



## **Indicator Fact Sheet**

### **Indicator 1: Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks by providers of development co-operation**

This fact sheet includes details on the methodology underpinning Indicator 1 during the 2015-2016 Round of [Global Partnership Monitoring](#), including means of measurement, method of calculation and data source.

For questions, please contact the OECD-UNDP monitoring team at [monitoring@effectivecooperation.org](mailto:monitoring@effectivecooperation.org)

Development co-operation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities

**Indicator 1. Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks by providers of development co-operation**

*The purpose of this indicator is to provide objective information on the extent to which, and the ways in which, existing country-led and country-level results frameworks are used by providers as a guiding tool to focus development co-operation on results that meet developing countries' priorities.*

*The main focus of the indicator (1a) is to measure the extent of use of existing country-owned results frameworks by providers of development co-operation in planning and designing new interventions – in particular, in regard to setting the intervention's objectives and expected results, and in planning the monitoring arrangements to track progress. Country-owned results frameworks (CRFs) include any form of government-led planning instrument where development priorities, goals and targets are defined in detail. Given that CRFs are often specified at the sector level, priority is given to use of sector CRFs in designing providers' new interventions – although other national and subnational planning instruments can serve as a reference too. The behaviour change pursued by this indicator is to gear development co-operation providers to assess performance based on indicators that are drawn from existing country-led results frameworks and tracked through country monitoring systems and statistics, minimising the use of ad hoc or parallel results frameworks by development co-operation providers.*

*While the indicator focuses on mapping out providers' behaviour in different countries and sectors, the data collection is complemented with an additional module (1b) that provides a descriptive assessment on the existence and characteristics of existing CRFs in the country (or alternative country-specific priority-setting mechanisms). This qualitative information will contextualise the country-level findings reported for sub-indicator 1a, in order to provide a complete snapshot of the situation at the country level and help inform policy discussions on how to strengthen collaboration between the country's priority-setting institutions and providers of development co-operation.*

**Relevant Busan commitment**

The Paris Declaration (§45) and Accra (§23) commitments, as reaffirmed in Busan, called for relying on partner country results frameworks and monitoring and evaluation systems in order to increase the focus on development results that meet developing countries' priorities.

Specifically, the Busan commitment (§18b) states that, where initiated by the developing country, transparent, country-led and country-level results frameworks would be adopted as a common tool among all concerned actors to assess performance based on a manageable number of output and outcome indicators drawn from the development priorities and goals of the developing country. Providers of development co-operation also agree to minimise the use of additional frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that were not consistent with countries' national development strategies.

**Indicator construction**

**1a. Providers' extent of use of country-owned results frameworks**

**Q<sup>9</sup> 1:** Percentage of providers' new interventions that draw their objectives and development focus from country-owned results frameworks.

**Q<sup>9</sup> 2:**  
**Numerator:** Number of results indicators in providers' interventions results frameworks that are drawn from country-owned results frameworks.

**Measurement**

Extent of use of country results frameworks by providers<sup>1</sup>, for development co-operation programming and results-reporting stages. The questionnaire covers three components:  
 (a) alignment of the intervention's objectives/focus with existing government-owned results frameworks and planning tools;  
 (b) use of results indicators drawn from these instruments; and  
 (c) use of ongoing government-sourced data to report on the intervention's results;  
 (d) reliance on final evaluations carried out with government support.

<sup>1</sup> Note that, at the empirical level, country results frameworks are often operationalised at different levels (e.g. sector level). Therefore, the definition of country-led results framework allows for the possibility to use other equivalent priority setting mechanisms at the country level since not all countries articulate their priorities through consistent, integrated Country Results Frameworks. Where there is no single agreed common Country Results Framework in existence, providers must clearly indicate the results framework that they used in designing their development intervention. In the absence of common CRFs, providers may wish to indicate alignment to other equivalent priority setting mechanisms (if any) such as use of sector plans and strategies. Where relevant they may also refer to national or subnational frameworks.

<p>Denominator: Total number of results indicators incorporated in providers' interventions results frameworks.</p> <p><b>Q<sup>3</sup>:</b></p> <p>Numerator: Number of results indicators that are planned to be reported using ongoing sources of information from existing country-owned monitoring frameworks.</p> <p>Denominator: Total number of results indicators (output/outcome indicators) that are reported in the intervention's closing document (i.e. included in the results framework or log-frame)</p> <p><b>Q<sup>4</sup>:</b> Percentage of new interventions that plan a final (ex post) evaluation funded by the government, or jointly by the government and the provider.</p> <p><b>1b. Assessment of country context</b></p> <p>To better understand the country context in terms of existing priority-setting mechanisms, a guided qualitative question focuses on describing the country's current arrangements to set sector priorities, goals and targets, and in broadly identifying the existence of different planning tools and the overall characteristics of the country's planning process.</p>	<p>A provider profile is created on the basis of these sub-indicators, reporting on the three dimensions of use of CRFs described above. Other information on country context and the composition of provider's portfolio will complement the profile. For legibility and reporting purposes, scores will be reclassified using a graduated scale to assess the extent to which providers of development co-operation use existing (sector-level) country results frameworks, within the following range: none to limited use, moderate use, high use, full use, on the basis of the proposed dimensions.</p> <p>The monitoring data will reflect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The extent to which providers of development co-operation rely on <i>development priorities and objectives</i> drawn from country-owned results frameworks in programming new interventions;</li> <li>(b) The extent to which providers of development co-operation use <i>results indicators</i> drawn from country-owned results frameworks in designing the results frameworks/logical frameworks of new interventions;</li> <li>(c) The extent to which providers of development co-operation plan to rely on <i>data sources</i> being tracked by existing government monitoring systems and statistical systems to report on these indicators of results (i.e. ongoing measurements, instead of intervention-specific data sources and measurements);</li> <li>(d) The extent to which providers' interventions are relying on country-led <i>evaluation</i> efforts at intervention closing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Data source</b></p> <p>Country-level data. Data will be collected, validated and aggregated at the country level by the government, with inputs from providers of development co-operation.</p> <p>Periodicity to be determined at country level depending on needs and priorities and existing mutual accountability review processes.</p>	<p><b>Aggregation</b></p> <p>Data is reported at the global level (<i>providers profiles</i>). Data will also be reported for each country in order to inform country-level policy dialogue (<i>country profiles</i>).</p> <p>The unit of observation is the provider's intervention in a given developing country. For reporting, the aggregation is carried out by nesting projects per provider in each country, and then averaging the extent of use of existing CRFs by providers at the country level. Reporting per provider at the global level will also be offered.</p>
<p><b>Baseline</b></p> <p>This monitoring round will establish the baseline for the indicator.</p>	<p><b>Target</b></p> <p>All providers of development co-operation use country-owned results frameworks in preparing their interventions.</p> <p>Rationale: based on the Busan commitment which calls on all actors to change behaviour in this area.</p>