

CORPORATE RESULTS FRAMEWORKS AND SCORECARDS AND THE EXPERIENCE OF SELECTED MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS AND BILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. This appendix provides a comparative overview of the structure of the corporate results frameworks and/or scorecards of selected multilateral development banks (MDBs) and non-MDBs, and an overview of strengths and weaknesses of corporate scorecards. It also offers snapshots of their experiences in designing and implementing results frameworks by drawing on available literature on performance measurement and management in public sector organizations. The experiences highlight the beginnings, evolution, and challenges associated with corporate results frameworks.

A. Results Frameworks in Multilateral Development Banks

2. At MDBs, results frameworks emerged from 2002 to 2014. The earliest to adopt results frameworks were the International Development Association (IDA, 2002); European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD, 2003); and the African Development Bank (AfDB, 2003). Next to implement the results framework were the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD, 2007); Asian Development Bank (ADB, 2008); Inter-American Development Bank (IADB, 2010); the World Bank, comprising the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and IDA (2011). Subsequently, the World Bank Group (WBG), consisting of the International Finance Corporation (IFC), Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), and the World Bank, launched the first bank-wide corporate scorecard (2014) to track the results and performance of these three organizations.

3. **Driving forces for the adoption of results frameworks and/or scorecards.** The global development agenda has partly driven the design and implementation of results frameworks and scorecards. The first decade of the 2000s was marked by a heightened focus on development results, propelling a shift in the orientation of MDBs and a quest for better reporting systems. The MDBs strengthened their focus on greater transparency and accountability, which are at the core of managing for development results. Such management centered on gearing resources—human, financial, technological, and natural—to achieve desired development results and on tracking evidence-based progress.

4. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), approved in 2000, set targets for eradicating poverty and eliminating other sources of human deprivation while the Monterrey Consensus (2002) underscored the need to mobilize resources more efficiently. Afterwards, the Joint Marrakech Memorandum (2004) called for a renewed emphasis on aid effectiveness, particularly on the harmonization and alignment of programming, monitoring, and evaluation activities. Subsequently, the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) identified the five imperatives of country ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, and mutual accountability as the core of the global development agenda. In this context, the shareholders and management of MDBs had increased their demand for information on the effective use of development resources.¹ Fund releases (concessional fund and general capital increase), as in the case of the AfDB, IDA, and IADB, required corporate results frameworks.

5. In the aftermath of the 2008 global financial crisis, the emphasis on the effective use of scarce resources became even more paramount. The development conversation focused on results and value for money, particularly among MDBs that provided the bulk of official development assistance across countries and sectors (footnote 1). The MDBs improved their collaboration and learning from each other,

¹ African Development Bank Group, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Inter-American Development Bank Group, International Fund for Agricultural Development, Islamic Development Bank Group, and World Bank Group. 2005. *Common Performance Assessment System (COMPAS) Report*.

and from 2010 onwards, updated their indicators to achieve a better alignment with progress made in results measurement approaches.

6. The approval of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 and alignment with new corporate strategies led MDBs to streamline their results frameworks, revisit their corporate scorecards, and modify some of their performance indicators. ADB reduced the number of indicators in its Transitional Results Framework 2017–2020 from 91 to 85 indicators to sharpen the focus on strategic priorities and improve the cost effectiveness of results measurement.² It changed some indicators on development outcomes to correspond with those in the SDG framework. Examples of these indicators are presented in a subsequent section on SDGs. Similarly, IADB revisited its results framework and reduced its main indicators to 55 (from 84 in the previous framework) to focus on key strategic priorities.³ IADB also introduced a set of auxiliary indicators to complement the results framework indicators. Table 1 shows the changes in the number of indicators across MDBs.

Table 1: Number of Indicators in the Most Recent Corporate Results Frameworks of Multilateral Development Banks

Multilateral Development Bank	Number of Indicators		Most Recent Results Framework Period
	Old	New	
African Development Bank	111	105	2016–2025
Asian Development Bank	91	85	2017–2020
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	21	21	2018–2020
Inter-American Development Bank	84	55	2016–2019
International Fund for Agricultural Development	57	62	2019–2021
World Bank Group	115	115	2017–2020

Note: The latest number of indicators for the World Bank Group (WBG) was based on the Corporate Scorecards report (October 2017). The tier on performance has two clusters of indicators: (i) WBG performance and (ii) World Bank performance. The report does not sum up the indicators, but a manual count yields a total of 119 indicators for all tiers. The Annual Evaluation Review team adjusted this figure to 115 to exclude 4 indicators in the World Bank cluster that were repeated in the WBG cluster: satisfactory outcomes for World Bank operations as a share of operations, stock of country strategies underpinned by a systematic country diagnostic, advisory services and analytics objectives accomplished, and time from concept note to first disbursement.

Sources: African Development Bank Group. 2017. *The Bank Group Results Measurement Framework 2016–2025*. Côte d'Ivoire; Asian Development Bank. 2017. *The Asian Development Bank's Transitional Results Framework 2017–2020*. Manila; European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. 2017. *Strategy Implementation Plan 2018–2020*. London; Inter-American Development Bank. 2015. *Corporate Results Framework 2016–2019*. Revised Version. Washington, DC; International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2017. *Report on the IFAD11 Results Management Framework*. Rome; World Bank Group. 2017. *Corporate Scorecards*. October. Washington, DC.

7. **Overview of results frameworks and their structure.** Interactive discussions among MDBs have contributed to near-convergence of their corporate-level results frameworks and/or scorecards. Two MDB's—AfDB and ADB—have a four-tier framework that covers both development results and MDB performance, adjusted to the needs of each MDB based on its mandate and operational challenges. These levels comprise (i) global or regional development context, (ii) contribution to development through MDB-financed operations, (iii) operational management, and (iv) organizational management (Table 2). IDB, IFAD, and WBG, however, have a three-tier framework, opting to combine operational and organizational performance under a single category on performance.

² ADB. 2017. *The Asian Development Bank's Transitional Results Framework 2017–2020*. Manila.

³ Inter-American Development Bank. 2015. *Corporate Results Framework 2016–2019*. Revised Version. Washington, DC.

Table 2: Tiers in the Corporate Results Frameworks of Selected Multilateral Development Banks

Multilateral Development Bank	Tiers or Levels				
	Development Context	Results Supported by MDB Operations	Operational Management/ Performance	Organizational Management/ Performance	Performance (Combined Operational and Organizational Effectiveness)
African Development Bank	•	•	•	•	
Asian Development Bank)	•	•	•	•	
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development			•	•	
Inter-American Development Bank	•	•			•
International Fund for Agricultural Development	•	•			•
World Bank Group	•	•			•

Note: The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development's framework has 5 tiers but uses a slightly different nomenclature. Instead of development context, it uses transition impact that has six transition quality indicators: competitive, innovative economies; well-governed institutions and firms; environmentally sustainable, green economies; inclusive, gender-equal economies; resilient economies and firms; and well-integrated, connected markets. In addition, it has an additional tier for financial performance and for resource framework (expenditure and efficiency investment).

Source: Reports from multilateral development banks, various years.

8. IFAD's scorecard has been proposed for 2019–2021, which will draw from a subset of results management framework indicators to track value for money.⁴ These include improving the disbursement ratio to avoid stagnant disbursements and project time overruns, reducing the time between the concept note and the first disbursement, and increasing the ratio of country office staff to headquarters staff.

9. The development context (Tier 1) refers to long-term development outcomes that countries are achieving while results supported by MDB operations (Tier 2) refer to outputs and outcomes contributed by the MDB. Operational performance (Tier 3) generally covers implementation quality, quality at entry, development finance, and implementation of development agendas or special themes. Organizational performance (Tier 4) refers to human resources, budget resources, and process efficiency. In the case of MDBs that have combined operational and organizational performance in one tier, this also covers innovation and knowledge, leverage and partnerships, and responsiveness, among others.

10. While MDB results frameworks share common uses and framework tiers, they necessarily reflect MDB's specific mandates and governance arrangements. In the case of regional MDBs, they also emphasize regional and subregional priorities. Consequently, while all MDB results frameworks track achievement of outputs and outcomes and monitor operational and organizational effectiveness to varying extents, this information needs to be interpreted in an institution-specific context.

11. Table 3 shows that IDB has relatively fewer indicators across tiers and sub-tiers than ADB and WBG due to its streamlining effort, which reduced the number of key performance indicators in the results framework and moved some of the indicators to the auxiliary set. IDB also introduced new indicators on innovation and knowledge under performance, which capture the percentage of partners that consider IADB Group solutions to be innovative, total number of IADB Group blog readership, and average number of visits to IADB Group publications.

⁴ International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2017. *Report on the IFAD11 Results Management Framework*. Rome.

Table 3: Corporate Results Framework Structure of Selected Multilateral Development Banks

Tier	Number of Indicators by Sub-Tier			
	Asian Development Bank (2017–2020)	World Bank Group (2017–2020)	Inter-American Development Bank (2016–2019)	International Fund for Agricultural Development (2019–2021)
Development context	22	22	13	7
	Poverty (10)	Goals (2)	Note: No breakdown by sub-tier	No poverty (1)
	Other development outcomes (12) Access to electricity, water and sanitation, and other services; intraregional trade in total Asia and Pacific trade; forest area as a proportion of total land area, etc.	Growth (5)		Zero hunger (6)
		Inclusiveness (9) Sustainability and resilience (6)		
Contribution to development results	30	32	25	25
		<i>IFC and MIGA operations</i>		Impact indicators (4)
	Quality at completion (7)	Growth (4)	Outputs (8)	Project-level resources (10)
	Core operational results (23)	Inclusiveness (5)	Immediate outcomes (10)	Project-level outputs (11)
		Sustainability and resilience (2)	Intermediate outcomes (7)	
		<i>IBRD and IDA operations</i>		
		Growth (6)		
		Inclusiveness (7) Sustainability and resilience (8)		
Operational management	24			
	Implementation quality (3)			
	Quality at entry (2)			
	Development finance (4)			
	Strategy 2020 development agendas and operations (8)			
	Strategy 2020 drivers of change (7)			
Organizational management	9			
	Human resources (3)			
	Budget resources (2)			
	Process efficiency and client orientation (4)			
Performance (operational and organizational effectiveness)		65	17	30
		<i>IFC and MIGA</i>		
		Development impact (10)	Responsiveness (3)	Mobilizing resources (3)
		Strategic context (6)	Multi-sectorality (2)	Resource allocation for the poorest (3)
		Operational delivery for clients (8)	Effectiveness (4)	Country program performance (6)

Tier	Number of Indicators by Sub-Tier			
	Asian Development Bank (2017–2020)	World Bank Group (2017–2020)	Inter-American Development Bank (2016–2019)	International Fund for Agricultural Development (2019–2021)
		Financial sustainability and efficiency (3)	Efficiency (2)	Quality at entry (2)
		Managing talent (4)	Leverage and partnerships (2)	Portfolio management (4)
			Innovation and knowledge (3)	Decentralization (2)
			Alignment (1)	Institutional efficiency (7)
		<i>IBRD and IDA</i>		Workforce management (3)
		Development impact (5)		
		Strategic context (6)		
		Operational delivery for clients (13)		
		Financial sustainability and efficiency (6)		
		Managing talent (4)		

IBRD = International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, IDA = International Development Association, IFC = International Finance Corporation, MIGA = Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency.

Source: Asian Development Bank. 2017. *The Asian Development Bank's Transitional Results Framework 2017–2020*. Manila; Inter-American Development Bank. 2015. *Corporate Results Framework 2016–2019*. Revised Version. Washington, DC; International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2017. *Report on the IFAD11 Results Management Framework*. Rome; World Bank Group. 2017. *Corporate Scorecards*. Washington, DC.

B. Results Frameworks in Bilateral Organizations

12. Bilateral organizations use results frameworks to focus on strategies, improve operations, and comply with public accountability requirements. The Japan Bank for International Cooperation's (JBIC's) performance measurement system is a response to the reorganization and rationalization plan for special public corporations, which required a system for feeding back results into operations.⁵ At the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), self-evaluations are carried out to improve operational management. At the end of the medium-term cycle (5 years), the ministers-in-charge review JICA's operations and organization, examine the continuation of each operation and the retention of the organization itself, and take necessary measures to reflect these decisions in the next medium-term plan based on the results.⁶

13. The first multi-tier results framework (2011–2015) of the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom was meant to monitor and manage the progress of development results and to publicly report on results delivery. Such corporate results framework drew heavily on the frameworks of ADB, AfDB, and IDA,⁷ reflecting progress on key development outcomes, results (outputs and intermediate outcomes), operational performance, and organizational performance. In 2016, DFID revised this framework to align it with the Single Departmental Plan (2015–2020). Targets are organized around the strategic priorities on strengthening global peace, security, and governance; strengthening resilience and response to crisis; promoting global prosperity; tackling extreme poverty and helping the world's most vulnerable; and delivering value for money and efficiency.

⁵ JBIC. No date. Performance Measurement for Strategic Management. In *Operational and Administrative Policies*. Tokyo.

⁶ JICA. 2017. *Annual Report*. Tokyo.

⁷ DFID. 2013. *DFID's Results Framework: Managing and Reporting DFID Results*. London.

C. Experience of Selected MDBs and Bilateral Organizations in Designing and Implementing Corporate Results Frameworks and/or Scorecards

14. This section synthesizes the experiences of selected MDBs and non-MDBs in developing and implementing corporate results frameworks and/or scorecards. The choice of organizations for this synthesis was dictated mainly by their suitability as a comparator organization and by the availability of comprehensive literature on their experiences over time.

1. Asian Development Bank

15. **Beginnings.** ADB adopted a corporate results framework upon the approval of Strategy 2020 in 2008, with two sets of targets and baselines to monitor and improve performance in achieving the priorities of (i) the Asian Development Fund, and (ii) ADB as a whole. The results framework is ADB's primary tool for mainstreaming development results across its operations. It is used in the annual Development Effectiveness Review, which comes with a scorecard portraying ADB's achievements, remaining challenges, and remedial actions.⁸ The findings are meant to inform ADB's operational directions and resource planning through the corporate work program and budget framework process.

16. The original corporate results framework consisted of 77 performance indicators. The indicators tracked (i) the development progress of the region (Level 1), (ii) ADB's core outputs and outcomes (Level 2), (iii) ADB's operational effectiveness (Level 3), and (iv) ADB's organizational effectiveness (Level 4).

17. **Reviews and updates of the corporate results framework.** The first review of the results frameworks took place in 2012 to ensure its continued relevance as a corporate performance management tool.⁹ The review noted that the results framework had driven the institutionalization of results-based performance management at ADB through the adoption of specific performance indicators and targets. The traffic light scoring system introduced in 2009 helped to identify performance strengths and challenges. Occasional refinements, moreover, allowed flexibility in the results framework.

18. Nonetheless, the 2012 review proposed several improvements: (i) a greater focus on outcomes and sustainability; (ii) tracking the success of completed policy-based operations, supplemented by a qualitative assessment in the annual development effectiveness review; (iii) a new results area exclusively on project implementation to increase emphasis, and a new indicator measuring efficiency in processing procurement contracts; (iv) additional indicators measuring nonsovereign operations, reflecting their growing importance in the ADB portfolio, and the introduction of indicators to measure ADB support for public-private partnerships; (v) expanded inclusive economic growth indicators; (vi) better measurement of gender equality, climate change, food security, and fragile and conflict-affected situations; (vii) adjustment of budget management indicators to enable measurement of efficiency as well as adequacy; and (viii) introduction of a new indicator measuring delegation to better assess conformity with the One ADB approach.

19. The subsequent results framework 2013–2016 built on the principles of strategic alignment, avoidance of indicator proliferation, cost-effectiveness of data collection and data comparability, harmonization with other MDBs, and retention of flexibility. It also increased the number of performance indicators from 77 to 91.

20. A second review followed in 2016, which led to the transitional results framework covering 2017–2020. This review highlighted the need to strengthen the focus on inclusive growth, reinforce the emphasis on outcomes, mainstream gender, and improve indicators. Related areas for action on strengthening inclusive growth centered on sharpening the definition and measures of inclusive growth,

⁸ ADB. 2017. *Annual Development Effectiveness Review*. Manila.

⁹ ADB. 2012. *Review of the ADB Results Framework*. Manila.

developing a more outcome-oriented approach to inclusive growth, strengthening country diagnostics on inclusive growth in country partnership strategies, and enhancing targeting interventions at low-income and vulnerable groups in project design, among others. The review, moreover, emphasized that the corporate results framework is a strategic document. Consequently, it must be strategy driven, rather than indicator-driven. The review also drew attention to streamlining the indicators to sharpen the focus on key strategic priorities and to extend the time span of the results framework from 4 years to 6 years.¹⁰

21. The current transitional results framework 2017–2020 is a response to new international developments that called for a strategic alignment of the framework to remain relevant, and adheres to the principles of ensuring relevance, enhancing efficiency, and setting targets prudently.¹¹ It has four tiers: (i) development progress in Asia and the Pacific; (ii) ADB’s contribution to development results; (iii) operational management (implementation quality, quality at entry, development finance, Strategy 2020 development agendas and operations, and Strategy 2020 drivers of change); and (iv) organizational management (human resources, budget resources, and process efficiency and client orientation).

22. **Challenges.** The 2012 review indicated that while the results framework has served ADB well, several challenges needed to be addressed to improve its usefulness. Among others, these pertained to clarifying level definitions in the terms of content and the causal links between levels, improving the alignment of the results framework with Strategy 2020’s strategic agendas and priorities, and expanding the framework’s coverage of nonsovereign operations. The results framework 2013–2016 addressed these by updating the original framework and introducing new and modified indicators.

23. The 2016 review identified new challenges, mainly in terms of sharpening the focus on key strategic priorities and streamlining the indicators from 91 to 85 indicators, which were addressed in the transitional results framework. Several other challenges, however, confront current efforts. Among these are the lack of causal relationship between Tier 1 and the rest of the tiers in the transitional results framework; need to revisit 85 indicators and 193 tracking indicators; and need to revisit existing indicators that were configured around Strategy 2020. Moreover, some indicators are perceived as not relevant to drive performance due to achievement of targets or likelihood that performance is likely to stay high (civil society engagement close to 100% now) and to the weak connection to levers of improved performance. Measuring priority areas such as knowledge has also been noted to be weak. Resolving these issues is part of ongoing efforts to draw up an SDG-aligned results framework for 2019–2024.

2. Inter-American Development Bank Group

24. **Beginnings.** IDB adopted a corporate results framework in 2010, which evolved to a single framework in 2016 for the three members of IADB Group—IADB, Inter-American Investment Corporation, and the Multilateral Investment Fund. The corporate results framework is an integral part of efforts to use empirical evidence to manage for development results and is central to accountability for delivering results.

25. Its initial implementation at IADB was a requirement of IADB’s Board of Governors in its Report on the Ninth General Increase in Resources (IDB-9). Although IADB’s corporate results framework began *de facto* in 2010, its formal implementation period was 2012–2015. The first Development Effectiveness Overview, published in 2010, came out with results framework tables. IADB’s corporate results framework was based on its institutional priorities and allowed shareholders to monitor its contribution towards selected regional development goals as well as desired progress on operational performance.

26. The IDB-9 corporate results framework was largely patterned after ADB’s 2008 corporate results framework. It drew on ADB’s multi-tier results framework, which included indicators with values for baselines, current or recent progress, and targets. IADB’s first corporate results framework adopted the

¹⁰ ADB. 2016. *Review of the Results Framework. Asian Development Fund 12 Replenishment Meeting*. Nepal.

¹¹ ADB. 2017. *The Asian Development Bank’s Transitional Results Framework, 2017–2020*. Manila.

following tiers: (i) regional development goals, (ii) output contributions, (iii) lending program, and (iv) operational effectiveness and efficiency. IADB differed from most MDBs by setting lending priorities as one of the tiers in its corporate results framework. No other organization reviewed at that time included lending priorities either as a tier or within the results framework, except ADB, which included lending priorities within tier 3 (operational effectiveness).¹²

27. **Midterm review of the corporate results framework.** A midterm review of the framework in 2013 noted that while IDB had made significant progress toward managing for development results anchored in a results framework, such framework had yet to become an integral tool to guide overall strategy and operations, as IDB-9 envisioned. Inconsistencies and gaps in the results framework structure reduced its value in setting corporate goals and post-2015 targets, reinforcing corporate accountability, and in supporting corporate decision-making. The review also noted weaknesses in quality control of data and reporting of information (footnote 12).

28. **Challenges.** The midterm review identified several key challenges, which included the lack of full alignment between lending and institutional priorities; unclear rationales for indicator selection in each of the four framework tiers; and absence of an explicit indication of the specific output contributions attributed to IDB-only efforts versus those of other development partners in a project, or of whether Bank output contributions are in annual or cumulative terms. Moreover, the process of engagement by which baseline and target values were set was not always evident and some targets lacked realism.

29. Measures to deal with these challenges centered on the following: (i) strengthen identification and measurement of outputs and intermediate and sector outcomes at the country level to provide a stronger link between operations and higher-level results; (ii) study the approach to results management in individual units for their potential applicability elsewhere in IDB; (iii) carefully review the process of generating, collecting, entering, and vetting the data that go into the corporate results framework and should include quality control, which could be accomplished by such means as validation of a sample of the data reported; (v) strategically select project information synthesized in the development effectiveness overview to illustrate issues that emerge from the corporate results framework tables.

30. The end of the corporate results framework period in 2015 provided an important opportunity to assess implementation experience since 2010. Lessons arising from the experience highlighted that a single tool cannot capture detailed results at all levels of the organization. The corporate results framework needed to focus on measuring the key strategic priorities. Simplicity in the number and type of indicators is essential for achieving this focus. Moreover, for the corporate results framework to be meaningful, ownership at all levels is critical. Board and employee engagement in developing the results framework directly impacts its future relevance and utility. To keep the results framework relevant, flexibility is essential. The ability to introduce improvements over the course of the reporting period yields a more useful results framework. Lastly, the corporate results framework can serve both accountability and managerial purposes. By promoting a greater understanding of the causes of variations in performance (i.e., under- or over-performance as compared to the target as well as volatility) and greater transparency with respect to the specific projects or business units that contribute to each of its targets, the corporate results framework can also help guide the IDB towards achieving the goals set out in its updated institutional strategy. These lessons were considered in preparing the corporate results framework 2016–2019.¹³

31. **A single corporate results framework.** In line with promoting an efficient and effective results-driven institution, results reporting by IADB, Inter-American Investment Corporation, and Multilateral Investment Fund was consolidated under a single corporate results framework for 2016–2019. The current corporate results framework is structured along three levels: regional context, country

¹² Office of Evaluation and Oversight. 2013. *Midterm Evaluation of IDB-9 Commitments: Corporate Results Framework*. IADB: Washington, DC.

¹³ IADB. 2015. *Corporate Results Framework 2016–2019*. Revised Version. Washington, DC.

development results, and IADB Group performance. The regional context level provides a high-level picture of the region's long-term development progress toward selected key indicators related to the strategic priorities in the Update to the Institutional Strategy.¹⁴ The second level—country development results—provides aggregate data on outputs and outcomes generated by IADB Group-financed projects in support of strategic priorities. This level is intended to provide information on how IADB Group-supported interventions are contributing to development in the region and includes several indicators measuring specific beneficiaries of IADB Group-supported projects. The third level, IADB Group performance, measures how IADB Group supports countries and clients in achieving results, leveraging its comparative advantages.

32. IADB noted that key to the successful implementation of the CRF 2016–2019 is the continued engagement with the corporate results framework Network of Champions and Senior Management. They play an important role in monitoring progress and identifying potential modifications to the framework. As part of the action plan, IDBG-wide communications and training activities are meant to ensure that employees are familiar with the corporate results framework and understand the implications it has on their daily work. Finally, achieving the expected results and targets is seen as a shared responsibility among the IADB Group's boards of directors, senior management, and employees. It requires strategic direction from IADB Group boards of directors and senior management teams, and innovative thinking, collaboration, and efficiency from its employees (footnote 13).

3. International Fund for Agricultural Development

33. **Beginnings.** IFAD's results measurement framework was approved in September 2007 but it became fully operational in 2008. It is an integral part of IFAD's development effectiveness framework, allowing accountability and learning for better institutional performance and development effectiveness. The first results measurement framework had two tiers: country-level outcomes and IFAD operational performance. It used six indicators, which were drawn from IFAD's Strategic Framework, to assess the quality, performance, and impact of IFAD country programs and projects: (i) poverty impact, (ii) innovation, (iii) relevance, (iv) effectiveness, (v) efficiency, and (vi) sustainability.¹⁵

34. **Updates.** IFAD updated its results measurement framework several times. The number of indicators increased to 50 in the IFAD8 framework (2010–2012) and then to 70 in IFAD9 (2013–2015). Both used a five-level structure, which was carried over to the IFAD10 framework (2016–2018). Subsequently, the IFAD10 framework reduced the number of indicators to 58. The five tiers of the IFAD10 framework comprised (i) macro outcomes (global poverty, food security, and agricultural investment outcomes); (ii) country-level development outcomes and impact delivered by IFAD-supported projects; (iii) country-level development outputs delivered by IFAD-supported projects; (iv) operational effectiveness of IFAD-supported country programs and projects; and (v) IFAD's institutional effectiveness and efficiency.¹⁶

35. The corporate-level evaluation of IFAD replenishments in 2014 informed the IFAD10 results framework. One major issue with this framework was that it pre-dated IFAD's Strategic Framework 2016–2025, leading to a relatively poor fit with the strategies. A revision of the results management framework in December 2016 partly resolved this issue. One new feature of the IFAD10 results management framework was the addition of a simple theory of change or impact pathway.¹⁷

¹⁴ The Update to the Institutional Strategy outlines the strategic direction through the end of 2019. The six strategic priorities are social inclusion and equality, productivity and innovation, economic integration, gender equality and diversity, climate change and environmental sustainability, and institutional capacity and rule of law. IADB Group. 2017. *Development Effectiveness Overview 2016*. Washington, DC.

¹⁵ IFAD. 2007. *Report on IFAD's Development Effectiveness*. Rome.

¹⁶ IFAD. 2017. *Report on the IFAD11 Results Management Framework*. Rome.

¹⁷ IFAD. 2016. *Report on the IFAD10 Results Management Framework (2016–2018)*. Rome.

36. Lessons from previous experience indicated that corporate results frameworks are important but are inherently imperfect tools. Although they can capture results and performance that are measurable by quantitative indicators, they need to be supplemented by additional narrative reporting. Internal management frameworks must ensure a complete statement of IFAD's work program and achievements and emphasize improving the quality and use of evidence.

37. **Corporate results framework.** In 2017, IFAD changed the name of its results measurement framework to results management framework. Five design principles guided the structure and content of the latest IFAD11 results management framework (2019–2021): (i) results management, not just results measurement; (ii) reflection of IFAD11 priorities, replenishment targets, and theory of change; (iii) consistency with the Strategic Framework 2016–2025; (iv) simplified three-tier structure; and (v) conciseness and quality. The simplified tiers consist of sustainable development goals, development results, and operational and organizational performance. The IFAD11 results management framework has 62 indicators, slightly higher than 57 in the IFAD10 framework.

38. **Challenges.** A major challenge lies in building a results-based organization on multiple fronts. It is not sufficient to assess where progress has been made and where efforts need to continue. It is also necessary to shift towards a culture of results. This culture change assumes that: (i) managers play an active role in leading change; (ii) incentives exist to drive behavior change; (iii) goals, values, and activities are aligned across managerial levels; and (iv) understanding of the development effectiveness framework is shared throughout IFAD.

39. In this light, leadership needs to be strengthened to reinforce the corporate vision of managing for results. Building a corporate-wide understanding of this vision and embracing it across the organization requires bold and sustained leadership to manage change. IFAD managers play a central role in helping to define the scope and outcomes of these reforms, including efforts to nurture a results-oriented culture and to send common signals.

40. Additional incentives could be considered to foster desired behavior, outputs, and results. Wiring results-focused behavior requires appropriate incentives, both financial and non-financial, at the corporate, team, and individual levels. While systemic incentives are important, complementary incentives for teams and individuals are also vital because organizational change requires individual-level change. Clarifying what types of outputs and results are actually being rewarded is essential. Studies show that people who work in the public sector are committed to the values of public service, which appear to motivate them beyond pay.¹⁸ These staff value opportunities to learn new skills, receive positive feedback from managers and peers, and reap rewards for modelling results-focused behaviors.

41. More should be done to align goals, values, and activities across all organizational levels. In line with international good practices, continuous efforts are called for to align IFAD's goals, values, and activities through a results framework that enables Management to keep an eye on the big picture while monitoring progress at the operational level. Making this process practical and meaningful will allow managers to make effective use of the framework to monitor corporate results.

42. The current development context, which is shaped by the 2030 Agenda and reduced development assistance budgets, implies that international institutions are under increasing pressure to demonstrate both results and value for money. For IFAD, this means that it can no longer be content with measuring and reporting on its results. It must manage for results by using evidence-based decision-making to ensure that IFAD-funded activities are relevant, inclusive, and cost-effective.

43. IFAD Management has committed to develop and adopt a Value for Money (VfM) scorecard starting in 2019. Through evaluative reasoning, the proposed scorecard will support Management in identifying

¹⁸ P. Milne. 2007. Motivation, Incentives, and Organizational Culture. *Journal of Knowledge Management* 11(6): 28–38; P. Senge et al. 2007. Collaborating for Systemic Change. *MIT Sloan Management Review* (Winter).

and balancing the trade-offs inherent in pursuing VfM: (i) short-term versus long-term benefits of any course of action; (ii) maximizing the number of poor and food-insecure men and women who benefit versus supporting the poorest countries or those in the most fragile situations; and (iii) reducing overhead versus strengthening the quality of operations. The proposed VfM scorecard comprises a subset of results management framework indicators related to the revised business model. These indicators were chosen based on their potential to overcome long-standing barriers to greater operational efficiency and effectiveness, achieve greater economy and equity, and enhance IFAD's VfM.

44. In this regard, the challenge is to reduce the time between the concept note and the first disbursement, which requires altering the long-standing practices of both IFAD and borrowers. Actions include shortening the operations review and compliance process; designing projects that are more readily implementable; demanding greater ownership from borrowers to ratify and establish project structures before approval; and being vigilant regarding start-up delays. Setting the clock from the start sets the tone for timely implementation.

45. A related challenge is to improve the disbursement ratio to avoid stagnant disbursements and project time overruns. It requires designing more focused projects that are proactively restructured when facing delays. Faster disbursement helps to contain project costs and maintain staff morale. Although quick disbursements do not guarantee good results, the latter are not possible without the former. Lastly, there is a need to increase the ratio of IFAD country office to headquarters staff to turn IFAD country offices—especially sub-regional hubs—into true service centers for borrowers. This will boost a better knowledge of project implementation support and sustained policy engagement.

4. World Bank and the World Bank Group

46. **Beginnings.** The World Bank¹⁹ has comprehensive systems for measuring and monitoring both development results and its own performance. Independent evaluation complements these systems. With the Results Measurement System, which was adopted for the 13th replenishment of IDA (IDA13) in 2002, IDA was an early adopter of a framework with quantitative indicators to monitor results and performance.²⁰

47. The first corporate scorecard of the World Bank in 2011 was inspired by IDA's results measurement system, drawing heavily on the IDA indicators.²¹ The corporate scorecard used an integrated results and performance framework, organized around a four-tier structure that groups indicators along the results chain. Two of the tiers tracked elements of development results, and the other two captured elements of performance. These four tiers were incorporated into the first World Bank corporate scorecard, which covered both the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and IDA. Eventually, the tiers were reduced to three with the combination of operational and organizational performance into one category. At an aggregate level, the corporate scorecard monitored whether the World Bank is functioning efficiently and managing its operations and services effectively to support countries in achieving results. It presented a high-level view and was not meant to provide country or activity-level information.

48. **Emergence of a World Bank Group scorecard.** In July 2013, WBG launched its group Strategy, outlining how it will partner more effectively with clients to help them achieve the ambitious goals of eradicating extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity through economic growth, inclusion, sustainability and resilience. These twin goals are the apex of the WBG's results measurement system. Subsequently, the first WBG corporate scorecard was launched in 2014. The WBG scorecard provides a

¹⁹ The term World Bank refers to the International Development Association and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

²⁰ World Bank. 2011. *Corporate Scorecard: Integrated Results and Performance Framework*. Washington, DC.

²¹ International Development Association (IDA). 2016. *The Way Forward for IDA18: The IDA18 Results Measurement System*. Washington, DC.

view of the results and performance indicators of three organizations: World Bank, IFC, and MIGA.²² Corporate scorecard results are updated and published annually.

49. WBG recently underwent a process of refining the corporate scorecard and the measurement systems that support it, guided by the principles of strengthening strategic alignment, enhancing data quality and validity of reported results, and balancing monitoring needs with harmonization and efficiency. A main driver of the revision was ensuring that SDGs were adequately reflected in results systems.²³ The revision has been geared toward harmonizing, aligning, and rationalizing the internal indicators sets used across WBG. Periodic updates and to the corporate scorecard have provided a space for flexibility.

50. **Challenges.** Linking the different tiers of the corporate scorecard is a challenge to WBG. While outcomes reported in Tier 1 are not attributable to WBG funds, there is an assumed link between project level outputs at Tier 2 and country level impacts at Tier 1. To illustrate, WBG's contribution to generation of additional megawatts of electricity at Tier 2 can be assumed to contribute to increased access to electricity at Tier 1. However, the challenge is communicating that outcomes reported at Tier 1 are impact to which Tier 2 outputs contribute, rather than purely *context*. The scale of WBG support implies there is potential for results to be used to monitor and steer toward change. Without communication of these links, there is a risk that the substantial achievements at Tier 2 become decontextualized from change or progress at Tier 1.²⁴

51. Similarly, there is a perceived disconnect between Tiers 2 (client results) and 3 (performance). Results are collected, analyzed, and presented in a way that not only provides performance information, but also enables evidence-based management and decision making. WBG sets targets against most of the indicators at Tier 3 and uses a traffic light system to convey whether they are on track or not. However, the question remains on whether and how this focus on achieving performance targets can be linked logically to concrete development results.

52. While a comprehensive results architecture exists, the quality of collected project-level data can be weak, which reduces the ability of staff to use results information for learning and decision making. A report on WBG self-evaluation systems suggested that staff are more likely to rely on tacit knowledge than on written information from the self-evaluation systems.²⁵ Information generated through the systems is not regularly mined for knowledge and learning except by the Independent Evaluation Group. The review pointed out that its use for project and portfolio performance management could be improved. The systems produce corporate results measures but need to generate value to staff and line management and to primary beneficiaries. The report also highlighted the importance of ongoing refinement of systems and incentives to promote collection and use of quality results information. The incentives need to shift to reward teams for good M&E and problem identification and resolution.

53. Learning has taken a backseat to accountability. The systems' focus on accountability drives the shape, scope, timing, and content of reporting and limits the usefulness of the exercise for learning. If the self-evaluation systems had been set up to primarily serve learning, they would have been more forward-looking (how can we do better?), more selective (which projects offer the greatest learning opportunities?), more programmatic (are there synergies across activities and countries?), attuned to unintended positive and negative consequences, and more often done in real-time (footnote 25). Use of results information for learning, thus, is an area for ongoing improvement.

²² World Bank and World Bank Group. 2017. *Corporate Scorecards*. October 2017. Washington, DC.

²³ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2017. *Results in Development Co-operation. Case Studies of Results-Based Management by Providers*: World Bank. Paris.

²⁴ OECD. 2017. *Results in Development Co-operation. Case Studies of Results-Based Management by Providers*: World Bank. Paris.

²⁵ Independent Evaluation Group (IEG). 2016. *Behind the Mirror: A Report on the Self-Evaluation Systems of the World Bank Group*. World Bank: Washington, DC.

54. Misaligned incentives for using self-evaluations are linked to an undue focus on ratings, attention to volume that overshadows attention to results, and low perceived value of the knowledge created. A competitive organizational culture alongside a heavy emphasis on ratings tends to make staff focus on avoiding negative ratings and to limit candor. The push for new deals, lending, and disbursements displaces incentives to invest in M&E. Without good data, systems create little value and are only partially used for performance management. Moreover, systems create little organizational learning when failures are not disclosed, safe places to learn are not in place, and lessons are not drawn from experience. Realizing the potential of self-evaluation to support WBG's strategy and twin goals requires greater clarity and better balance among accountability, performance management, and learning objectives (footnote 25).

55. **Identified action areas.** Efforts are called for in several areas: (i) reforming the implementation of the results reporting system to make it more compatible with innovation and course corrections; (ii) helping staff understand that project objectives pertaining to innovating, piloting, and testing are feasible and that projects with such objectives are rated appropriately, provided the project development objective and indicators are set in the right way; (iii) strengthening rewards and leadership signals at all levels of the organization to reinforce the importance of self-evaluation; (iv) formulating a more systematic approach to improving M&E quality; and (v) expanding voluntary evaluations that respond to learning needs of management and teams (impact and process evaluations, retrospectives, and beneficiary surveys), and ensuring that information technology systems capture and make accessible knowledge from self-evaluations (footnote 25).

5. Department for International Development of the United Kingdom

56. **Beginnings.** DFID's initial corporate results framework (2011–2015) was accountability- and communication-driven. It drew heavily on the frameworks of ADB, AfDB, and IDA and was designed to deliver results on four tiers: (i) progress on key development outcomes, (ii) outputs and intermediate outcomes, (iii) operational effectiveness, and (iv) organizational effectiveness. The results framework intended to improve accountability to both parliament and taxpayers and to enable DFID to monitor progress and pursue challenges accordingly. It helped DFID to communicate to the public the extent to which its commitments had been met.

57. **Reviews of the corporate results framework.** The results agenda has pushed DFID and its partners to focus more consistently on the delivery of results. The organization now has tighter accountability throughout its business processes and for the first time, it had a mechanism for allocating its budget according to a desired set of global results. In 2014, an internal review focused on the strategic, operational, and technical aspects of tier 2 of DFID's corporate results framework. Subsequently, an external review in 2015 looked more widely at DFID's approach to impact.²⁶

58. The internal review found that DFID's tier 2 results did not adequately capture all of DFID's efforts, measuring results from only around half of DFID's investments.²⁷ The external review indicated that the emphasis on aggregating results accorded priority on results that can be measured and delivered within short programming cycles, often at the expense of long-term and sustainable impact. Moreover, the review pointed out that the links between the different tiers were not always apparent. Top-down corporate results targets led to a lack of flexibility in terms of programming and delivery and tended to detract from a more adaptive and context aware country-level approach. In addition, a narrative was lacking in terms of how project level results are linked to country and to corporate level results. The review suggested stronger contextual analysis along with an analysis of partner country priorities and of the in-country donor landscape.

²⁶ Independent Commission for Aid Impact. 2015. *DFID's Approach to Delivering Impact*. London.

²⁷ OECD. 2014. *Results in Development Cooperation. Provider Case Studies: United Kingdom*. London.

59. Both internal and external reviews recommended building more focus on outcomes and impact into future results frameworks. They also proposed a shift from direct attribution to reporting DFID's contribution to development outcomes. At the departmental level, it was suggested that a results framework be developed, which better reflects the range of impacts it seeks to achieve, capturing not only the extent of its engagement but also its transformative impact, including successes in institution building and policy influence. This called for looking beyond quantitative indicators.²⁸

60. **Revised corporate results framework.** In response to the findings of the internal and external reviews, DFID shifted to a more performance-focused management framework in 2016. Such framework is supported by a new platform that will improve both collection and management of results and boost the use of results information for decision making. Alongside this new framework, DFID is working on building and strengthening results systems from the bottom up to ensure that capacity and tools are in place for reporting.²⁹

61. **Challenges.** In 2015, DFID produced a Single Departmental Plan (2015–2020)—the new form in which results commitments would be tracked. The latest update was done in May 2018. Targets are organized around the strategic priorities of the UK Aid Strategy³⁰ alongside value for money commitments. The five strategic objectives center on strengthening global peace, security, and governance; strengthening resilience and response to crisis; promoting global prosperity; tackling extreme poverty and helping the world's most vulnerable; and delivering value for money and efficiency. Concerns around output indicators in the new results framework are now being addressed by combining them with narrative reporting on qualitative results at country and portfolio levels. The challenge is no longer about results only, but about transformation. Knowing how economic, political, and social institutions interact is essential, along with what this means for poverty reduction efforts.

62. The pursuit of development results is subject to political winds. As a government department, DFID must be properly accountable to the British people. There are significant challenges in shifting the culture of the organization to different ways of working, in part due to political pressure applied by ministers. The flux and flow of political agendas for government aid spending will continue due to electoral cycles. Adapting to changes in political leadership and shifting ministerial priorities within the limits of DFID's mandate and priorities has been a balancing act. DFID's response to ministerial priorities has been in relation to results, evidence, and value for money (VfM). These elements matter, but a more nuanced discussion is needed about what it looks like in countries where change is complex, politically challenging, and uncertain.³¹

63. Drawing up standard measures of development results that work across different contexts and programs is difficult, particularly for VfM assessment methods. Even moving from the quantity of education (enrolment figures) to its quality (learning outcomes) poses measurement challenges that are yet to be fully resolved. VfM also leads to pressure on partners to compress the cost of inputs and to deliver simple interventions that can be quickly scaled up. VfM needs to be reoriented towards a more strategic approach, in which sustainable impact is a main consideration.

64. Measurement will remain a crucial part of a revised results agenda. DFID plans to focus on the results that matter most, even when they are harder to measure. While VfM of some policy work and investments can be more difficult to track and quantify, particularly when the path to impact calls for many steps over a lengthy timeframe, such work remains vital.³²

²⁸ Independent Commission for Aid Impact. 2015. *DFID's Approach to Delivering Impact*. London.

²⁹ OECD. 2017. *Results in Development Cooperation. Provider Case Studies: United Kingdom*. Paris.

³⁰ DFID. 2015. *UK Aid: Tackling Global Challenges in the National Interest*. London.

³¹ Overseas Development Institute. 2017. *The Politics of the Results Agenda in DFID: 1997–2017*. London.

³² DFID. 2015. *Economic Development Strategy: Prosperity, Poverty, and Meeting Global Challenges*. London.

6. Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs

65. **Beginnings.** The Netherlands' Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) introduced systematic results reporting more than 10 years ago and have been submitting an annual results report and letter to parliament since 2012.³³ The government maintains a strong emphasis on results. Accountability for aid spending is first and foremost to the Dutch Parliament.

66. **Revised corporate results framework.** MFA introduced a new corporate results framework in 2016 in response to a critique by Parliament. Parliament pointed out that while reporting gave a sense of the scale of what was being delivered, it did not articulate the extent to which this was on track or delivering value for money. Domestic accountability and communication are currently driving the push for more and better results information in the Netherlands. A new corporate results framework, which measures aggregated outputs against budgeted targets, helps to create greater accountability and aims to ensure that progress can be tracked.

67. The new corporate results framework aligns to the SDGs, wherever possible. The new framework aggregates data from across the aid program against concrete baselines and targets. The framework is structured around 15 core indicators, organized by theme and result area. Most indicators can be classified as 'reach indicators' since they focus on volume and count the number of beneficiaries who are reached by a service or intervention. The framework is viewed as providing a missing middle between policy objectives and budget/delivery. The ministry plans to extend the framework to up to 25–30 indicators and potentially include outcome-oriented indicators.³⁴

68. Alongside the corporate results framework, a separate results framework for Dutch humanitarian assistance was developed in the second quarter of 2016. The framework focuses on three result areas: (i) the number of crises-affected people assisted by Dutch humanitarian aid and the quality of the aid; (ii) the contribution of Dutch humanitarian aid to increasing the self-reliance of people and organizations; and (iii) the contributions and results of the Netherlands in relation to coordination within the humanitarian system.³⁵

69. Ensuring the results of Dutch Aid are transparent and communicated to the Dutch public is also paramount. The ministry aims to not only bring the figures out but bring them to life by connecting them to people. It does this through content analysis, storytelling, and sharing information and experience. In 2016, the ministry launched the Dutch Development Results website, which aims to showcase to the Dutch public the contribution the Netherlands has made to eradicating poverty and promoting inclusive growth. The website presents results from sectors and countries using an interactive platform, balancing quantitative results and results stories to demonstrate tangible changes.³⁶

70. **Challenges.** MFA acknowledges that while it may be straightforward to incorporate the indicators into new projects, there is a challenge in retrofitting the indicators into existing programs and ensuring implementing partners have the systems and capacity to collect data and report. MFA is building new information technology systems, called results modules, to enable aggregation of the results against indicators from project, to country, to thematic and up to corporate level. MFA staff members are also working closely with embassy staff to ensure they understand what is required of them in relation to the results-based management approach.

³³ OECD. 2017. Results in Development Cooperation. *Provider Case Studies: Netherlands*. Paris.

³⁴ OECD. 2017. Results in Development Cooperation. *Provider Case Studies: Netherlands*. Paris.

³⁵ Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2016. OECD DAC Peer Review of the Netherlands: Memorandum by the Netherlands. The Hague.

³⁶ Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2017. *Dutch Development Results in Perspective*. The Hague. <https://www.dutchdevelopmentresults.nl/>

71. To meet Parliament's accountability requirements, MFA aims to claim full attribution against each of the indicators. This may prove technically difficult particularly in areas where several stakeholders are working to deliver interventions. For example, the number of women and girls with access to modern contraception (one of the framework indicators) is usually measured at national and international levels. Attributing results to Dutch support will be a complex process. For multilateral contributions, MFA plans to use a calculated proportional approach. Guidance on attribution and contribution, quantitative and qualitative indicators, baselines and targets, and aggregation will be further worked out in technical notes. Given transparency goals, there will also be challenges for MFA to create systems to verify and ensure the quality of the data entered by partners.

72. MFA sees the results-oriented aid approach as contributing to steering, accountability, transparency, communication and learning.³⁷ The aim is for results to inform different planning and budget cycles as well as to enable decision making through the different reporting tools. MFA staff members acknowledge that this requires both monitoring and evaluation and hope that over time, decisions on resources and deployment will be better aimed at achieving results.³⁸

73. Building a results framework with a focus on achieving targets, however, can lead to unintended consequences in relation to direction and decision making. One notable weakness of the logical framework is its tendency to look at the results of each program in isolation from other initiatives. Interventions can also combine to undermine each other or cause unintended negative consequences. It is also important that the results framework does not start to influence programming choices toward meeting short-term targets, rather than long-term impact.

74. Overall, ensuring the corporate results framework is integrated into country-level systems and structures in a way that is useful for country level planning, reporting, and management will not be easy. It will be important to ensure that the framework does not simply become an additional reporting burden. Using the new generation of multi-annual country strategies in the context of the SDGs alongside a dedicated focus on open and accessible data represent an opportunity to take a more country-led approach.³⁹

75. The Netherlands' results approach is focused on accountability and communication towards domestic audiences. However, there is a growing commitment to improve the use of results information for internal learning and decision making. Building a culture and new systems will be challenging and will require change management, flexibility, and robust data systems.⁴⁰

D. Strengths of Corporate Scorecards

76. **Scorecards can help align an organization behind a shared vision, and get people working on the right things and focusing on results.** A scorecard is more than a way of keeping score. It is a system, consisting of strategy, people, processes, and technology. Its value comes from the continuous self-inquiry and in-depth process of discovery and analysis that is at the heart of strategic planning and performance management systems.⁴¹

77. **Corporate scorecards serve accountability and managerial purposes.** As a tool for accountability, they are valuable in communicating corporate-level results to shareholders and external audiences. As a managerial tool, they inform a diverse set of management decisions. By pinpointing variations in

³⁷ Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2016. OECD DAC Peer Review of the Netherlands: Memorandum by the Netherlands. The Hague.

³⁸ Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2016. Ambition Statement for Results-Based Management and Transparent Aid. The Hague.

³⁹ OECD. 2017. Results in Development Cooperation. *Provider Case Studies: Netherlands*. Paris.

⁴⁰ OECD. 2017. Results in Development Cooperation. *Provider Case Studies: Netherlands*. Paris.

⁴¹ Rohm, Howard. No date. A Balancing Act. *Perform 2(2)*.

performance, the corporate scorecard helps to guide the organization towards achieving the goals set out in its institutional strategy.⁴²

78. **Scorecards vary.** At one extreme, a scorecard reflects a performance measurement framework for grouping existing measures into categories and displaying the measures graphically. The measures are usually operational, not strategic, and are used mainly to track operations and service delivery (input, output, and process measures). At the other extreme, a scorecard is a robust organization-wide strategic planning, management, and communications system. As a strategy-based system, it aligns the work with organization vision and strategy and communicates strategic intent throughout the organization and to external stakeholders. The focus is on achievements based on good strategy executed well. In today's setting, organizations need to do well strategically and operationally to survive and to meet future challenges. A scorecard offers a tool that helps to balance strategy and operations.⁴³

79. For the WBG, for example, the corporate scorecards have served as the apex of the institution's accountability framework. These have highlighted important global development strides in reducing extreme poverty but have also identified the need to close the prosperity gap, particularly for people living in areas affected by fragility, conflict, and violence. Snapshots of 2017 results indicated that overall, WBG is on track in most areas, but off track in some areas.⁴⁴

80. The 2017 scorecard of ADB indicated that despite significant progress, poverty and risks of renewed poverty remain. Overall, it showed that performance was good in terms of achieving results in Strategy 2020's core operational areas, the quality of country strategies, operations completed satisfactorily, and promotion of the drivers of change. Similarly, performance was rated good in maintaining sufficient staff resources and increasing staff motivation and diversity as well in maintaining budget efficiency and adequacy. However, performance was rated poor in mobilizing development finance. Performance was rated mixed in country assistance programs completed successfully and in improving business process efficiency and client orientation. Given these, ADB has identified actions to address challenges, which are discussed in the annual Development Effectiveness Review.⁴⁵

E. Challenges and Insights Drawn from Past Experiences

81. **Results frameworks and/or scorecards need to be strategy-driven, not indicator-driven.** The structure of the framework must ensure that the strategic objectives are prominent, with indicators serving as a supporting tool for achieving development objectives. Strengthening alignment with indicators for various levels boosts the coherence of the results framework and/or scorecard.⁴⁶

82. **Arbitrary target setting must be avoided.** A review of the results framework of ADB in 2016 found that targets were set for indicators that monitor country development progress (Tier 1), which led to arbitrary target setting. The weighing of indicators was problematic because each country had its own development priorities.⁴⁷ Given the realization that monitoring country results offers more flexibility and avoids the problem of target setting, the scorecard now shows whether performance has improved, stayed constant, or regressed in relation to the transitional results framework 2017–2020.⁴⁸ The review,

⁴² Inter-American Development Bank. 2015. *Corporate Results Framework 2016–2019*. Revised Version. Washington, DC.

⁴³ H. Rohm. 2008. *Using the Scorecard to Align your Organization*. Balanced Scorecard Institute. <http://balancedscorecard.org>

⁴⁴ On track in terms of satisfactory outcomes of World Bank operations, stakeholder feedback on knowledge, client feedback on World Bank effectiveness and impact on results, stock of country strategies underpinned by a systematic country diagnostic, disbursement ratio, and talent management, among others. Off track in relation to the satisfactory outcomes of IFC operations, satisfactory WBG performance for country strategies, preparation time from concept note to first disbursement, and operations design drawing lessons from evaluative approaches. World Bank Group. 2017. *Corporate Scorecards (October)*. Washington, DC.

⁴⁵ ADB. 2017. *Development Effectiveness Review*. Manila.

⁴⁶ Rohm, Howard. 2008. *Using the Scorecard to Align your Organization*. Balanced Scorecard Institute. <http://balancedscorecard.org>

⁴⁷ ADB. 2016. *Review of the Results Framework*. Manila.

⁴⁸ ADB. 2017. *The Asian Development Bank's Transitional Results Framework 2017–2020*. Manila.

moreover, highlighted the value of using a contribution approach in monitoring intermediate or long-term outcomes, given that development outcomes are a result of combined resources, actions, policies, and measures of developing countries and the private sector.

83. MDB results frameworks aggregate data from across countries to describe progress at a strategic level. As continued emphasis is placed on the use of partner countries' results frameworks, MDBs need to balance the need for a comprehensive corporate view of results with the need to reflect individual country or regional performance. This demand-driven context adds to the challenge of setting specific targets at the corporate level that could also be relevant to partner countries.

84. **In aligning the results measurement system with the SDGs, the organization must focus on the critical areas of the SDGs in which it has substantial engagements or comparative advantage.** IDA's comparative advantage, for example, is rooted in a country-based business model that leverages additional resources and benefits from the WBG global reach, multisectoral engagement and knowledge, and strong client relationships based on its field presence.⁴⁹ The WBG noted that SDGs are crosscutting, making one-on-one mapping challenging. One map can illustrate support to more than one goal, but a clear-cut determination of the weights of the support is difficult.⁵⁰

85. One common challenge among MDBs springs from the dual accountability and management nature of the results frameworks. MDBs must balance the political and technical elements of the frameworks. They need to present information in an aggregated format, while still including sufficient detail for internal analysis. Often, this second function requires that results frameworks align with other internal performance metrics to serve as management tools. The tension between the accountability and management functions is also found in the challenge of having enough indicators to monitor performance at all levels, while remaining within a manageable number.⁵¹

86. **Additional narrative reporting needs to supplement the scorecard.** This will help to ensure a complete statement of work program and achievements, encourage a continuing emphasis on improving the quality and use of evidence, and complement efforts to increase the use of the results framework as a management tool for achieving development results.⁵²

87. **Leadership signals about the value of self-evaluation can be strengthened by making better institutional use of the knowledge generated.** The value of self-evaluations is boosted by using self-evaluations strategically to bridge knowledge gaps, developing frameworks for capturing and acting on evaluative lessons, tracking projects with high-quality results frameworks, and testing approaches to uphold accountability and learning needs.⁵³

88. **The development of a performance culture is not easy.** Effort is required to create the internal preconditions for results management through targeted organizational and human resource development. Capacity development, however, is not enough. Firm leadership and political will are also vital if these capacities are to be developed and used. The role of leadership is pivotal in setting the course, clarifying the core organizational functions and objectives, and providing the model for the behavior and attitude that are required to support a results orientation.⁵⁴ MDBs are under pressure to establish consistent sets of internal procedures and incentives that reward their staff for achieving sustainable return on investments, and not simply for accounting for the use of donor resources.

⁴⁹ IDA. 2016. *The Way Forward for IDA18: The IDA18 Results Measurement System*. Washington, DC.

⁵⁰ World Bank Group. 2017. *Corporate Scorecards*. Washington, DC.

⁵¹ Multilateral Development Banks. 2012. *Common Performance Assessment System (COMPAS) Report*.

⁵² International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2017. *Report on the IFAD11 Results Management Framework*. Rome.

⁵³ Independent Evaluation Group (IEG). 2016. *Learning from IDA Experience: Lessons from IEG Evaluations*. World Bank: Washington, DC.

⁵⁴ Multilateral Development Banks. 2011. *Common Performance Assessment System (COMPAS) Report*.

89. **Misaligned incentives for using self-evaluation systems are often due to an excessive focus on ratings, attention to volume that overshadows attention to results, and low perceived value of the knowledge created.** Making the system more compatible with innovation and experimentation is essential.⁵⁵ Moreover, establishing an effective incentive system calls for alignment with strategic corporate priorities. In line with this, rationalizing key performance indicators is necessary to align them with corporate priorities and to boost the organization's capacity to design and execute its budget.⁵⁶

90. **Data quality is a crucial component of any meaningful effort at managing for results and is essential for decision making and accountability.** Several years of experience with collecting and reporting on indicators show that some indicators are easier to measure than others, and data are more reliable for some indicators than for others. This may lead to goal displacement, and the organization moving away from more challenging but more rewarding goals. For development results in MDB-assisted countries, data quality is variable due to several reasons: subjectivity in assessing changes, difficulty in aggregating indicators and verifying data to obtain a final value, and labor-intensive process of data collection and analysis.⁵⁷ The IDBG noted that when issues related to development effectiveness arise during project implementation, the ratings/scores are often downgraded. However, they do not always lead to remedial actions unless concern about the creditworthiness of the finance exists. The rating needs to be complemented by a concise analysis of results to heighten the project team's awareness of developmental issues.

91. A good balance is necessary between quantitative and qualitative criteria. Clearly defined rating and scoring criteria, particularly those based on predetermined quantitative measures, speed up the scoring. Unique project features can be scored better using qualitative criteria. The more dimensions are included in scoring tools, the smaller the distribution of the scores. This results in a narrower range and less analytical power. Care must be taken in the design of the rating criteria and weights to ensure that final scores are distinct across projects. Project teams and validators must not hesitate to report scores at the extreme ends of the scale, when warranted, and not dilute scoring by grading projects in the middle range.

92. Tension is sometimes inevitable between the project teams and score validators. This becomes acute if scores are incorporated into the performance evaluation of project teams. Ensuring a mutual understanding that scoring should be considered in broad ranges is essential and that there are more aspects to *ex ante* development assessments than mere scoring.

93. **A major issue in results frameworks is flexibility and procedures for accommodating quick adjustment in case of special and unforeseeable circumstances.** Rigidity occurs when the specified performance measurement categories form the sole basis of defining key performance, leaving no room for cross-perspectives that have a combined effect on strategy execution. There is also the danger of neglecting indicators that do not fall into any of the specified categories, creating a situation where development managers only take interest in what they want to measure and are oblivious of emerging developments in the external environment.⁵⁸ Results frameworks should also be allowed to evolve, as experience with target setting and monitoring progress increases. They should not become straitjackets.

F. Guiding Principles Used in Recent MDB Results Frameworks and/or Scorecards

94. For the corporate results framework and/or scorecard to remain relevant, it must be regularly aligned strategically with new developments. Thus, for ADB, the principle of relevance is a key guiding

⁵⁵ IDA. 2016. *The Way Forward for IDA18: The IDA18 Results Measurement System*. Washington, DC.

⁵⁶ African Development Bank Group (AfDB). 2017. *The Bank Group Results Measurement Framework 2016–2025*. Côte d'Ivoire.

⁵⁷ IDA. 2016. *The Way Forward for IDA18: The IDA18 Results Measurement System*. Washington, DC.

⁵⁸ Awadallah, Ehmadi and Amir Allam. 2015. A Critique of the Balanced Scorecard as a Performance Measurement Tool. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 6(7).

principle for its transitional results framework and/or scorecard (2017–2020), along with efficiency and effectiveness.⁵⁹ Similarly, the IDA results measurement system (2018–2020) places a premium on aligning its results framework with the SDGs and on maintaining continuity while addressing emerging issues. It also supports ensuring data quality, balancing monitoring needs with efficiency and selectivity, and harmonizing the results framework with the WBG scorecard.⁶⁰

95. Five principles guided the structure and content of IFAD’s latest results framework (2019–2021): (i) results management, not just results measurement; (ii) reflection of IFAD’s latest strategic priorities, replenishment targets, and theory of change; (iii) consistency with the Strategic Framework (2016–2025); (iv) simplified three-tier structure; and (v) conciseness and quality.⁶¹ For the AfDB Group, supporting the new results framework (2016–2025) with departmental incentives is essential, including updated performance indicators that are aligned with corporate priorities.⁶²

1. Non-Multilateral Development Banks

96. **Non-MDBs have also adopted corporate results frameworks.** Among these are the United Nations Development Programme or UNDP (2000); Japan Bank for International Cooperation (2002); Swedish International Development Agency (2007); Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom (2011); Japan International Cooperation Agency (2012); Canada’s Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development or DFATD (2013), now called Global Affairs Canada; Danish International Development Agency (2013); and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia (2014).

97. **Non-MDBs use results frameworks to focus on strategies, improve operations, and comply with public accountability requirements.** UNDP’s results framework/scorecard, for example, is in line with promoting a strategy-focused and knowledge-driven organization.⁶³ It is articulated around six perspectives—partnerships, policy, people, performance, resources, and client perception. The Japan Bank for International Cooperation’s performance measurement system is a response to the reorganization and rationalization plan for special public corporations, which required a system for feeding back results into operations.⁶⁴ At the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), self-evaluations are carried out to improve operational management. At the end of the medium-term cycle (5 years), the Ministers in charge review JICA’s operations and organization, examine the continuation of each operation and the retention of the organization itself, and take necessary measures to reflect these decisions in the next medium-term plan based on the results.⁶⁵

98. DFID’s four-tier results framework is meant to monitor and manage the progress of development results and to publicly report on results delivery. The DFID results framework draws heavily on the frameworks of ADB, AfDB, and IDA,⁶⁶ reflecting progress on key development outcomes, results (outputs and intermediate outcomes), operational performance, and organizational performance.

99. **Non-MDBs and MDBs face similar technical and organizational challenges to the use of results frameworks.** Dealing with political dynamics, however, tends to be relatively pronounced for some bilateral organizations that need to respond to the increased pressure from domestic political

⁵⁹ ADB. 2017. *The Asian Development Bank’s Transitional Results Framework 2017–2020*. Manila.

⁶⁰ IDA. 2016. *The Way Forward for IDA18: The IDA18 Results Measurement System*. Washington, DC.

⁶¹ IFAD. 2017. *Report on the IFAD11 Results Management Framework*. Rome.

⁶² AfDB. 2017. *The Bank Group Results Measurement Framework 2016–2025*. Côte d’Ivoire.

⁶³ UNDP. 2003. UNDP Balanced Scorecard. Building a Strategy-Focused Organization. Presented at the Worldwide User Group Meeting in Orlando, Florida on 6 November 2003.

⁶⁴ JBIC. No date. Performance Measurement for Strategic Management. In *Operational and Administrative Policies*. Tokyo.

⁶⁵ JICA. 2017. *Annual Report*. Tokyo.

constituencies for accountability, both for the use of public funds and for development outcomes. The challenges to measuring and managing results are summarized in the subsequent Box.

Box: Challenges to Measuring and Managing Results

Technical

- Keeping results frameworks simple while maintaining their usefulness as a management tool
- Selecting appropriate indicators that measure results at the correct level
- Aggregating data
- Linking budgets to results information
- Tracking outcomes
- Strengthening staff capacity
- Partners limited view of the results framework as a requirement or imposition, not as a result management tool
- Lack of demand for results information and management from the partner country
- Difficulty in linking information on results tracking to decision making
- Inadequate context analysis of the political, economic, institutional, environmental, and socio-cultural situation

Organizational

- Fostering a results-focused culture and a clear leadership
- Setting realistic expectations
- Investing in data quality and evidence
- Providing incentives to using results information to change strategies and policies
- Capacity support for partner organizations and for statistical bodies in partner countries

Cultural

- Addressing, potentially, changing development priorities at national level
- Clarity and transparency in communicating results
- Reporting poor performance to the domestic legislature and the wider public

Source: A. Evans. 2014. *Implementing the Results Agenda: A Quick Review of Key Trends and Challenges*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies; J. Mayne. 2007. *Challenges and Lessons in Implementing Results-Based Management Evaluation* 13 (1). pp. 87–109; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2013. *Managing and Measuring for Results: Survey Highlights*. Paris.

100. **Striking balance on simplicity.** Keeping results frameworks simple is not easy due to the need to strike a balance among results measurements for the needs of domestic stakeholders, needs of partner countries, and management needs. Often, results frameworks are filled with indicators that are too complex to use or too excessive.⁶⁷ A strategic approach to indicator selection is necessary to deal with this problem.

101. **Issues with low quality data.** The necessary data to populate results frameworks are not always reliable or available. Low quality data at the inception phase can weaken performance measurement since the baseline performance level is not known. Consequently, some organizations have established results measurement systems for their own needs, contributing to many co-existing results frameworks. To facilitate data collection, strengthening partner systems, using standard indicators, and adopting an incremental approach to improve frameworks over time are crucial.⁶⁸

102. The emphasis on aggregating results has led to priority on results that can be measured and delivered within short programming cycles, often at the expense of long-term and sustainable impact.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2013. *Managing and Measuring for Results: Survey Highlights*. Paris.

⁶⁸ Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2014. *Measuring and Managing Results in Development Co-operation*. Paris.

⁶⁹ Independent Commission for Aid Impact. 2015. *DFID's Approach to Delivering Impact*. London.

Moreover, coming up with standard measures of development results that work across different contexts and programs can be problematic, particularly for value for money assessment methods. Even moving from the quantity of education (enrolment figures) to its quality (learning outcomes) poses measurement challenges. Supplementing the results framework by other approaches is vital, such as accounts of policy and institutional changes, and contextualizing results in terms of country development challenges.

103. The pursuit of development results is subject to political winds, as in the case of DFID, which is a British entity spending British funds. Adapting to changes in political leadership and shifting ministerial priorities within the limits of DFID's mandate and resources has been a balancing act. In recent times, DFID's response to ministerial priorities has been in relation to results, evidence, and value for money. These elements matter, but experience shows that a more nuanced conversation is needed about what this looks like in countries where change is complex, politically challenging, and uncertain.⁷⁰ A clear articulation of strategy and impact based on an understanding of the various challenges around the world is essential.

104. **Communicating poor performance to parliament and the wider public in times of austerity can be daunting.** The public may be less supportive of maintaining current levels of aid because of the economic crisis and a degree of pessimism about the effectiveness of aid.⁷¹ However, where the public has an appetite for understanding development and for stories of how change happens (what works/does not work, why, how and why aid alone cannot achieve development targets), it is important to balance simple messages on results with narratives. Communicating explanations could be more effective than presenting figures alone.⁷² Reporting about the risk taken in fragile contexts or in humanitarian situations also helps to heighten the public willingness to accept less than perfect projects.

105. **The global dialogue on SDGs is likely to stretch the results agenda further, driving development organizations to track progress toward goals and be accountable for their commitments.** Improving and fine-tuning results frameworks and/or scorecards will be a continuing effort. The experiences of MDBs and non-MDBs in surmounting hurdles to measuring and managing results are valuable in boosting future operational and organizational performance and in achieving desired development results. Such experiences will be discussed further in the theme chapter of AER 2019. Results have a potential to transform the design, delivery, and evaluation of development programs; improve the value for money of development assistance; and promote accountability to those who fund and invest in development programs. Sharing the story of results, nonetheless, calls for better evidence and better delivery of key messages to stakeholders and clients, in which self-evaluation and independent evaluation play pivotal roles.

G. Summary

106. The establishment of corporate results frameworks and/or scorecards is part of the self-evaluation systems of MDBs and bilateral organizations for improving their performance. All development organizations under review have multi-tiered results frameworks to track performance and are structured to link organizational effectiveness indicators to key results indicators.

107. Corporate results frameworks and/or scorecards help to align an organization behind a shared vision and get people to focus on results. They enable development managers to transform strategy into tangible performance measures and to coordinate a range of management processes such as goal setting, resource allocation, performance assessment, and learning. Corporate results frameworks and scorecards serve accountability and managerial purposes. Where corporate results frameworks are

⁷⁰ Overseas Development Institute. 2017. *The Politics of the Results Agenda in DFID: 1997–2017*. London.

⁷¹ Glennie, A., W. Straw, and L. Wild. 2012. *Understanding Public Attitudes to Aid and Development*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research and Overseas Development.

⁷² Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2014. *Measuring and Managing Results in Development Co-operation*. Paris.

reviewed and updated over time, flexibility gets a boost. Updates keep the results framework relevant and identify areas where fine tuning is required. Building in flexibility into the framework facilitates alignment with evolving development agendas.

108. Results frameworks and/or scorecards, however, are imperfect tools in performance measurement and management. They tend to capture quantitative indicators that do not portray the entire picture. A more nuanced discussion is also needed where change is complex, politically challenging, and uncertain. Some organizations have dealt with this issue by supplementing quantitative indicators with narratives and videos. In certain cases, the attention of results frameworks and scorecards to aggregating results had led to a priority on results that can be measured and delivered within short programming cycles, often at the expense of long-term impact. In addition, coming up with standard measures of results that work across different contexts and programs can be problematic, particularly for VfM.

109. An additional critique of the results framework and scorecard is that it may not always account for unintended consequences. The logical framework approach used in results frameworks tends to downgrade the achievement of higher objectives by unforeseen routes and externalities. Care is needed when program-context interactions are complex and when the efficacy of intended means is not well understood in advance.

110. Building a culture of results calls for change management, flexibility, and robust data systems as well as for a heightened importance of self-evaluation within the organization. Appropriate incentives, both financial and non-financial, are required at the corporate, team, and individual levels. The systems need to generate value to end-users of information and to reward teams for good M&E, problem identification, and problem resolution. Expanding voluntary evaluations that respond to learning needs such as impact and process evaluations, retrospectives, and beneficiary surveys are necessary. Moreover, information technology systems must make findings from self-evaluations accessible.

111. The current development context, which is shaped by SDGs, new corporate strategies, and budget constraints, will exert pressure on development organizations to demonstrate both results and value for money. Measurement will remain integral to the results agenda. Delivering results that matter most will continue to be crucial.