshop
Participants interested in implementing impact research together with key stakeholders in the project to be investigated.

Relevance of the workshop for the conference theme ‘M&E for Responsible Innovation’
The World Citizens panel aims to contribute to systemic change by using innovative, empowering methodologies and building partners’ capacity to produce and make use of evaluative findings.

**Format and workshop approach:**
Presentation (20 minutes including questions for clarification), followed by discussions in sub-groups to explore the various advantages and disadvantages of stakeholder involvement in impact studies (20 minutes) and discuss possible solutions to overcome the dilemmas (45 minutes), ending with a plenary session to share the main outcomes of the discussions.

**Workshop title:** Using Outcome Mapping principles & concepts for sustainable innovation

**Workshop facilitator:** Steff Deprez

**Institution:** Steward of the Outcome Mapping Learning Community (OMLC: [www.outcomemapping.ca](http://www.outcomemapping.ca))

**Workshop objectives and content:**
The objective of the workshop is to highlight how particular OM concepts and principles are used/can be used to inspire and improve M&E processes for sustainable innovation.

A study of 10 years OM (commissioned by the OMLC) learned that OM is rarely used in its full form by programmes/projects, but practitioners seem to ‘borrow’ elements that are relevant and meaningful for their M&E practice. The aims of the workshop is also not to present or introduce the OM approach as such but will investigate how some of its core elements are/can be used in M&E practices to purposefully manage innovation initiatives. Based on some characteristics of innovation processes and its governance (fast feedback loops, flexibility, work with the actors in the system, their relationships and interdependency, collective impact, unintended changes, collaborative learning, ...), the usefulness of particular OM concepts - often in combination with or integrated into other approaches - will be presented and discussed.

**Type of participant who would be interested in the workshop:**
M&E practitioners and programme managers

**Relevance of the workshop for the conference theme “M&E for Responsible Innovation”:**
Innovation initiatives that aim to contribute to a sustainable and equitable future are most likely not relying on one particular method or approach (such as OM). However, some of the core elements or typical concepts of OM can be an added value - in combination or integrated with other approaches - to design and carry out meaningful M&E practices.

**Format and workshop approach:**
- An overview of some key characteristics of innovative processes towards sustainable changes and its governance
- A presentation on how particular OM concepts can assist in M&E practices for managing innovative initiatives (incl. examples, specific applications, ...)
- Guided discussion with participants

**Co-funded by (see below)**

- [Wageningen University Centre for Development Innovation](http://www.agriculturewageningen.eu)
- [Hivos](http://www.hivos.org)
- [Oxfam Novib](http://www.oxfammovib.org)
- [CO-OP](http://www.coopdevelopment.org)