

# Some reflections on adopting a results framework

## 1. Is the data to report on the results available?

- Be careful of asking for ‘aspirational’ data sets – those that may not yet exist or be easily attainable
- AusAID tries to use data that our partners choose to report
  - Of course we also seek additional data at times and we support the collection of that but keep to a minimum

## 2. Importance of linking the Results Framework to a specific and sufficiently motivating reporting entity

- In AusAID’s case a report to Cabinet and Australian public
- In Cambodia the CDF and GDCC – the NSDP and the JMIs?

3. Importance of recognising other partnership dialogue processes alongside a RF to build evidence, consensus, partnership, effectiveness

- Joint evaluations, research, surveys, partnership dialogue
- Jointly developed annual milestones/progress markers towards achieving the results
- TWGs and Partnership talks a good mechanism for this

4. A comprehensive RF or an iterative approach?

- Concept of 'leading' sectors – not necessarily 'advanced' sectors
- What are the incentives, what are the catalysts?

5. Difficulty in consistently sourcing data to report on cross cutting issues such as gender and disability

- Unless it is made an explicit focus within the results framework

6. The proposed partnering & dialogue mechanisms

- Role of the GDCC
  - How will it perform better than what it does now?
  - What is the link to the TWGs?
  - Is this the place for cross sectoral reporting?

## 7. TWGs

- Support the navel gazing the CDC suggests
- Alignment with NSDP priorities makes sense
- Focus on achievable targets/milestones within a measurable timeframe and within the context of the NSDP and results framework
- BUT need to acknowledge and incorporate the more sensitive issues on which it's important to maintain a dialogue