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INTRODUCTION

Since 2020, Conciliation Resources has used a tailored version of Outcome Harvesting to shed light on the impact of its peacebuilding efforts. This paper delves into the Outcome Harvesting process and presents insights and lessons gained from Conciliation Resources’ experience of using it. The paper covers:
1. What Outcome Harvesting is and why it is suited to peacebuilding
2. How Outcome Harvesting responds to the challenges of measuring peacebuilding impact
3. What Conciliation Resources’ Outcome Harvesting process looks like
4. Lessons and recommendations
1. WHAT IS OUTCOME HARVESTING AND WHY IS IT SUITED TO PEACEBUILDING?

An approach that captures rapid and non-linear change

Outcome Harvesting is an approach to monitoring and evaluation (M&E) designed for programmes operating in unpredictable, fast-changing environments. It employs ‘harvesters’ to identify, formulate, verify, analyse and interpret ‘outcomes’ of interventions in contexts where cause-and-effect relationships are complex and attributing outcomes to interventions is challenging.

Unlike many traditional evaluation approaches, Outcome Harvesting does not focus solely on assessing progress against rigid logframes and pre-established indicators. It is flexible enough to capture a range of relevant outcomes in conflict situations.

The volatile and uncertain nature of peace processes means that traditional, sequential M&E techniques often do not fully capture sudden escalations or unforeseen political and social changes in conflict-affected areas. Addressing these uncertainties requires methodologies that are adaptive and non-linear, that respect local conceptions of peace and grasp its complex dynamics, and that make evaluations useful for the intended users. Deploying and improving such approaches is not just a technical task, but one that requires willingness and investment from multiple stakeholders – from donors to policymakers, researchers, peacebuilding practitioners and data analysts.

An approach that aids adaptation

Outcome Harvesting integrates elements of ‘outcome mapping’, which focuses on behavioural change, and ‘utilisation-focused evaluation’, which aims to make evaluations as useful as possible for the intended users.

Outcome Harvesting is particularly suited for programmes that adapt their goals and strategies frequently. It stands out for its unique method of observing changes first and then determining whether and how an intervention contributed to these changes. This ‘reverse’ methodology is invaluable in changing environments, accommodating unexpected outcomes and ensuring that data collection and analysis remain relevant.

An approach that captures intangible changes

In contrast to traditional evaluation techniques, which assess progress against set goals or indicators, Outcome Harvesting considers additional influencing factors and recognises the complex and long-term nature of social change.

This makes it ideal for use in peacebuilding contexts, where results are often intangible and incremental, but where a robust framework for identifying and understanding outcomes is still needed. Outcome Harvesting can map tangible and intangible shifts in peacebuilding landscapes, gaining deeper insight into the myriad factors that influence them. The method not only evidences change but articulates how interventions contribute to this change.

While Outcome Harvesting is effective in documenting visible and straightforward changes, such as the signing of peace agreements or a rise in civic participation – key for performance reports – its real advantage lies in identifying and summarising less tangible, more difficult-to-quantify changes found in peacebuilding interventions, for example increased trust between powerholders and their constituents, improved resilience in communities, or shifts in public narratives.

Outcome Harvesting gathers evidence of changes, referred to as ‘outcomes’, and then analyses the extent of an intervention’s influence on these changes. The changes can be in behaviours, actions, relationships, policies, or practices of people and institutions impacted by an intervention, and they can be framed as positive or negative, intended or unintended, and direct or indirect.
Peace is a multifaceted concept that encompasses a range of conditions and ideals within societies, between nations, and among individuals. At its heart, peace is not just the absence of conflict, violence, or war, but also the presence of social cohesion, resilience, justice, equality, essential services, and effective dispute resolution mechanisms. It means societies where people coexist peacefully and disputes are resolved through dialogue and mutual respect, rather than coercion or violence.

Progress towards peace is not linear but prone to setbacks driven by political, economic, and social instability. It requires the commitment and cooperation of all stakeholders involved, including governments, civil society, communities, and international organisations. For peace efforts to be truly effective, they need to be inclusive, address the needs and grievances of all segments of society, and adapt to changing situations. This makes them very difficult to measure.

The main challenges in measuring peacebuilding impact are twofold:

1. **Conceptual challenges** relate to the fact that peace is difficult to define, varies by context, operates on different levels and involves diverse mandates;

2. **Practical challenges** relate to the operational realities and limitations of working in conflict-affected environments, and issues with standardised project frameworks that are ill-suited to these complex settings.

Below we set out these challenges and discuss how Outcome Harvesting – and Conciliation Resources’ approach to it – responds to them.

### Conceptual challenges

**1. Peace is contextual** – grasping the contextual complexity is critical for meaningful impact assessment.

How peace is defined and what it entails can vary widely among different ethnic, sectarian, regional, or political groups. This can make one group’s vision of peace problematic for another. Additionally, the factors that contribute to conflict are unique to each situation, and can include historical events, inter-group grievances, local and environmental stresses, regional power struggles, political pressures, and community-specific issues.

Designing indicators of change can be challenging, and to simplify this, peacebuilding indicators often focus on the reduction of violence, using mainly quantitative data. However, this tends to overlook the importance of evaluating progress in tackling the underlying causes of conflict and creating the conditions for a more sustainable and equitable peace marked by social justice and the eradication of structural violence.

**The Outcome Harvesting response**

Conciliation Resources’ Outcome Harvesting approach responds to this challenge by conducting the process with our partners – individuals, groups and organisations embedded in the conflict-affected context and communities – at every step of the process. Our partners can describe what meaningful change looks like in their specific context. This collaborative approach enables the identification and elucidation of outcomes that might otherwise go unnoticed. It ensures that the analysis of these outcomes is grounded in a comprehensive understanding of the local setting. Furthermore, the involvement of partners enriches the evaluation with a holistic view of the peacebuilding ecosystem. It brings to light the roles and contributions of various actors within the community, ensuring that the interplay of factors contributing to peace and conflict is fully considered.

**2. Peacebuilding is a long-term process** – and changes manifest slowly and initially to those living within the affected context.

Peacebuilding should lay the groundwork for lasting peace and stability through profound structural shifts within societies. This can encompass a wide range of activities, including rebuilding trust and social cohesion, transforming institutions, promoting psychological healing and reconciliation, and bolstering civil society and its ties with governmental bodies. These efforts progress gradually, demanding years, if not decades, of dedicated work and support across different societal layers, including communities, governments, and international bodies. The changes brought about are often slow to manifest and recognisable first to those most deeply familiar with the local context.
The Outcome Harvesting response
A case in point is the reduction of violence observed in quantitative data for certain areas of the Central African Republic following the Anti-balaka/Séléka conflict that flared up in 2013. While this was seemingly a positive development, the reality on the ground was different: in one community, for example, the reduction in violence was the result of a group’s forced displacement and dispossession by another. But, by monitoring relationships in a neighbouring community where no groups had been displaced, Outcome Harvesting data over time revealed more nuanced signs of progress towards peace such as an increase in peaceful interactions between conflicting groups. This was evidenced by their participation in each other’s funerals and celebrations, the coexistence of businesses owned by members of different groups in the same marketplaces, and the use of community dialogue sessions to resolve minor disputes. These gradual indicators of change, which become apparent only after prolonged engagement and continuous data collection, offer a more accurate measure of sustainable peace.

3. Building and sustaining peace involves a wide array of people operating at different levels of society, each with their unique roles, perspectives, and mandates.

This multiplicity of stakeholders means that actions and policies at one level can have significant implications at others. For example, the enforcement of a peace agreement at the international or national level can deeply influence local communities, with outcomes that can be beneficial or detrimental. Similarly, grassroots efforts that effectively foster reconciliation or inclusive growth at the local level can serve as models for or pose challenges to broader national processes. Moreover, each person measures peace from their own standpoint, based on their specific roles and objectives, which often results in a disjointed understanding of how progress at one level affects other levels.

The Outcome Harvesting response
By focusing on assessing contributions to change rather than attributing direct causation, Outcome Harvesting offers a way to understand how peace interventions deal with this complexity. It encourages the examination of social and political changes – such as shifts in leadership, policy reforms, and the dynamics between political figures and their supporters, as well as interactions with other entities like civil society and international NGOs – and considers their impact on peacebuilding outcomes. By asking, “What significant social and political developments have occurred, and how do these influence our interpretation of the outcomes?”, Outcome Harvesting helps peacebuilders identify pathways to build connections across different levels of action, providing a more integrated view of peace progress.

Practical challenges

1. Gathering data safely and reliably in areas affected by conflict.

Collecting data with local populations can expose those providing the data to risks of violence and retaliation from conflicting parties. Moreover, in environments where narratives are deeply polarised, or where inequalities are entrenched, peacebuilding efforts may be perceived as taking sides. This perception leads to extreme caution over the sharing of information.

The Outcome Harvesting response

A collaborative approach and trust are essential in mitigating these issues. Conciliation Resources’ approach to Outcome Harvesting gives local partners the role of key contributors in identifying, formulating, and analysing outcomes. They not only have physical access to areas that may be inaccessible for international organisations, but also bring contextual knowledge which is crucial for keeping those providing data safe. Partners thus assume greater ownership of the process, identifying outcomes and engaging critically with the data. This strategy represents a departure from traditional M&E methods, where partner involvement is often absent, extractive or superficial.

2. Results frameworks that fail to capture or tell the story of meaningful change

Obligations in donor contracts can require peacebuilders to adopt systems and frameworks that are ill-designed for the complex change processes inherent to peacebuilding.

While they have certain benefits for project management, these systems often rely on linear causality and direct attribution. Linear causality refers to the assumption that specific interventions lead directly to desired outcomes without significant external influences or feedback loops. Direct attribution involves trying to link outcomes exclusively to specific interventions, frequently overlooking the impact of external factors or other concurrent initiatives.

Peacebuilders recognise that the evolving and dynamic nature of conflict renders linear causality and direct attributions unfeasible. Yet, the impulse to make project plans conform to linear frameworks and to report results through single attribution statements persists. This situation leads to less meaningful evaluations that report on indicators set at a project’s inception and no longer reflect the project’s current state. Furthermore, the use of templates that are ill-suited for narrating the change story or for capturing unexpected results means that donors may not fully grasp the project’s impact.
Most critically, traditional evaluation frameworks often defer evaluation to the end of the project, offering lessons and recommendations post-implementation. Given the dynamic nature of conflict, if these recommendations are not actionable immediately, they risk becoming quickly obsolete.

**The Outcome Harvesting response**

Outcome Harvesting is a tool for evaluation, but it can be used for adaptive programming. Conciliation Resources has built Outcome Harvesting into the project cycle and day-to-day monitoring of our work, which means we encourage ongoing data collection and the recording of changes as they occur. Deeper outcome analysis happens through an annual cycle detailed in the following sections, and this approach makes data readily available to decision-makers – staff and partners – enabling responsive management. This adaptive M&E approach makes interventions more effective as well as providing a solid evidence base for planning.

In addition, when allowed by donors, we have adapted report templates to accommodate the Outcome Harvesting data. For example, rather than presenting one-line results in spreadsheets, we provide elaborated outcome statements that present a clear story of change, and link outcomes to the intervention’s theory of change and conflict analysis.

---

**3. WHAT DOES CONCILIATION RESOURCES’ OUTCOME HARVESTING PROCESS LOOK LIKE?**

Conciliation Resources’ approach to Outcome Harvesting goes hand-in-hand with our culture of evaluative thinking and knowledge-building. We use reflective spaces to challenge and improve the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of our work. In addition, we apply gendered conflict analysis in order to help us uncover different aspects and experiences of exclusion and conflict, and to generate ideas about how peacebuilding initiatives can cater to the needs of diverse groups and tackle the factors driving conflict.

---

**BOX 1: KEY DEFINITIONS**

**What is an outcome?**

An outcome is an observable change in the behaviour of individuals, groups, communities, organisations, or institutions. They are actions, activities, relationships, agendas, policies, practices of one or more societal actors influenced by an intervention.

**Who is the harvester?**

A harvester is the person or group of people responsible for periodically and systematically collecting information about changes observed as a result of the intervention.

**Who are intended users?**

Those who need the findings in order to make decisions or take actions.

**What are the intended uses?**

The decisions and actions from Outcome Harvesting serve for adapting programming, monitoring and evaluation, reporting, learning or advocacy.

**What does it mean to harvest outcomes?**

Harvesting outcomes is the identification, formulation, analysis and interpretation of outcomes to provide the needed information for the intended uses.

**A SIX-STEP PROCESS**

**Harvester**
- Members of the programme team
- Partner organisations

1. **Harvester identifies outcomes**
   - Harvester formulates outcome (including data source) and inputs the information into the online system
   - MEL team review outcomes for quality assurance and provide feedback to the programme team
   - After feedback process outcomes are modified, rejected or approved and marked as final

2. **Data collection activities**
   - Implementation and data harvesting continues the same process

3. **Design of the harvest and MEL plan (selection of data collection methods)**
   - If needed adaptations are made to the MEL plan
   - Most significant outcomes (positive/negative, expected or unexpected) are brought to the Outcome Harvesting workshop for analysis
   - If implementation continues

4. **Design of the Theory of Change (ToC)**
   - When necessary changes are made to the ToC
   - If implementation has reached the end

5. **Outcome Harvesting workshops**
   - Outcome Harvesting workshops are facilitated by the MEL team and supported by critical friends to bring reflection and learning about the outcomes, analyse their significance to progress on the ToC and programme contribution and attribution

6. **Outcomes**
   - Outcomes are used for evaluation
Step 1: Design the harvest
This step involves formulating questions based on the programme’s Theory of Change. Examples of Outcome Harvesting questions:

- Whose power has changed and how?
- To what extent are we seeing progress in relation to the intended outcomes in the Theory of Change?
- What changes are we seeing that differ from the assumed change pathways in the Theory of Change?
- How effective have our interventions been?

“Having the Theory of Change provides an essential framework in which to structure and clarify our team’s approach and ambitions.”

Step 2: Gather data and draft outcomes
In this step, harvesters identify outcomes using the many methods available to them, guided by Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) plans developed for each intervention. They formulate outcome statements crafted to generate a comprehensive description of the changes observed (see Box 2), including:

The outcome: a concise description of who did what differently, in 50 words or less, including the name of the actor, the action taken, and its timing and location.

The significance: an assessment of the importance of the change – whether the change is a new development or a substantial shift from previous patterns. Additionally, it considers the characteristics of the individuals or groups involved, such as their gender, age, ethnicity, socio-economic background, geographic location (rural or urban), abilities, and sexual or gender identities. These factors are crucial in understanding the full impact and relevance of the change within its specific context. This part also examines whether the change appears systemic and whether it has catalytic potential.

The contribution: details the programme’s influence on the change. It includes a description of activities or resources committed by Conciliation Resources and its partners to facilitate this change, acknowledging other contributors, especially those who might be less visible publicly, such as women’s groups, spouses of officials, or young people.

BOX 2: EXAMPLE OF AN OUTCOME

Title: Women’s Dialogue Space (WDS) members establish strong cross-political relationships.

Who: Women leaders from across different political, clan and socio-economic divides who are members of the Women’s Dialogue Space.

What: Members of the WDS have over time built close personal friendships that transcend political affiliations, enabling them to closely collaborate. Notable examples of these relationships include attendance at funerals of members who have lost loved ones, the contribution of gifts to newly married members of the WDS, and the fund that members created to support women electoral candidates.

When: 2022 Where: Somali Regional State, Ethiopia

Significance: The trust and close collaboration between WDS members stands in stark contrast to the intense political polarisation in the region, and to the fear, tension and mistrust between members when the WDS started out. These close relationships are enabling women to advocate and lobby from a unified position, and to show how inter-political unity can be fostered and how politics can be conducted collaboratively and constructively. Cross-political relationships have created opportunities to set common advocacy agendas on women’s political participation. This may present a platform for increased meaningful representation of Somali women at the regional and federal level.

Contribution: The need for a women’s only space to discuss peacebuilding and politics was identified in a study on barriers to women’s political participation commissioned by Conciliation Resources and conducted by partner KasmoDev. On this basis, KasmoDev led the establishment of the WDS. They facilitated sessions and training that encouraged sharing, learning and discussion between members, and supported joint initiatives. Conciliation Resources provided ongoing technical support and guidance to KasmoDev.
Step 3: Review
Outcome statements are continually reviewed by the Conciliation Resources’ MEL team to ensure they provide all required information. A MEL specialist typically facilitates this, ensuring the outcomes represent a verifiable change with a credible link to the intervention.

Step 4: Substantiate
Substantiation is key to the validity and credibility of the findings.

Not all outcomes need to be substantiated – only those that need factual corroboration as they can’t be traced to an original source. This can be done by looking for independent documentation, or testimonies from knowledgeable third parties who are familiar with the project or conflict.

Where an external evaluator is involved, they can play a key role in substantiating outcomes, including by seeking triangulation from independent parties. They review the outcomes and the contributions made by partners or Conciliation Resources and provide their agreement or feedback on the formulated outcomes.

“Outcome Harvesting helps us identify opportunities for programme adaption and address some roadblock questions.”

Step 5: Analyse
A sample of the outcomes collected throughout the year are selected for additional analysis. These cover all a programme team’s workstreams. These outcomes are discussed at the Outcome Harvesting analysis workshop, conducted annually and facilitated by the specialist MEL team. This workshop serves several key purposes:

Analysis and interpretation of outcomes: This involves a detailed examination of each outcome to understand its implications and the broader impact on the project.

Participatory reflection and discussion: Teams and partners are encouraged to present and critically reflect on the observed outcomes. This participatory approach ensures a diverse range of perspectives and insights, contributing to a more robust analysis.

Evaluative thinking: This involves rigorously challenging and scrutinising the contribution and significance of the outcome statements. This critical examination helps understand the depth and breadth of the outcomes.

Assessment of intervention effectiveness: One of the key objectives of the workshop is to assess the effectiveness of the intervention based on the outcomes. This helps identify areas of strength and those requiring improvement.

Learning and adaptation: The workshop provides an opportunity to draw key lessons from the implementation, focusing on what has worked well and what has not. These insights are crucial for adapting the programme to build on positive outcomes or to innovate in response to negative ones.

Inclusion of ‘critical friends’: The workshop also involves critical friends – internal or external experts such as peacebuilders, gender, policy, or research specialists. Acting as trusted insiders, they bring their expertise and experience to the reflection process. They pose constructive questions and help surface operational and organisational issues that need addressing.

“I enjoyed thinking through our outcomes in a structured way and receiving questions from critical friends that pushed us towards more nuanced thinking.”

Step 6: Use the findings
The findings and outcomes produced through the Outcome Harvesting process are used for:

• Testing Theory of Change and strategies
• Making informed decisions for adaptive management
• Developing learning outputs
• Reporting
• Evaluation
• Accountability
• Advocacy
• Communications and fundraising

“When approaching proposal writing, Outcome Harvesting has been an invaluable resource for identifying historic evidence of impact and demonstrating it to potential donors and other audiences. Having it organised in an easily accessible central database has made a huge impact.”
4. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since Conciliation Resources adopted Outcome Harvesting in 2020 as a new approach at the outset of our new Strategic Plan, we have found that it has both revolutionised our MEL practices and ingrained a culture of continuous learning and adaptation, allowing us to better understand the complex impact of our peacebuilding work. Our experience, evidenced by a 2022 mid-term strategic review, demonstrates that Outcome Harvesting has not only improved our operational efficiency but also aligned closely with our strategic objectives, enhancing our ability to achieve and showcase impactful peacebuilding results.

“Outcome Harvesting is a great way to slow down in our ever-busy rush, critically reflect on our collective achievements and celebrate the positive transformations that remind us about why we are working in this peacebuilding field.”

Based on the insights gained through the experience to date, we present a set of lessons and recommendations aimed at advancing the peacebuilding sector’s ability to measure impact and support organisations considering the adoption of Outcome Harvesting:

1. Integrating data collection into ongoing activities maximises value for money

Acknowledging the substantial MEL value inherent in information exchanged in ‘informal’ settings, we have embedded data collection in routine administrative meetings, casual catch-ups, advocacy trips, and various other encounters. Using these everyday interactions as opportunities for gathering insights is highly cost-effective and ensures that financial investments in peacebuilding are utilised to their fullest potential.

2. Leveraging diverse expertise makes for richer analysis

Outcome Harvesting has harnessed the broad range of expertise within Conciliation Resources and our partners. By bringing together various perspectives for impact assessment, including ‘critical friends,’ in our Outcome Harvesting workshops, we deepen our analysis, leading to more nuanced and comprehensive peacebuilding strategies.

3. The process promotes knowledge sharing on peacebuilding practice

The adoption of Outcome Harvesting has significantly promoted internal learning, facilitating an exchange of insights that enriches our approach to peacebuilding and cultivates a learning culture within the organisation. Furthermore, insights from the process have also contributed to broader peacebuilding research and policy development, shaping a better understanding of effective practices.

4. The process can support gender-transformative peace

Outcome Harvesting methodology not only helps us identify gender and inclusion-related outcomes, but also brings gendered analysis to the assessment of our work. Our Gender and MEL teams worked together to build gender into the Outcome Harvesting system and process, which is crucial for ensuring inclusivity and addressing the diverse needs present within conflict-affected contexts.

5. Decision-making is increasingly evidence-based and focused on effective strategies and interventions

Outcome Harvesting has facilitated adaptive management, ensuring our efforts are aligned with impactful outcomes. Project or programme-wide Theories of Change complement Outcome Harvesting by supporting the analysis of outcome significance and highlighting where change is or is not happening as expected. We link outcomes to our broader strategic framework in our Organisational Results Framework and goals in our Strategic Plan.

6. Effective Outcome Harvesting needs accessible digital tools

To fully integrate Outcome Harvesting as an organisational process, it is essential to invest in an accessible, user-friendly and inclusive online platform – we introduced Podio into Conciliation Resources for this purpose. This tool should simplify inputting, reviewing, and downloading outcomes, accommodating users across contexts with different technical abilities and internet speeds.
7. Train and accompany harvesters and users

All individuals involved in the process should receive training in Outcome Harvesting, covering essential aspects such as question formulation, data collection, and analytical processes, as well as on-call advice.

8. Ensure a trust-based environment for analysing impact

Nurturing trust among peacebuilders involves creating spaces where people working at all levels feel valued and heard and their contributions respected. While the process of analysing impact might sometimes be uncomfortable, it is essential that it remains a safe and supportive experience.

9. Investing in Outcome Harvesting offers organisational efficiencies

Outcome Harvesting is cost-effective. Our experience is that when an organisation makes an upfront decision and initially invests time and resources to establish the system and process, secure internal buy-in and build the necessary skills, this pays out in overall efficiency. This includes simplified reporting and donor accountability processes and readily available data for organisational communications and fundraising.

CONCLUSION

Our journey with Outcome Harvesting to date has convinced us that there are flexible, qualitative M&E approaches that can robustly evidence the impact of peacebuilding. The data gathered through these approaches can enhance other M&E systems, including quantitative frameworks. We believe that approaches like Outcome Harvesting should be promoted and embraced by peacebuilding practitioners and the donors that support them; accessible guidelines for Outcome Harvesting, as well as opportunities for the exchange of experience, challenges and lessons between peers, could help facilitate this.
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