Outcome-Oriented Methods: Methods that support measurable results and protection outcomes

- To share examples of two outcome-oriented methods that may support the development of protection strategies and program design
- To explore, through context-specific scenarios, steps that could support results-based methods

Outcome Mapping within the DRC—Shaping Program Design

Richard Nunn, Regional Protection Advisor in Horn, East and Central Africa, Oxfam

Lebanon: A field example of the benefits and challenges of using a causal logic exercise to support protection strategies and program design

Jessica Lenz, Senior Program Manager-Protection, InterAction

Facilitated by *Katrien Ringele, Technical Advisor, Protection and Rule of Law, International Rescue Committee*

---

1. **Outcome Mapping, Richard Nunn, Oxfam - [Powerpoint](#)**

2. **Outcome-Oriented Methods – Case of Lebanon, Jessica Lenz - [Powerpoint](#)**

3. **EXERCISE AND PLENARY DISCUSSION**

Participants broke into groups and explored a fictional case scenario (building on actual crises). Participants were asked to explore different outcome-oriented methods and think through a series of questions that would help them consider how such methods might be applied. They were not asked to do a causal logic or outcome mapping, but to consider where the entry points would be, to consider how current structures are set up, resources available, actors present to engage, and various dynamics they would need to take into consideration if such methods were to be used. Participants considered the process and steps needed to determine whether such a method could by applied within the context.

Although all the scenarios are the same, each group has a slight twist. For example, one group was asked to look at the use of outcome-oriented methods with a strong civil society and then to consider how this would be affected if civil society were weak. Another faced a protection issue prioritized by the HC and considered what changes might need to happen if the issue was not prioritized.

Challenges:
- To make protection **multidisciplinary** then we need to be able to explain in plain language that is not too academic
- Understanding of **when to use** certain methods and **overlap** between methods
- Certain methods may be **more suitable for clock** (causal logic)/**cloud** (outcome mapping)
- Outcome mapping seems to be more **planning tool**, you need to do the analysis first
- The key is **how you go about the analysis**: problem-focused and wide-range of different factors considered.
- Tools **don't have to be mutually exclusive** in their use
- **Varying degrees of understanding** about tools reflects challenges in the field
- These methods are good for **linking input to outcome**, but don't necessarily help determine what the outcome should be
- Do you come to the process **to determine outcomes**? Or should you already have predetermined outcomes? The answer is most likely both and you should always be prepared to refine the desired outcome
- To what degree do different methods allow you to **prioritize different outcomes**?

Opportunities:
- Not a linear process – can help you **refine plans** and **challenge assumptions**
- **Challenge your assumptions**, including pre-determined / default vulnerable groups / vulnerabilities
- Being more **efficient**

- Help to facilitate joint efforts/**move in the same direction**, when coming from different policy positions, although this does take time
- Process may bring in **multiple voices**, more relevant, and direct information
- Opportunity to move away from agency perspective and look at **bigger picture**, designing for comprehensive protection response; establish changes you want to see and how to contribute
- Civil society – can be used to identify **opportunities to build relationships**
- Can help get development and **other actors to the table**
- Does causal logic etc. help construct a narrative that allows others to get on board? Does it offer a way to talk about the issues without using abstract tools?
- We need to be able to 'make the case' / demonstrate the value of this approach, these methods, to package it and communicate

Benefits:
- Outcome mapping benefit from identification of boundary partners and contributions to outcome
- Methods good at establishing link between inputs and outputs, attribution and contribution; seems we are missing a step / link?
- Outcome methods potential to clarify logic and present this clearer to donors and other stakeholders

How to do it in practice:
- Clusters should **lead on analysis**
- There is value in **getting more actors (right people with the right capacities) to commit** to an exercise on outcome mapping.
- Where leadership is not clear, would **need to identify a lead agency**
- Need **commitment to 'follow through'** (including resources etc.), therefore must include donors
- Causal logic is about **constructing the narrative**
- Need the right people to **drive these conversations** otherwise people won't come back
- Need to make the case in messaging to **demonstrate why this approach is different**
- Need to **package tools to make them accessible** e.g. for HNO.
- Should bring **M&E experts** into the discussion
- More guidance of which tools to be used when