American University Kyiv

STRATEGIC APPLICATION OF RESULT-BASED MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING FOR THE EFFECTIVE RECONSTRUCTION OF UKRAINE

СТРАТЕГІЧНЕ ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ УПРАВЛІННЯ, ОРІЄНТОВАНОГО НА РЕЗУЛЬТАТ ТА МОНІТОРИНГУ, ОЦІНЮВАННЯ ТА НАВЧАННЯ ДЛЯ ЕФЕКТИВНОГО ВІДНОВЛЕННЯ УКРАЇНИ

by Vitaliy Kuchynsky

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Master Degree 2024

APPROVED BY:

Artem Kliuchnikov, Ph.D., Faculty Mentor

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the application of Results-Based Management (RBM) and Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) approaches in the reconstruction process in Ukraine, analyzing the current challenges and proposing specific recommendations. The analysis is based on the results of semi-structured interviews with key experts in development, public administration, and international aid. The study highlights key issues, such as the superficial application of RBM/MEL, lack of human capital, the dynamic context of war, the gap between international practices and Ukrainian realities, and insufficient coordination between stakeholders. The results emphasize the importance of strategic planning, transparency, innovative technologies, and involvement of local communities for the effective use of RBM/MEL in reconstruction processes. The study offers practical recommendations for the Government of Ukraine and international partners aimed at strengthening human resources, increasing transparency, and ensuring the integration of RBM/MEL into project planning and implementation processes. This study fills an important gap in the literature, offering valuable practical knowledge for implementing RBM/MEL in post-war reconstruction in Ukraine.

Keywords: Results-Based Management, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning, reconstruction, donor assistance Ukraine, transparency, coordination, innovation.

Contents

INTRODUCTION

Ukraine today faces huge challenges in recovering from the large-scale destruction caused by the war. According to the joint Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment (RDNA3) released by the Government of Ukraine, the World Bank Group, the European Commission, and the United Nations currently estimate that as of 31 December 2023, the total cost of reconstruction and recovery in Ukraine, is **$486 billion**.

The restoration of the infrastructure, economy, and social sphere will require large-scale international support, particularly financial assistance from Western donors such as the European Union, the United States, the World Bank, the IMF, and other international financial institutions.

Successful management of these resources is critical to ensuring transparency and efficiency. **Results-Based Management (RBM) and Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL)** are the main tools to achieve such goals. RBM is about setting clear goals and measuring results on the go to inform management decisions to ensure efficient resource use. MEL, in turn, provides an opportunity to conduct an in-depth assessment of progress at specific time intervals in achieving these goals and make timely adjustments to strategies to improve project effectiveness. Please see the RBM/MEL glossary in the annexes.

Ukraine already has examples of successful application of RBM/MEL in government programs, particularly in decentralization reform and medical reform, where clear indicators and regular monitoring have become key to achieving positive results. However, in the context of the country's reconstruction after the war, these tools become especially important since the volume of international aid and the expectations from donors need to ensure maximum transparency and accountability.

International donors, such as the European Union, the World Bank, the USA, and other governments, expect Ukraine to apply international best practices in the recovery process, including the use of RBM and MEL to monitor the use of funds and evaluate the effectiveness of projects. Such practices will help to avoid corruption, ensure optimal use of resources, and achieve long-term results that will meet the interests of both Ukrainian society and international partners.

This study aims to analyze how RBM and MEL tools can be strategically used to manage recovery processes in Ukraine based on lessons learned from past examples of post-conflict reconstruction in different countries worldwide.

Context of RBM/MEL implementation in Ukraine

Ukraine started to actively use RBM/MEL methodology in the post-independence period, when the country began to cooperate with international organizations and donors such as the World Bank, the United Nations, and the European Union. Though the governmental agencies mostly resisted adopting the RBM approach, first attempts were made at improving the management of state development programs. Having little cash on hand and looking for international experience, the country aimed to increase the efficiency of resource management to ensure transparency of processes and accountability for the use of international aid.

In the early 1990s, with the period of reforms and the transition to a market economy, international partners, in particular the World Bank and the United Nations, began to implement international practices in Ukraine, including effective management and evaluation. By 2000s, the intensification of reforms in the public sector was accompanied by the adoption of policies aimed at increasing the efficiency of the use of public resources. This included the use of RBM in international aid programs and development projects. After the 2014 Revolution of Dignity, Ukraine significantly increased its efforts to reform public administration. At this time, RBM became a key management tool in government programs, especially those supported by international donors like UNDP and World Bank (UNDP 2024), (WB 2023). With the onset of full-scale war in 2022, RBM/MEL becomes even more relevant for managing recovery processes and using international aid, where transparency and accountability are critical for effective country recovery.

Coming from a highly centralized society, the life of the Ukrainian public administration is strictly based on the laws and regulatory acts approved by the Ukrainian parliament or other public agencies. Key legislative documents are expected to play an important role in implementing the RBM/MEL methodology. However, the Draft Law of Ukraine "On State Strategic Planning," which was expected to establish the principles of strategic planning at the national level, aimed at effective management to achieve state goals, has not been signed a law despite many requests of the Ukrainian key decision makers. The Law of Ukraine "On the State Budget" introduces some RBM principles into the budget process, focusing on medium-term planning and assessing the effectiveness of the use of budget funds. In addition, regulatory acts regulating the involvement of international technical assistance provided for the use of MEL as a tool for assessing project performance.

However, despite some legal basis, the actual implementation of RBM/MEL in public administration is often fragmentary or formal. One of the striking examples is the preparation of strategic documents that often remain declarative without practical implementation. At the same time, civil society organizations cooperating with international donors demonstrate the active use of RBM. Partners such as the EU, USAID, or the World Bank are introducing clear requirements for the use of RBM/MEL in projects aimed at reforming the healthcare system, energy, etc.

Ukraine already has successful experience in applying RBM in various areas. Thus, the **decentralization reform** that started in 2014 became an example of the effective use of this approach. Its goal was to transfer financial and administrative resources from central to local authorities, which contributed to improving the quality-of-service provision, development of local infrastructure, and the economy. The use of clear performance indicators, such as the growth of local budgets or the number of infrastructure projects, made it possible to ensure transparent monitoring of the reform.

Similarly, **the healthcare reform** launched in 2017 aimed to create a transparent healthcare financing system based on the principle of “money follows the patient”. To achieve the goals of the reform, clear indicators were developed, such as the number of registered patients, the increase of doctors' salaries, and the quality of the provision of medical services. The implemented system of the National Health Service of Ukraine (NHSHU) made it possible to evaluate and monitor the achievement of goals based on clear indicators. This has led to

increased access to healthcare services, increased doctors' salaries and ensured financial transparency.

Another example is the **Energy Efficiency program**, which aims to reduce energy consumption and gas dependence. Defined clear goals for reducing energy consumption based on established indicators (for example, the number of households that have implemented energy-efficient technologies, reducing gas consumption, increasing energy savings). Thousands of energy efficiency projects have been implemented with the support of international partners, reducing energy costs and promoting sustainable development.

In the post-conflict period, RBM/MEL should become an integral part of the recovery and reconstruction process planning, implementation, and monitoring. This methodology will ensure transparency in the use of funds, involve stakeholders, and increase trust in the country's recovery process. The following chapters will assess the integration of RBM/MEL in the current reconstruction attempts based on the interviews with key stakeholders and will provide recommendations for the future.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The publications selected for this review cover the foundational principles of RBM and MEL, handbooks that offer step-by-step guidance, and sector-specific guidelines that emphasize the role of these systems in improving the effectiveness and sustainability of recovery work. Additionally, the importance of adaptive management and the use of RBM/MEL in conflict-affected settings are explored, providing a comprehensive overview of how these frameworks can be applied in Ukraine's complex post-conflict environment.

Foundational Principles of RBM and MEL

Drucker (1954) introduced the concept **of Management by Objectives (MBO),** emphasizing goal-setting and accountability as critical elements of results-oriented management. His framework advocates aligning individual and organizational goals to enhance productivity and efficiency, making measurable outcomes the focal point of success. These principles serve as a cornerstone for modern Results-Based Management (RBM) systems, particularly relevant in the context of Ukraine's post-war reconstruction. Drucker's emphasis on structured, goal-oriented approaches underscores the importance of setting clear objectives to ensure transparent management and successful rebuilding outcomes.

The **OECD DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance** (1991) laid the groundwork for systematic evaluations of development interventions, introducing five key criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. These criteria have become foundational in RBM and Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) systems worldwide. In Ukraine, applying these principles ensures that reconstruction projects meet the needs of stakeholders, deliver long-term impacts, and remain accountable to both domestic and international contributors.

Global Standards and Practical Implementation of RBM/MEL

The **United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG, 2005)** established global norms and standards for evaluation, focusing on transparency, impartiality, and utility. These standards promote consistency and objectivity in evaluations, critical for Ukraine's reconstruction to maintain trust among stakeholders. By adhering to these norms, Ukraine can ensure that its evaluation processes align with international best practices, fostering credibility and accountability in rebuilding efforts.

Kusek and Rist (2004) provided a **step-by-step guide for implementing RBM/M&E systems,** emphasizing clear objectives, reliable data collection, and adaptive management. Their work highlights the importance of feedback loops in making real-time adjustments, which is essential for managing dynamic reconstruction efforts. Ukraine can benefit from this approach by ensuring that projects are continuously monitored and adapted to evolving needs, enhancing decision-making and overall recovery effectiveness.

Importance of RBM/MEL in Conflict-Affected Settings

Patton (2011) introduced **Developmental Evaluation (DE)** as a flexible framework tailored to dynamic and conflict-affected environments. DE prioritizes real-time feedback, adaptive management, and continuous learning, making it highly applicable to Ukraine's reconstruction, where rapid changes demand responsive evaluation methods. Patton's work emphasizes the importance of adaptability, enabling Ukraine's recovery programs to adjust to emerging challenges while maintaining focus on long-term goals.

The **IFRC (2012)** guidelines for post-disaster infrastructure rehabilitation stress resilience and disaster risk reduction. These principles are crucial for Ukraine to not only rebuild but also enhance infrastructure to withstand future crises. By incorporating MEL systems into all phases of reconstruction, Ukraine can ensure that projects meet resilience standards, reducing vulnerability to future disasters and promoting sustainable development.

Performance Management and Mixed Methods Evaluation

Hatry (1999) underscores the value of **performance measurement in the public sector**, advocating for the use of efficiency indicators and data-driven decision-making to improve accountability. For Ukraine, integrating performance management into public administration will enhance the transparency and effectiveness of reconstruction projects, fostering trust among citizens and donors.

Bamberger, Rao, and Woolcock (2010) advocate for **mixed-methods evaluation**, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive understanding of project outcomes. In Ukraine, this approach allows for a nuanced analysis of both economic recovery and social resilience, ensuring that reconstruction efforts address diverse aspects of recovery, from measurable economic impacts to community well-being.

Stakeholder Engagement and Long-Term Sustainability

Mayne (2007) highlights the importance of **stakeholder engagement and long-term impact** in RBM practices. His work stresses the need to involve local actors to ensure that projects align with community priorities, fostering ownership and sustainability. For Ukraine, engaging local stakeholders in the reconstruction process is essential to building trust and ensuring that recovery efforts meet local needs.

The **World Bank (2010)** report on Canada's MEL system emphasizes the benefits of continuous learning and adaptive management. These lessons are directly applicable to Ukraine's recovery, where involving stakeholders throughout the project cycle ensures responsiveness to changing conditions and promotes sustainable outcomes.

Local Ownership and Sovereignty in Post-Conflict Recovery

Chandler (2006) critiques Western-led state-building interventions, warning against creating dependencies on external actors. For Ukraine, prioritizing **local ownership and sovereignty** in reconstruction efforts is essential to avoid external dependency and ensure alignment with national priorities. Empowering local actors to lead recovery initiatives fosters resilience and sustainability, creating a foundation for long-term stability.

Sector-Specific Guidelines for Reconstruction

The **UN DESA (2007)** report emphasizes the importance of tailoring governance reforms to the specific realities of post-conflict countries. For Ukraine, balancing systemic reforms with incremental capacity-building in governance is critical for restoring public administration and maintaining peace. The report's phased approach—immediate reconstruction, transition to stability, and long-term governance stabilization—provides a roadmap for Ukraine's recovery.

The **UNDP (2016)** guide on local governance in fragile settings highlights the importance of **real-time monitoring, flexible management, and stakeholder participation.** These principles are essential for navigating the complexities of Ukraine's reconstruction, ensuring that projects remain adaptable to changing conditions while maintaining focus on long-term objectives.

This review synthesizes foundational principles, global standards, and practical applications of RBM and MEL, offering a robust framework for Ukraine's reconstruction. Key themes include the importance of goal-setting and accountability (Drucker, 1954; OECD DAC, 1991), adaptability in conflict-affected settings (Patton, 2011; IFRC, 2012), and stakeholder engagement (Mayne, 2007; Chandler, 2006). By integrating these insights, Ukraine can ensure

that its recovery efforts are transparent, accountable, and resilient, laying a sustainable foundation for long-term development.

METHODOLOGY

1. Research Design

The main objective of this study is to analyze how performance management (RBM), focusing on monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL), can be strategically applied to ensure effective management of Ukraine's post-war recovery. The research themes were developed based on literature reviews as well as preliminary consultation with the stakeholders. The research uses a "think-tank" approach to develop practical recommendations for policymakers rather than promoting theoretical debates. The results will provide an understanding of how the RBM and MEL frameworks can be used to ensure transparent, accountable, and effective management of the recovery process.

The object of this research focuses on the application of RBM/MEL systems in Ukraine's post-war reconstruction, specifically targeting their integration into governance, infrastructure projects, and stakeholder relationships (foreign donors, the Government of Ukraine, local authorities, business, and civil society) to ensure effective, transparent, and sustainable recovery.

2. Research Approach

The research is primarily qualitative and includes documentary, analytical, and historical research to study the knowledge base and experience of the utilization of the RBM/MEL methodology, including the conflict-affected environment. The main findings are based on in-depth interviews with experts and key stakeholders involved in RBM, MEL, and Ukraine's recovery.

3. Data Collection methods

a) Documentary research

The research started with an in-depth review of relevant papers and publications, including:

- Academic and policy publications on RBM/MEL approaches.
- Practical handbooks for implementing RBM/MEL frameworks
- Evaluation standards and RBM/MEL frameworks by international organizations.
- Reports by governments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on lessons learned

b) In-depth interviews

In-depth, semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders and professionals in the RBM/MEL field have been conducted to complement the literature review. All in all, six in-depth interviews were conducted with representatives of both Ukrainian and international organizations, including:

- Representatives of Ukrainian nongovernmental organizations
- Ukrainian public sector experts
- Representatives of intergovernmental organizations who manage the development and recovery projects in Ukraine
- Independent RBM/MEL experts.

These interviews aimed to provide insight into the following issues:

- Application of RBM/MEL in the Ukrainian context.
- Key challenges and opportunities for integrating RBM/MEL into recovery.
- Lessons learned from previous recovery efforts that can be adapted for Ukraine.
- Stakeholder perspectives on accountability, transparency, and adaptability in recovery programs.
- The interviews were transcribed, coded, and analyzed to identify the main themes that will be used to form recommendations for Ukraine's recovery strategy.

4. Data Analysis Methods

a) Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA)

The data collected during the documentary research and interviews were processed and analyzed using thematic and content analysis. Key themes related to accountability, transparency, adaptability, and stakeholder involvement in RBM/MEL were identified, analyzed and drafted as key findings and recommendations to Ukraine.

b) Comparative analysis of international best practices

The study applied best practices analysis as part of the literature review process to validate the information received during the in-depth interviews. This cross-analysis helped to formulate key findings and practical recommendations directly applicable to Ukraine.

KEY FINDINGS

1. RBM/MEL Application in Ukraine

The process of rebuilding Ukraine after the war is an extremely complex task that requires high flexibility, coordination, and responsibility on the part of all participants. In this context, the application of performance management tools such as RBM/MEL is seen as an effective approach to increase transparency, adaptability, and effectiveness. However, the implementation of these methodologies faces numerous challenges, which reflect both the peculiarities of the current political, economic and social context, as well as the limitations of institutional capacity.

One of the key challenges is a **formalistic (superficial) approach** in using RBM. Experts note that, despite strategies on paper, their actual implementation is often superficial. One of the interlocutors noted that *"the public sector has written a strategy for developing small and medium-sized businesses, a very good strategy. The Ministry of Finance has developed a strategy how to increase revenue for the budget. Donors say the strategy is great, but business says that we will not be able to survive."* This indicates a gap between formal plans and the real conditions of their implementation, especially in conditions of insufficient coordination between participants.

A serious obstacle to implementing RBM and MEL is **the lack of qualified personnel**. As one of the experts emphasized, *"civil servants face limited time and human resources when engaging stakeholders."* This problem is particularly acute at the local level, where communities often lack specialists who can work with data, coordinate projects, and evaluate their impact.

The lack of qualified personnel also creates an additional burden on the existing staff. One respondent noted, *"One person does three people's work, and that doesn't allow RBM to be properly implemented."* Such a situation complicates long-term planning and the implementation of comprehensive approaches.

War creates an ever-changing, **dynamic context** that makes long-term planning and evaluation difficult. As one interlocutor noted, *"the framework and context are constantly changing. This area may disappear in three months, or several schools or factories will be destroyed."* This leads to the fact that plans have to be constantly adapted, which reduces the effectiveness of the system approach.

The war also affects access to data and its accuracy. For example, donors often require photo and documentary evidence, but many citizens refuse to provide their data due to the uncertainty of the future. This makes monitoring and evaluating projects difficult, especially in times of crisis.

Gap between international practices and Ukrainian realities, because international donors and organizations often use standardized approaches that do not take into account local realities. One of the interviewees shared an example of *"international donors bringing dry flour and canned beans, but people did not have water or electricity to cook them."* This indicates insufficient adaptation of humanitarian programs to the context of Ukraine.

Another problem is the lack of involvement of Ukrainian experts in the development and implementation of such projects when the preference is given to international staff with little knowledge of the local situation. One of the interlocutors noted that *"many international workers have no idea about the real living conditions of Ukrainians because they spend most of their time in offices."*

Insufficient coordination between key stakeholders - international donors, government structures, and local communities is another serious problem. One of the interlocutors noted: *"Sometimes it is impossible to find one donor, and then ten appear with similar offers."* This leads to duplication of effort and inefficient allocation of resources.

Despite significant challenges, experts note that RBM and MEL have the potential to transform recovery processes. However, these opportunities remain untapped due to limitations in coordination, lack of personnel, and insufficient adaptation to the context. RBM provides clear tools for needs analysis, impact assessment, and strategy adaptation, but their effective application requires addressing these challenges.

2. Strategic Planning and Sustainability of Results

Strategic planning is critical in Ukraine's post-war reconstruction, as it determines how to efficiently and sustainably use limited resources to achieve significant results. The RBM/MEL approach provides a clear framework for the formation, implementation, and monitoring of the implementation of strategic plans. However, the current state of legislative regulation, institutional capacity, and understanding of these methodologies among Ukrainian civil servants face significant challenges.

Based on interviews with key experts, this section analyzes existing challenges, gaps, and potential opportunities for integrating RBM/MEL into strategic planning processes in Ukraine.

The interviewees raised the following issues regarding **the actual challenges of strategic planning**. Although the lack of effective legislative regulation of RBM in strategic planning, according to one of the interlocutors, has a negative effect on the effective application of this approach in the work of state institutions, however, in his opinion, *"legislative regulation of the*

RBM issue plays a secondary role, it is more important to motivate civil servants to apply this methodology." The lack of motivation and understanding of methodology at the level of executors leads to formalism in the preparation of strategic documents.

Another expert gave an example illustrating this formalism: *"When I worked in the ministry, we had to prepare an environmental impact assessment as part of the European integration efforts, but the responsible units simply copied the previous assessments and inserted the name of the new document. Legislative consolidation does not always guarantee changes in approaches."* This example shows a superficial approach to implementing strategic tasks, which reduces the effectiveness of planning.

Also, one of the challenges is the lack of a dedicated law on strategic planning. Although a draft law was developed back in 2011, it was never adopted. As another interviewee noted, *"The absence of such a law makes it difficult to coordinate strategic planning between different sectors, for example, defense, energy, and social services."* As a result, government agencies face challenges in defining goals, priorities, and resources in a comprehensive manner.

Despite these challenges, **RBM enables the stakeholders to focus on results** by providing a powerful tool for structuring strategic planning processes. One interviewee emphasized that *"the main goal of RBM is to achieve results that meet the needs of beneficiaries. This allows processes to be reviewed and adapted in case of deviations from the goals."* Such flexibility is especially important in post-conflict reconstruction, when priorities may change depending on the situation.

Another expert emphasized that RBM helps optimize resource utilization. *"RBM allows you to analyze results, set clear goals, and plan available resources, taking into account their limitations."* This ensures the rational use of funds and human resources, minimizing losses.

RBM also has great potential to improve transparency and communication. *"RBM improves information sharing. People understand how the [reconstruction] system works, and that builds trust,"* one interviewee noted. In times when the public is particularly vigilant about resource allocation, transparency is a key factor in maintaining public trust.

Regarding **institutional framework and capacity**, the interviewees mentioned that RBM/MEL is gradually being implemented in public administration, but challenges related to low institutional capacity remain. *"Officials at the central and local levels do not understand what MEL is,"* one of the interviewees noted. This problem is even more acute in the regions most affected by the war, where the level of capacity of civil servants may not be sufficient to solve the tasks of development the affected regions face.

Another important issue is the cultural differences between Ukrainian beneficiaries and international donors. As one respondent noted, *"International donors often require the implementation of RBM/MEL, but beneficiaries do not always understand how to work with these tools."* This leads to misunderstandings and conflicts that can hinder project implementation.

Adaptability and flexibility of planning are key principles of effective planning in post-war reconstruction. One respondent emphasized that "*any system must be flexible and respond to changing contexts. After the war, everything will change, and our planning systems must be ready for it."*

The RDNA document[1], used as a framework for damage assessment and recovery planning, is an example of an attempt to integrate flexibility into planning. This document is regularly updated to reflect new data on the destruction level and the regions' needs.

Overall, Ukraine has significant potential to integrate RBM/MEL into its strategic planning processes, but this requires changes at several levels. Major obstacles include legislative gaps, insufficient institutional capacity, and limited understanding of these approaches among public officials. At the same time, RBM/MEL provides a powerful toolkit to achieve transparency, adaptability, and sustainable results.

3. Goals Alignment

Alignment of goals between central authorities, international donors, and local communities is one of the key conditions for the successful reconstruction of Ukraine after the war. Applying the RBM/MEL approach can be a powerful tool to ensure a coordinated approach. Still, challenges related to institutional capacity, gaps between levels of governance, and lack of transparency remain significant.

One of the biggest challenges in terms of the **alignment of reconstruction goals** is the gap between the goals formed at the national level and their adaptation to the real needs of communities. As one of the respondents noted, *"similar problems, different levels; how to get from the national level to the community level?"* Although strategic documents have been

[1] The Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment (RDNA), conducted by the World Bank , the Government of Ukraine , the European Commission , and the United Nations with support from other partners , evaluates Ukraine's damage and losses from Russia's invasion while assessing the economic and social needs for both survival during the war and future prosperity .

developed in Ukraine, such as the Regional Development Strategy for 2021–2027 (updated in 2024), its implementation at the local level remains formal.

The formal approach to planning is manifested in the fact that regional strategies are often created based on national frameworks without considering local realities. *"Oblasts write their strategies on a national basis, and communities - on a regional basis,"* noted one of the interlocutors. As a result, this creates a systemic problem where plans remain "strategies on paper" that do not reflect real priorities.

Another important aspect is the lack of qualified personnel. There are about 1,500 local communities in Ukraine, but, as the expert noted, "*there is a lack of specialists in small communities, and they will not appear from anywhere. It is impossible to wake up one morning and become an expert, know the methodology, and be able to implement it."* This requires systematic work on capacity building at the local level.

A **formal approach to goal agreement** significantly weakens the effectiveness of RBM. As one of the interlocutors noted, *"...regional administrations have half a year to develop regional strategies within the framework of the national one. But is this possible with limited resources and a lack of qualified personnel?"* Time and resource constraints create conditions under which strategies become purely formal, and their real implementation remains questioned.

In addition, the **temporary nature of international aid** makes long-term planning difficult. One of the respondents emphasized that "*international aid projects are temporary. They helped this year, and in three years, we have to develop new documents again* [without clear prospects of potential funding]. *This is not a stable story."* The instability of funding and dependence on donor programs create difficulties in maintaining the consistency of strategic planning.

RBM is a logical structure that ensures transparency and efficiency of planning and monitoring processes, thus **contributing to building trust** between key stakeholders. As one interlocutor noted, *"this is a logical structure that demonstrates how certain goals will be achieved. In this way, mutual trust is formed between the beneficiary and the donor."* Transparency of the process, clear goals, and achievement indicators contribute to the improvement of trust between participants.

The DREAM system[2], currently in test mode, is an example of an innovative approach to integrating RBM into planning. This universal platform integrates with the Ministry of Education

[2] DREAM is a pilot project launched by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (Resolution No. 1286, November 15, 2022) that collects, organizes, and publishes open data on reconstruction projects in real-time, ensuring transparency and accountability. Once legislated, its use will become mandatory for recovery project initiators,

and Ministry of Health databases, providing communication between the levels from the bottom up. Thanks to this, communities can transparently define their needs, and donors can monitor how their resources are used to achieve the stated goals.

The lack of **coordination between different stakeholders** —government, civil society, and business—is a significant obstacle to aligning goals. As one of the experts noted, *"government, civil society, and business are three worlds that rarely intersect ."* Such a gap makes it difficult to form a coordinated approach to project implementation.

Civil society often plays a key role in solving local problems. *"Most problems are not solved by the government, but by civil society and business,*" emphasized one of the interlocutors. For example, in the field of distribution of humanitarian aid, businesses and civil society choose more effective strategies aimed at developing the local economy.

Transparency and accountability are critical to aligning goals across levels of governance. As one of the experts noted, *"the issue of RBM/M&E should be prescribed at the stage of project development."* Clearly defined performance indicators and monitoring tools ensure the correspondence between stated goals and real needs. This facilitates better coordination between donors, government, and communities.

Reconciling goals between national strategies, international donor priorities, and local community needs remains challenging, requiring deeper integration of RBM and MEL into all planning stages. Formalism, lack of expertise and coordination, and the short-term nature of development projects create obstacles that can be overcome by implementing transparent, innovative, and long-term approaches. At the same time, RBM/MELs remain powerful tools that ensure transparency, trust, and alignment at all levels.

4. Stakeholder Engagement

Effective stakeholder engagement in reconstruction is critical to achieving sustainable and inclusive outcomes. In this context, the use of performance-based management tools such as RBM and MEL is particularly important, as they allow for transparency, improve coordination between stakeholders, and adapt strategies to changing contexts. However, as experts have shown, stakeholder engagement faces significant challenges that limit the effectiveness of these tools.

---

enabling risk mitigation, accurate reporting, and performance improvement while fostering investment attractiveness.

One of the main problems for involving interested parties is **the formality of the engagement process.** As experts note, the interaction between government structures, businesses, donors, and civil society often occurs at the level of creating "good" strategies that do not find real implementation. Such a situation indicates a gap between theoretical concepts and the real needs of the beneficiaries.

The second problem is the **lack of qualified personnel** capable of effectively using RBM/MEL in interacting with various stakeholders . Respondents noted, *"It requires training, communication, content creation, data analysis, and the ability to work with people."* The shortage of specialists at the local level is especially critical, where the effectiveness of interaction often depends on the competence of individual managers.

Different stakeholders have different and sometimes conflicting interests, which exacerbates the **fragmentation of interests** between them. National strategies often do not consider the specific needs of local communities, and business and civil society can be left out of decision-making processes. As noted by experts, *"Local self-government dominates [in the local reconstruction efforts], but it is also important to involve business, NGOs and other groups."* Such fragmentation limits the possibility of forming comprehensive strategies and well-coordinated reconstruction efforts.

The public and even some key stakeholders lack a clear understanding of the country's long-term goals. One respondent emphasized, *"The clearer the [reconstruction] models, the more open the planning, the easier it is to engage people."* **Lack of transparency and clear communication** creates distrust and can lead to resistance to reform by the key stakeholders and the general public.

War and dynamic changes in community needs create additional challenges for engaging stakeholders in long-term planning. Some of the respondents noted that beneficiary needs are changing very quickly, but the initial reconstruction plans often use outdated data, so when the project starts, the needs have changed already. This makes it difficult to develop effective strategies that correspond to actual conditions.

Despite significant challenges, RBM and MEL offer tools that can facilitate **better coordination and more effective interaction** between stakeholders. In particular, they allow the mapping of stakeholders, creating platforms for information exchange, and ensuring transparency of decision-making. However, the potential of these tools remains limited due to the aforementioned barriers.

5. Transparency and Accountability

Transparency and accountability are key principles of effective management and resource allocation in the post-war reconstruction. Given the challenges of corruption, limited resources, and crisis conditions, RBM/MEL tools can be important in ensuring trust, control, and effective use of funds. This section examines the current state of transparency and accountability in Ukraine and opportunities for improving the MEL system.

As respondents noted, **transparency of decision-making** is especially important for Ukraine, where a large part of the population is vulnerable due to the ongoing war. One of the interlocutors noted: *"Since it's difficult to determine who will receive 1000 or 10,000 hryvnias, it's important to do it transparently in a poor country like Ukraine."* Thus, transparency in donor assistance prioritization is important for promoting trust in the reconstruction process. This also requires clear and open monitoring and reporting mechanisms that ensure efficient allocation of resources.

Another aspect emphasized by experts is the need to **work openly to promote trust**, even during wartime. As one of the respondents noted: *"It is wrong to say that we need to do everything secretly because the enemy can use this information against us. But transparency and openness allow the community to understand better what is happening*." At the same time, in the context of security, it is sometimes not possible to fully inform the public about the details of recovery measures, challenging to strike a balance between transparency and security.

Transparency in using RBM/MEL often runs counter to the **misperception of MEL approach** as a tool for control rather than improvement. One of the interlocutors emphasized: "*Officials should focus not on the process but on the result. We need to change the mentality of officials."* The lack of a long-term (outcome) result-based approach limits the effectiveness of using MEL as an accountability tool.

Even though there are developed reporting mechanisms for donors, the project implementers **formally report to the local beneficiaries,** which doesn't contribute to real transparency. As stated by one of the experts: *"There is no problem with reporting to donors, but it is important to communicate with the community [as well]."* However, due to the crisis conditions, ensuring this level of communication is a significant challenge.

Some respondents mentioned **pressure** from their clients who tried to change the evaluation results in their own interests. As the respondents noted, *"Sometimes customers required rewriting the report to get the desired results."* This undermines the objectivity of the assessment and can negatively affect the credibility of the RBM/MEL processes.

Technology can play a key role in ensuring transparency, but there are **challenges in implementing technological solutions** in real life. As noted by interviewees, these decisions are often implemented with delays or do not consider local conditions. For example, digital platforms can provide real-time transparency, but their effectiveness depends on trained personnel and access to quality data.

MEL has the potential to become a major tool for transparency and accountability. Tools such as digital project tracking platforms, regular audits, stakeholder engagement, and public reporting can help reduce corruption, improve financial management, and build trust among the public and donors. However, implementing these tools requires removing barriers such as formalism, lack of resources, and mental barriers.

6. Donors Coordination

Effective coordination of international donors in the post-war reconstruction of Ukraine is a key factor determining the success of reconstruction strategies and projects. In the current context, characterized by numerous challenges, such as the fragmentation of donor efforts, lack of transparency, and uniform monitoring standards, it is important to implement results-based approaches (RBM) and monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) systems. These tools can effectively address duplication of efforts, mismatches between donors and local needs, and optimizing resources.

The interviewees mentioned a **fragmentation of efforts and a lack of a single coordination platform.** As one of the interlocutor noted, donor efforts are often coordinated at the international level without considering local realities. For example, one of the key platforms is the Multi-Agency Donor Coordination Platform (G7) — which functions as a centralized tool but does not cover all donors. One respondent noted that "*aid often goes its own way, without sufficient coordination.*"

An additional problem is that some donors, such as the United States or small states like Switzerland, act separately, with their own priorities and mechanisms for project implementation. This creates a situation where different initiatives are duplicated or implemented in parallel, reducing resource use efficiency.

RBM/ MEL can provide the basis for enhancing a comprehensive platform, registering all donor initiatives, and providing up-to-date data on their status. As one expert noted, "…*platforms that*

provide access to information in real-time allow donors to avoid duplication and direct resources to the most critical areas."

RBM creates opportunities for collaborative planning sessions where all participants can agree on priorities based on critical needs. According to one of the respondents, *"RBM forms a complete picture and shows where it is better to get involved."*

The survey repeatedly raised the issue of the lack of **agreed performance indicators**, which makes it difficult to monitor and assess the impact of projects. For example, one of the respondents emphasized: *"Now there are many donors' projects, but coordination is not enough. There are no common performance indicators."* This makes it difficult to assess progress and implement corrective measures when problems arise.

In addition, donors often focus on quantitative indicators, such as the number of people involved, instead of evaluating qualitative changes, such as the impact on the behavior of beneficiaries. One of the participants in the study noted: *"Donors are more concerned with outreach metrics such as project outreach than qualitative changes."*

Lack of transparency in **communications and interaction** between donors, government structures, and local communities also creates additional barriers to coordination. As noted in one of the interviews: "Few projects communicate with each other, and the government does not always play the role of coordinator." This problem makes integrating donor efforts into a national recovery strategy difficult.

Another challenge is **limited involvement and true interaction with local communities**. Although international platforms, such as the Ukraine Facility[3], seek to involve local communities in planning, this happens at a grassroots level. One of the respondents noted that the involvement of stakeholders is limited to "routine meetings" that do not contribute to solving real problems. This indicates that interaction mechanisms need deeper integration with local needs.

MEL systems allow for the introduction of transparent reporting mechanisms, which increases trust between participants. For example, regular publication of reports on the use of resources and the results achieved will promote greater openness and accountability.

Donor coordination is a difficult but crucial element in the successful recovery of Ukraine. The use of RBM and MEL provides the potential to significantly improve this process. Through the creation of centralized platforms, transparent reporting mechanisms, collaborative planning and

[3] The Ukraine Facility is the European Union's financial assistance program for Ukraine. 50 bl for 2024-27 (https://www.ukrainefacility.me.gov.ua/en/)

data-driven decision-making, greater alignment of efforts and optimal use of resources can be achieved. However, effective implementation of these tools requires deep integration with local realities and active involvement of all stakeholders.

7. Data Gathering and Utilization

The collection and use of data in Ukraine in the context of post-war reconstruction face several challenges caused by the bureaucratization of processes, limited access to up-to-date information, and mistrust of official statistics. At the same time, new initiatives and technologies are emerging that can change the situation. Survey analysis reveals both the challenges and opportunities shaping modern monitoring and evaluation practice. As one respondent emphasized, *"Using data allows us to adapt strategies and focus on the most important areas."* This allows donors and government agencies to respond more accurately to changing community needs.

One of the biggest challenges is the **lack of trust in official statistics**. Survey participants emphasized that the data provided by the State Statistics Service often does not meet the real needs of users. Moreover, these data are considered "bureaucratized", which makes their use difficult. As one of the respondents noted*: "Official statistics cannot be trusted at all, which is especially critical for front-line territories."* This distrust also extends to local authorities, which often do not have access to the necessary information, for example, about the number of entrepreneurs or socially vulnerable groups in their territories.

Ukraine faces a serious problem of the **lack of up-to-date demographic data**. The last census took place back in 2001, and since then, even before the full-scale war, data on the demographic situation has been out of date. This problem was greatly exacerbated after the outbreak of the war when large population movements made it impossible to accurately estimate the number of people in certain regions. As survey participants noted, *"The lack of accurate demographic data makes recovery planning and monitoring much more difficult*."

The **bureaucratic approach to data collection** and use creates significant barriers to their effective use. For example, respondents mentioned that state budget programs and reports on their implementation are presented in a format that does not allow for automatic processing of information or use for analysis. It was also noted that the data often does not consider the end users' needs. As one of the respondents noted: *"The data provided by the State Statistics Service are focused on formal indicators and not on real needs."*

Despite the challenges, positive data collection practices in Ukraine show potential for improvement in this area. For example, the DREAM system, which is used to monitor restoration projects in real-time, is an example of the integration of modern technologies into management processes. This platform allows open publication of project data, which promotes transparency and accountability.

In addition, international organizations such as UNDP and UNICEF conduct mixed research that combines traditional survey methods with modern tools such as satellite imagery, drones, and big data analysis. For example, UNICEF used a methodology that included household surveys, big data analysis, and online surveys to get a more complete picture of the state of communities.

Another significant challenge is the **inefficient exchange of information** between the various actors involved in the recovery process. Local authorities, international organizations, and civil society often work in isolation, without access to the same data sets. For example, local authorities in frontline areas cannot obtain accurate information about the number of vulnerable groups or the needs of communities. This complicates planning and resource allocation.

Among the promising areas of development, the respondents noted the increasing use of **technologies and innovations** such as mobile technologies for data collection and conducting telephone surveys as an alternative to traditional methods. For example, UNFPA is working with KSE to replace the census with telephone surveys, which can partially solve the problem of the lack of demographic data.

The importance of public involvement in the data collection process was also noted. Transparency and availability of information allow citizens to understand how reforms are progressing and promote trust in the process.

Ukraine's data collection and use system is currently in the stages of transformation. Although it faces numerous challenges, such as mistrust of statistics, outdated data collection methods, and insufficient coordination among stakeholders, there are prospects for improvement. Innovative approaches, the introduction of new technologies, and the use of systems such as DREAM demonstrate that Ukraine has the potential to create a more effective and transparent system for monitoring the progress of recovery.

8. Innovations and Modern Technologies

Innovative approaches and technologies, such as geographic information systems (GIS), big data, remote sensing, and others, have significant potential to increase the effectiveness of

monitoring the reconstruction of Ukraine. However, their implementation faces a few challenges, including data security, political will, funding, and wartime infrastructure constraints.

Ukraine has already demonstrated examples of successful **use of innovative approaches**. For example, the Fiscal Policy Research Center created the first interactive reconstruction map in the Kyiv region. This interactive map allows one to track expenses for restoring the Kyiv region. Here, you will find all the information about financing the reconstruction of damaged facilities at the district, territorial community, and settlement levels. These AI-powered tools promote transparency and help predict costs. A similar approach can be extended to other regions to monitor recovery projects in real-time.

Satellite imagery and drones can play a significant role in monitoring. For example, UNDP uses these technologies to assess damage and demining. This approach provides a detailed picture of the situation, even in remote or dangerous regions.

Geoinformation systems, such as the AICOM[4] Systems enable efficient collection, storage, and analysis of data in the education area. AICOM, for example, collects information about schools and educational infrastructure, which helps to make informed management decisions. Extending such systems to other sectors, including health and infrastructure, can significantly improve the quality of decision-making.

Additionally, the DREAM system used to monitor recovery projects is an important step toward integrating technology into the recovery process. It allows open publication of project data, ensuring transparency and accountability.

Although the potential for innovation is significant, implementing **modern technologies faces serious challenges**. One of the main issues is data security. As respondents pointed out, many Ukrainian citizens distrust databases and electronic services like DIIA, fearing that information about citizens, entrepreneurs, or other vulnerable groups can fall into the hands of the enemy.

In addition, several respondents expressed skepticism about using complex technologies such as big data. In the context of war, priority is given to simple and reliable methods of gathering and analyzing information that can be implemented quickly. As one of the participants noted, "*Innovation in Ukraine does not work. The simpler, the better*."

Innovative tools can also play an important **role in communication**. For example, the use of electronic tools that allow tracking the progress of projects in real-time can not only promote transparency but also shape positive public opinion about recovery. As one respondent noted,

[4] Automated informative complex of educational management » (AICOM) – enables collection, storage, management, and use of data in the field of education that enables evidence-based decision making

"Tools like dashboards or even Fly Radar, can visualize how transport or passenger flow is restored, building public trust."

Innovative approaches and technologies, such as GIS, satellite imagery, drones, and data management systems such as DREAM or AICOM, can potentially change approaches to monitoring Ukraine's recovery. At the same time, their implementation requires overcoming several challenges, including ensuring data security, adapting technologies to local conditions, and increasing digital literacy among civil servants and stakeholders. Integrating these innovations into Ukraine's recovery should become a strategic priority to ensure efficiency, transparency, and accountability.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USING RBM/MEL TO ENSURE EFFECTIVE RECONSTRUCTION IN UKRAINE

Applying the RBM/MEL approaches to the post-conflict reconstruction of Ukraine can transform this process into a transparent, accountable and effective system. However, to realize this potential, a number of systemic challenges need to be overcome, such as a lack of human resources, gaps in legislation and insufficient coordination between stakeholders. Based on interviews with key experts, this section offers practical recommendations that will help overcome these barriers.

1. **Strengthening human capacity**

One of the biggest challenges identified by experts is the acute shortage of qualified specialists capable of implementing RBM and MEL. This problem is particularly acute at the regional and local levels, where communities often lack specialists who can work with data, coordinate projects, and assess their impact. As one respondent noted, *"One person does the work of three, and this makes it impossible to properly implement RBM."* To address this problem, it is necessary to launch large-scale training programs for civil servants that cover all aspects of project management, from planning to implementation and evaluation. In addition, combining international experience with local knowledge will ensure that the Ukrainian context is best taken into account. Institutionalizing these programs through universities and professional associations (e.g. Ukrainian Evaluation Association) will contribute to long-term support for such initiatives.

2. **Legal and institutional consolidation of RBM**

The lack of clear legislative regulation of RBM and MEL is a significant obstacle to their effective application. Without such a foundation, many civil servants approach these methodologies formally, perceiving them as a bureaucratic requirement rather than a tool for real change. One respondent emphasized: *"Legislation should go beyond formalities to motivate civil servants to use RBM as a strategic tool."* Developing and adopting laws and regulations integrating RBM/MEL into the public administration framework will help standardize these practices and foster a results-oriented culture.

3. **Increasing transparency and accountability**

Transparency has become a major topic of discussion regarding public trust and resource management. In a post-conflict context where resources are limited and public scrutiny is heightened, transparent mechanisms are key. Tools such as real-time dashboards, public reports,

and community engagement mechanisms can improve the visibility of reconstruction processes. As one interviewee noted, "*Transparency [as part of RBM] fosters trust and helps people understand where resources are going."* However, it is important to consider the balance between transparency and security in wartime by implementing adaptive systems.

4. **Using innovative technologies**

Ukraine has already demonstrated the potential for innovation in public administration, for example, through the success of the DREAM system, which allows for real-time monitoring of reconstruction projects. Tools such as geographic information systems (GIS), big data analytics, remote sensing, and mobile data collection can further enhance reconstruction. However, their implementation requires careful planning. Some respondents are skeptical of complex technologies, emphasizing the need for simple and reliable methods to implement quickly. Investment in digital literacy among civil servants and other stakeholders will facilitate the effective use of technologies.

5. **Involving local communities**

Effective reconstruction is impossible without the active involvement of local communities and civil society. This ensures that recovery is aligned with the real needs of the population and is explained in simple terms to ensure 'buy-in'. One respondent emphasized: *"The clearer the planning models, the easier it is to involve people."* Through inclusive planning, Ukraine can strengthen social cohesion and ensure local community ownership of the reconstruction results.

6. **Balancing national strategy and regional needs**

Achieving coherence between national strategies and regional needs is critical for effective reconstruction. However, as respondents noted, regional strategies are often created based on national frameworks without taking into account local realities. This reduces the relevance and effectiveness of plans. In this context, regional development agencies (NGOs and similar) can help local authorities set priorities, manage resources, and monitor progress.

7. **Improving the quality of statistics**

Distrust of official statistics and outdated demographic data makes planning and monitoring difficult. One respondent noted: *"Official statistics cannot be trusted, which is especially critical in frontline areas." T*herefore, the donors should continue to support the reform of the statistical bodies of Ukraine to ensure that their data reflects the needs of users. Additionally, upgrading data collection methods and implementing innovative solutions such as telephone surveys and mobile technology can partially address these problems.

8. Promoting donor coordination

Fragmentation of donor efforts is one of the main obstacles to effective use of resources. A centralized platform for registering all donor, national and local initiatives and tracking their progress can reduce duplication of efforts. As one respondent noted, *"Platforms that provide access to real-time information allow donors to avoid duplication and direct resources to the most critical areas."*

These recommendations provide a comprehensive roadmap for integrating RBM and MEL into Ukraine's reconstruction processes. Removing structural, human resources, and technological barriers will ensure efficiency, transparency, and responsiveness to the needs of citizens and international partners.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the study's main results allows us to draw several key conclusions regarding the current state and prospects for the application of RBM/MEL in Ukraine's reconstruction process.

First, strategic planning is critically important for ensuring the effective use of limited resources; however, the lack of an appropriate legislative framework, low motivation of civil servants, and formalism in planning approaches significantly limit the potential of RBM/MEL. This indicates the need for systemic changes at the legislative and institutional levels.

Second, the shortage of qualified personnel remains one of the main obstacles to the effective implementation of RBM/MEL. The insufficient number of specialists, especially at the local level, creates an additional burden on staff and makes it impossible to implement strategies qualitatively. This problem requires the introduction of large-scale training and human capital development programs.

Third, the dynamic context of the war complicates long-term planning and monitoring. Constant changes in priorities and uncertainty about the future reduce the effectiveness of strategies and create challenges for data collection and use. This highlights the importance of implementing adaptive and flexible approaches in planning and evaluation.

Fourth, there is a significant gap between international practices and local realities in Ukraine. Donor organizations often use standardized approaches that do not take into account the specifics of the Ukrainian context, which leads to ineffective programs. Integrating local expertise and taking into account local needs is critical to increasing the relevance of projects.

Fifth, insufficient coordination between stakeholders, including international donors, government structures and local communities, creates conditions for duplication of efforts and inefficient allocation of resources. This requires the creation of transparent mechanisms for cooperation, unification of performance indicators and the introduction of platforms for data sharing.

Despite numerous challenges, RBM and MEL have significant potential to transform the reconstruction process in Ukraine. These approaches can ensure transparency, accountability and adaptability, which are critical for successful post-conflict recovery. However, realizing this potential requires addressing the barriers identified in the study and implementing long-term systemic changes.

Appendix A – Glossary of RBM Terms

(CANADA RBM)

Accountability

The obligation to demonstrate that responsibility is being taken both for the means used and the results achieved in light of agreed expectations. While no one organization or project is entirely responsible for the achievement of outcomes—especially at higher levels in the results chain—the implementer is responsible for designing a project with achievable expected outcomes, and demonstrating that it is Managing for Results, i.e. that:

- expected outcome and output indicators are established,
- monitoring, including data collection on output and outcome indicators is regularly undertaken,
- management decisions are informed by the data collected and its assessment,
- corrective action is undertaken so the expected outcomes can be achieved, and
- reports on outcomes achieved are supported by evidence.

Activities

Actions taken or work performed through which inputs are mobilized to produce outputs.
In Global Affairs Canada-funded projects, activities are the direct actions taken or work performed by project implementers.

Actual Data

Actual data is:

- collected on each indicator as per the collection frequency identified in the performance measurement framework during implementation and documented in various reports and data systems
- used for analysis to assess progress on or towards expected outcomes, in comparison to baseline data and targets
- used as evidence of progress on or towards or on the achievement of an expected outcome in the narrative of performance reports

Assumptions

Assumptions are the conscious and unconscious beliefs we each have about how the world works. From the perspective of the design team, assumptions constitute beliefs (validated or otherwise) about existing conditions that may affect the achievement of outcomes and about why each level will lead to the next. In the context of the theory of change and logic model, assumptions are the necessary conditions that must exist if the relationships in the theory of change are to behave as expected. Accordingly, care should be taken to make explicit the important assumptions upon which the internal logic of the theory of change is based.

Arrows between the levels represent assumptions (explained in the theory of change narrative) about why the outputs or outcomes from one level should lead or contribute to the changes at the next level, and about existing conditions, including risks, which may affect the achievement of the outcomes.

Attribution

The extent to which a reasonable causal connection can be made between a specific outcome and the activities and outputs of a government policy, program or initiative.

Baseline (Data)

Baseline data provides a specific value for an indicator at the outset of a project or program. Baseline data is collected at one point in time, and is used as a point of reference against which progress on the achievement of outcomes will be measured or assessed.

Beneficiary

The set of individuals that experience the change of state, condition or well-being at the ultimate outcome level of a logic model. In its international assistance programming, Global Affairs Canada-funded implementers usually work through intermediaries to help achieve changes for beneficiaries. Global Affairs Canada implementers may also work directly with beneficiaries. In this case, beneficiaries may, like intermediaries, also experience changes in capacity (immediate outcome), and changes in behaviour, practices or performance (intermediate outcome).

Data Collection Methods

Data collection methods represent **how data on** indicators are collected. Choosing a data collection method depends on the type of indicator and the purpose of the information being gathered. Data collection methods can be informal and less structured, or more formal and more structured. Different methods involve "trade-offs with respect to cost, precision, credibility and timeliness."[64]

Data Sources

Data sources are the individuals, organizations or documents from which data about your indicators will be obtained. The implementer will need to identify data sources for indicators. Data sources can be primary or secondary.

- **Primary data** is collected directly by the implementer at the source.
- **Secondary data** is data that has been collected and recorded by another person or organization, sometimes for altogether different purposes.

Development Results

Development results are a sub-set of results of the Global Affairs Canada's international assistance results (or outcomes) focused specifically on producing tangible improvements in the lives of the poor and vulnerable. In the Department's results chain for international assistance programming, these would be changes described at the immediate, intermediate and the ultimate outcome levels. See also Outcomes or Results, Immediate Outcomes, Intermediate Outcomes, Ultimate Outcomes.

Donors

Global Affairs Canada or another donor organization that provides financial, technical and other types of support to a project. See also Stakeholder

Evaluation

"Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project [or part of], programme or policy, its design, implementation and results". "In the development context, evaluation refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of a development [initiative]."

Expected Outcome or Results

An outcome that a program, policy or initiative is designed to achieve.

Ex-post Evaluation

"Evaluation of a ... [initiative] after it has been completed. Note: It may be undertaken directly after or long after completion. The intention is to identify the factors of success or failure, to assess the sustainability of results and impacts, and to draw conclusions that may inform other [initiatives]"

Implementer

Private firm, non-governmental organization, multilateral organization, educational institution, provincial or federal government department or any other organization selected by Global Affairs Canada to implement a project in a partner country. Depending on the context, an implementer may be referred to as an implementing organization, executing agency, partner or recipient.

Indicator (Performance)

An indicator, also known as a performance indicator, is a means of measuring actual outcomes and outputs. It can be qualitative or quantitative, and is composed of a unit of measure, a unit of analysis and a context. Indicators are neutral; they neither indicate a direction of change, nor embed a target.

Indicators (Qualitative)

Qualitative indicators capture experiential information, such as the quality of something, or beneficiaries' perception of their situation. They can help measure the presence or absence of specific conditions, or an individual or group's perception of how a service compares with established standards. Qualitative indicators can capture contextual information about situations, events and practices. For example, "level of confidence (1-4 scale) of farmers (f/m) in the security of roads leading to local market" or "%/total

individuals (f/m) who felt that they were completely or mostly able to participate in democratic management bodies".

Indicators (Quantitative)

Quantitative indicators are used to measure quantities or amounts. For example; "# of human rights violations", "ratio of women-to-men in decision-making positions in the government", or "%/total of women-owned businesses represented in trade fairs".

Inputs – (Intrants)

The financial, human, material and information resources used to produce outputs through activities in order to accomplish outcomes.

Intermediary

Individual, group, institution or government, that is not the ultimate beneficiary of the project, but that will experience a change in capacity (immediate outcome) and a change in behaviour, practices or performance (intermediate outcome) which will enable them to contribute to the achievement of a sustainable change of state (ultimate outcome) of the beneficiaries. Intermediaries are often mandate holders or duty bearers that are responsible for providing services to the ultimate beneficiaries. They are the entities that implementers work with directly. See also Beneficiary and Stakeholder

Logical Framework Analysis

(Replaced by the logic model, performance measurement framework and risk register in fall 2008)

The logical framework analysis is a planning and communications tool that describes the intent of an investment and presents expected results, indicators, risks and mitigating strategies.
Note: The logical framework analysis is a Results-Based Management tool that was used by Global Affairs Canada until 2008. The logic model, the performance measurement framework and the risk register have since replaced the logical framework analysis. However, logical framework analysis is still used by others in the international development community and officers may encounter it when working with partners tools (Multilateral, sector-wide approaches, programs-based approaches, etc.)

Logic Model

Like a roadmap or a blueprint, a logic model is a visual depiction of the main elements of a theory of change for a specific project or program, reflecting the series of changes that are critical to achieving project success**.** It depicts the logical connections between the planned outputs and the expected outcomes (immediate, intermediate and ultimate) that the project aims to achieve or contribute to. The logic model forms a pyramid shape with multiple complementary pathways branching off below one ultimate outcome level.

The logic model is used as both a planning and design tool during the development of a project or program, and a management tool during project or program implementation.
As **of 2016,** Global Affairs Canada **project level** logic model contains the following levels: ultimate, intermediate and immediate outcomes and outputs. See also Results Chain

Outcome or Result

Results are the same as outcomes. An outcome is a describable or measurable change that is derived from an initiative's outputs or lower-level outcomes. Outcomes are qualified as immediate, intermediate, or ultimate; outputs contribute to immediate outcomes; immediate outcomes contribute to intermediate outcomes; and intermediate outcomes contribute to ultimate outcomes. Outcomes are not entirely within the control of a single organization, policy, program or project; instead, they are within the organization's area of influence. In the context of development, these are also referred to as development results.
Global Affairs Canada uses the terms **results** and **outcomes** interchangeably throughout its different documents.

Outputs

Direct products or services stemming from the activities of an organization, policy, program or project.
In Global Affairs Canada's results chain for international assistance programming, outputs are the direct products or services stemming from the activities of an implementer.

Performance Management

Performance Management refers to the various business processes associated with the performance functions of the department and its programs. It includes results-based management, integrated risk management, performance reporting, evaluation, and audits.

Performance Measurement –

"The process and systems of selection, development and on-going use of performance measures [indicators] to guide decision-making."[71]
See also Results-based Monitoring and Indicator (Performance)

Performance Measurement Framework

The performance measurement framework is the Results-Based Management tool used to systematically plan the collection of relevant data over the lifetime of the project, in order to assess and demonstrate progress made in achieving expected results. The performance measurement framework is the "skeleton" of the monitoring plan: it documents the major elements of the monitoring system in order to ensure regular collection of actual data on the performance measurement framework indicators. The performance measurement framework contains all of the indicators used to measures progress on the achievement of the project's outcomes and outputs. In addition, it specifies who is responsible for collecting data on the

indicator, from what source, at what frequency and with what method. It also includes the baseline data and target for each indicator.

Performance Reporting

The process of communicating evidence-based performance information, including progress on or towards the expected outputs and outcomes: comparing what you expected to achieve with what you have actually achieved, and explaining any variation between the two. This evidence should include the data collected on the performance indicators identified in the performance measurement framework (or equivalent) to measure these outputs and outcomes. Performance reporting supports decision-making, accountability, transparency and managing for results. See also Progress on and Progress towards

Results

Results are the same as **outcomes**. See outcome definition.

Results-Based Management

Results-Based Management is a life-cycle approach to management that integrates strategy, people, resources, processes, and measurements to improve decision making, transparency, and accountability. Results-Based Management is essential for […] senior management to exercise sound stewardship in compliance with government-wide performance and accountability standards. The approach focuses on achieving outcomes, implementing performance measurement, learning, and adapting, as well as reporting performance. RBM means:

- defining realistic expected results based on appropriate analyses;
- clearly identifying program beneficiaries and designing programs to meet their needs;
- monitoring progress towards results and resources [utilized] with the use of appropriate indicators;
- identifying and managing risks while bearing in mind the expected results and necessary resources;
- increasing knowledge by learning lessons and integrating them into decisions; and
- reporting on the results achieved and resources involved.

The aim of Results-Based Management is to improve management throughout a project and a program life cycle: from initiation (analysis, project planning and design), to implementation (results-based monitoring, adjustments and reporting), and to closure (final evaluations and reports, and integrating lessons learned into future programming). By managing better, you can maximize the achievement of projects.

Results-based Monitoring

"… the continuous process of collecting and analyzing information on key indicators and comparing actual results with expected results in order to measure how well a project, program or policy is being implemented. It is a continuous process of measuring progress towards explicit short-, intermediate-, and

long-term results by tracking evidence of movement towards the achievement of specific, predetermined **targets** by the use of **indicators**. Results-based monitoring can provide feedback on progress (or the lack thereof) to staff and decision makers, who can use the information in various ways to improve performance".

Results Chain

A visual depiction of the logical relationships that illustrate the links between inputs, activities, outputs, and the outcomes of a given policy, program or project.

While some practitioners use the terms "results chain" and "logic model" interchangeably, Global Affairs Canada uses the logic model, along with the outputs and activities matrix and the theory of change narrative, to reflect the complexity of the changes expected from international assistance programming.

See also Logic Model, Outputs-Activities Matrix, and Theory of Change

Stakeholder

Stakeholders include beneficiaries, intermediaries, implementers and donors as well as others such as an individual, group, institution, or government with an interest or concern – economic, societal, or environmental – in a particular measure, proposal, or event.

Target

A target specifies a particular value, or range of values, that you would like to see in relation to one performance indicator by a specific date in the future. Together, the targets established for the various indicators of a specific expected outcome will help you determine the level of achievement of that outcome.

Theory of Change – (Théorie du changement)

"Every program [and project] is based on a "theory of change" – a set of assumptions, risks and external factors that describes how and why the program [or project] is intended to work. This theory connects the program's [or project's] activities with its [expected ultimate outcome]. It is inherent in the program [or project] design and is often based on knowledge and experience of the program [or project design team], research, evaluations, best practices and lessons learned"[75]

At Global Affairs Canada, the theory of change for a specific project is visually displayed in the logic model, which shows the output and outcome levels, and the outputs and activities matrix, which adds activities, and it is fully explained in an accompanying theory of change narrative.

Triangulation – (Triangulation)

"The use of three or more theories, sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment. Note: by combining multiple data sources, methods, analyses or theories, evaluators seek to overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single methods, single observer or single theory studies."

Unexpected Results / Outcomes - (Résultats inattendus)

A negative or positive change that is not part of the logic model but can be linked to the project. Not to be confused with a risk occurring or with other results not linked to the project.

Appendix B – Interview Questions

Section I: RBM/MEL Framework in Ukrainian Context

1. **Strategic Planning and Sustainability of Results:**

In your opinion, how can RBM/MEL effectively prioritize Ukraine's immediate and long-term reconstruction needs to ensure the sustainability of results?

What tools or methods would be most effective in ensuring a strategic focus on key long-term objectives?

2. Goal Alignment:

How can RBM and MEL ensure better alignment between the Ukrainian government's goals, international donor priorities, and local community needs?

3. **Challenges and Opportunities in Reconstruction:**

What do you see as the main challenges in applying RBM/MEL in Ukraine's reconstruction, given the current political, economic, and social context?

4. **Stakeholder Engagement:**

How can RBM/MEL tools better support meaningful engagement and coordination among multiple stakeholders (government, international donors, civil society, and local communities) during the reconstruction process?

5. **Transparency and Accountability:**

In the Ukrainian context, how can MEL systems be better designed to enhance transparency and accountability, ensuring that funds and resources are used efficiently and effectively?

6. **Donor Coordination:**

From your experience, how can RBM and MEL help coordinate better the efforts of multiple international donors to avoid duplication and ensure that resources are channeled to the most critical areas?

Section IV: Data-Driven Decision Making and Innovations

7. **Data Collection & Use:**

What key data collection methods should be prioritized to monitor Ukraine's reconstruction progress? How can this data be utilized to inform decision-making in real-time?

8. **Innovations in MEL:**

Are there any innovative approaches or technologies (e.g., GIS mapping, big data, remote sensing) that you think could be particularly useful in monitoring Ukraine's reconstruction?

Section V: Future Recommendations

9. Key Recommendations:

What would be your top five recommendations for Ukraine's government and international partners regarding using RBM and MEL to ensure a successful and efficient reconstruction?

LITERATURE

1. Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The practice of management*. Harper & Brothers. https://www.amazon.com/Practice-Management-Peter-F-Drucker/dp/0060878975
2. OECD DAC. (1991). *Principles for evaluation of development assistance*. OECD. https://gsdrc.org/document-library/principles-for-evaluation-of-development-assistance/
3. United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). (2005). *Norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system*. UNEG. https://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21
4. Kusek, J. Z., & Rist, R. C. (2004). *Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system: A handbook for development practitioners*. The World Bank. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/638011468766181874/pdf/A-handbook-for-development-practitioners-ten-steps-to-a-results-based-monitoring-and-evaluation-system.pdf
5. Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. The Guilford Press. https://www.guilford.com/books/Developmental-Evaluation/Michael-Quinn-Patton/9781606238721
6. Hatry, H. P. (1999). *Performance measurement: Getting results*. The Urban Institute Press. https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=PQNUNlwdbDQC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
7. Bamberger, M., Rao, V., & Woolcock, M. (2010). *Using mixed methods in monitoring and evaluation: Experiences from international development*. The World Bank. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1578113
8. Mayne, J. (2007). *Best practices in results-based management: A review of experience*.

   https://www.focusintl.com/RBM043-2007 07 UN Best Practices in Results-Based Management.pdf
9. World Bank. (2010). *The Canadian MEL system: Lessons learned from 30 years of development*. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/pt/865531468226748462/pdf/The-Canadian-monitoring-and-evaluation-M-E-system-lessons-learned-from-30-years-of-development.pdf
10. Chandler, D. (2006). *Empire in denial: The politics of state-building*. Pluto Press. https://www.plutobooks.com/9780745324289/empire-in-denial/
11. IFRC. (2012). *Post-disaster community infrastructure rehabilitation and (re)construction guidelines*. https://recovery.preventionweb.net/publication/post-disaster-community-infrastructure-rehabilitation-and-reconstruction-guidelines

12. UN DESA. (2007). *The challenges of restoring governance in crisis and post-conflict countries*. https://gsdrc.org/document-library/the-challenges-of-restoring-governance-in-crisis-and-post-conflict-countries/

13. UNDP. (2016). *Guide to local governance in fragile and conflict settings: Building a resilient foundation for peace and development*. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/Guide_Local_Governance_in_Fragile_and_Conflict_Settings.pdf

14. WB. (2023). The World Bank and Ukraine: Laying the Groundwork for Reconstruction in the Midst of War. https://www.worldbank.org/en/results/2023/11/30/the-world-bank-and-ukraine-laying-the-groundwork-for-reconstruction-in-the-midst-of-war

15. UNDP. (2024). Updated Ukraine Recovery and Reconstruction Needs Assessment. https://www.undp.org/ukraine/publications/updated-ukraine-recovery-and-reconstruction-needs-assessment