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Overview

1. Conflict Dynamics’ approach to Outcome Mapping
2. Examples from South Sudan, Sudan, and Somalia
3. Lessons learned for using Outcome Mapping techniques for peacebuilding and governance work in conflict-affected contexts
1. Conflict Dynamics’ approach to Outcome Mapping
Outcome Mapping review

- **Sphere of Control**: Intervention
- **Sphere of Influence**: People the intervention works with
- **Sphere of Interest**: People who benefit from the intervention
How Conflict Dynamics uses Outcome Mapping

THREE STAGES OF OUTCOME MAPPING

INTENTIONAL DESIGN

STEP 3: Boundary Partners
STEP 5: Progress Markers

OUTCOME & PERFORMANCE MONITORING

STEP 9: Outcome Journals

EVALUATION PLANNING
The terminology

**BOUNDARY PARTNERS** = Constituencies with whom the program interacts directly to effect change

**OUTCOMES** = Changes in the behavior, relationships, activities, and/or actions of a boundary partner
PROGRESS MARKERS = Changes we hope to observe in boundary partners’ behavior/attitude/knowledge

- **EXPECT**
  - Minimally successful
  - E.g. They read our options papers

- **LIKE**
  - Quite successful
  - E.g. They use the concepts and approaches

- **LOVE**
  - Exceeds expectations
  - E.g. They write and pass a law that accommodates diverse interests
The terminology

**OUTCOME JOURNAL** = Record of observations

- Baseline
- Observations at regular intervals (3-6 mo.)
- Observations through interviews or group assessment
The terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Marker</th>
<th>Baseline (November 2013)</th>
<th>Mid-project (January 2014)</th>
<th>Project end (April 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress (0, 1, 2)</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Progress (0, 1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expect to see:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Ministers attend one or more workshops or dialogue events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In June 2012, state ministers of gender and cabinet affairs attended a consultation workshop in early stages of project design. No further workshops held at baseline date. EVIDENCE: Attendance records from “Consultation Workshop: Building the House of Governance in Jonglei State” (June 2012).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Ministers make themselves available for bilateral consultations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>During project design and planning stage, in June 2012, October 2012 and October 2013, the former governor, former deputy governor and several state ministers met with Conflict Dynamics project team to discuss political accommodation. EVIDENCE: Meeting records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Conflict Dynamics uses Outcome Mapping

• Integrated with Logical Framework
• Some progress markers double as indicators
• Monitoring tool
• Feed into evaluation
2. Examples from South Sudan, Sudan, and Somalia
South Sudan
Jonglei State – Counties and ethnic groups

Ethnic boundaries on this map are not an exact representation of the situation in the state.

Building the “House of Governance” in Jonglei

**Aim:** Support South Sudanese in Jonglei state to inject fresh policy ideas, representative of people’s diverse interests, into governance and political dialogue processes
Building the “House of Governance” in Jonglei

• Jointly with John Garang Memorial University (JGMU)
• October 2013 – April 2014
• Engaged county and state leaders
  • Including traditional leaders and civil society
• Training for JGMU and local research team
• Workshops and consultations at state level
• Dialogues for each county
Adaptions due to crisis

• December 2013: Civil war started
• Focus on safety of partners and project team
• Modify project design
• Change monitoring plan
  • How sampling conducted
  • When data gathered
Progress markers: Research team

Expect to see

1.1 Understands political accommodation (PA) concepts
1.2 Can describe how and why PA links to peacebuilding

Like to see

2.1 Demonstrates competence in application of at least three steps of methodology
2.2 Members use the language of PA independent of the project

Love to see

3.1 Applies at least one step of the methodology independently, without project facilitator or CDI guidance (individually, or as a team)
3.2 Members produce own analysis, research or policy papers on PA, or using one or more steps of the methodology
Progress markers: JGMU Faculty

Expect to see

1.1 Understands political accommodation (PA) concepts
1.2 Understands how and why PA links to peacebuilding

Like to see

2.1 Uses language of PA in teaching, a speech, or piece of writing
2.2 Shares some of the tools of PA with students

Love to see

3.1 Produces research papers that use language of PA, or one or more steps of the methodology
3.2 Incorporates PA concepts and/or methodology as part of their regular teaching curriculum
Achievement by progress marker level

Research Team

- **Expect to see**
- **Like to see**
- **Love to see**

JGMU Faculty

- **Expect to see**
- **Like to see**
- **Love to see**

**Green** = full achievement; **amber** = partial achievement; **red** = not observed
Capturing unexpected changes

- Advocacy for affirmative action at JGMU
- Use of PA approach beyond the Boundary Partner
- Faculty engagement with public officials
- Use of concepts in seed distribution
Aim: By 2017, combinations of target constituencies reach sufficient consensus on POLITICAL DIALOGUE PROCESSES that can accommodate their interests. ... and a critical mass of target constituencies can, having built internal consensus, effectively engage in dialogue on GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS through these processes.
Political Accommodation in the Republic of Sudan

• January 2015 – December 2017
• National level in Sudan
• Engaged ruling party leaders, opposition political parties, armed movements, civil society, women’s and youth groups
• Focused on developing options for and reaching consensus on governance arrangements and political dialogue processes, and on increasing political will to allow and/or participate in political dialogue
Sudan: Boundary partners

- Government of Sudan/NCP
- SPLM-N and alliances
- Civil Society Initiative
- Women’s Task Force
- Teeba Press/Journalists
Political Accommodation in Somalia and Somaliland

**Aim:** By December 2017, political actors have begun to implement agreed governance arrangements that enhance political accommodation within Somalia, and between Somalia and Somaliland.
Political Accommodation in Somalia and Somaliland

- June 2015 – December 2017
- Federal and state level in Somalia and Somaliland
- Engaged federal ministers, cabinet members, legislators, and state governments
- Focused on supporting inclusive legislation and policies, building relationships between the federal and state governments around division of powers, and encouraging substantive agreements between Somalia and Somaliland
Somalia: Boundary partners

• Office of the Prime Minister
• Office of the President
• Office of the Speaker
• Ministry of Interior and Federal Affairs
• Ministry of Constitutional Affairs
• Interim Jubaland Administration
• Galmudug State
• Interim South West State
3. Lessons learned for using Outcome Mapping for peacebuilding/governance in conflict contexts
Comparing OM across programs: Lessons learned

- Most success with specific, focused project (8 mo.) instead of longer-term (3-5 yrs.) programs with broader scope
- Choose boundary partners wisely:
  - Need fairly unified group
  - Sustained interaction > periodic
- If boundary partners are disparate, hard to use same set of progress markers
- Collection method matters: Most useful when it provides an opportunity to have an in-depth, directed conversation
- Access for in-depth interviews can be a challenge
- “Expect/like/love” language can be confusing
Advantages of Outcome Mapping

✓ Tracks how people’s behavior changes over the course of a process
✓ Flexible, drawing together different data collection techniques, working with whatever is feasible in the circumstances
✓ Can capture unintended changes
✓ Structures team discussions at strategic moments
✓ Opportunity for structured feedback from beneficiaries
✓ Can answer some questions an evaluation would
Disadvantages of Outcome Mapping

- Not enough on its own
- Effect beyond boundary partners unclear
- Difficult to compare observations across large numbers of boundary partners
- Difficult without regular, sustained interactions
- Requires staff familiarity with method and ability to integrate into programming
Questions

• How have you used OM in peacebuilding/governance programs?
• How often do you adjust the boundary partners and progress markers as the context/focus of work changes?
• What data collection methods have you found work best to monitor progress? (And to access boundary partners?)