

Annex 03 Outcome Harvesting Method and Process

1. Introduction

The purpose of the PITCH evaluation is to facilitate a critical analysis of the programme's contribution to evidence-based changes, in relation to the PITCH programmatic goals and advocacy strategies. Outcome harvesting was used to assess the outcomes to which the PITCH programme has contributed, as well as the impact and sustainability of the outcomes. Outcome Harvesting identifies outcomes as behavioural changes in social actors other than PITCH partners but influenced (not controlled) by PITCH. A sample of the harvested outcomes was used by ResultsinHealth to develop stories of change that gave insight into the processes contributing to the outcomes, relevance of the outcomes from the perspectives of the key populations and adolescent girls and young women targeted by PITCH, and other relevant changes such as changes in context. The desk review of the PITCH advocacy logs played an important role in supporting this process. The evaluation team sought to harvest the most significant outcomes that emerged in the period January 2016 – July 2020, in order to respond to evaluation questions 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4 in the evaluation terms of reference (ToR). In consultation with the PITCH Monitoring and Evaluation Lead, a design of the outcome harvesting process was made. This included harvesting questions, roles and responsibilities, as well as an explanation of the harvesting choices made in this evaluation. In line with the methodology, the outcome harvesting steps were thus tailored to the needs of the users.

2. Harvesting questions

The evaluation questions from the PITCH ToR for which the outcome harvesting methodology was used have been further specified into the following harvesting questions:

Harvesting questions	Evaluation questions from PITCH ToR
1. What are the -positive and negative, intended and unintended - outcomes and how do they demonstrate (potential) significant progress towards equal access for all to HIV-related services, to sexual reproductive health rights (SRHR) for all, to equal and full rights for Key Populations?	1.1 Which significant advocacy outcomes has PITCH made a measurable contribution to? To what extent does evidence exist to support these claims of contribution?
2. What did PITCH (Aidsfonds, Frontline AIDS and implementing partners) do that contributed to these outcomes and how adaptive have they been in response to outcomes achieved and changes in context	1.2 How has PITCH contributed to any positive or negative unexpected outcomes? What lessons have been learned, and how have these unexpected outcomes influenced partners' advocacy planning?
4. What are the indications that the (processes of) change that PITCH contributed to, will sustain beyond the lifetime of the programme and in the absence of significant external funding?	1.4 Reflecting on structural and legislative changes, how sustainable are the achievements of PITCH beyond the programme's lifetime, and in the absence of significant external funding?

3. Roles and responsibilities

Conny Hoitink: As Outcome Harvesting specialist on the evaluation team, Conny oversaw the identification and formulation of outcomes, as well as the substantiation of a selection of those outcomes with external knowledgeable stakeholders. These stakeholders included the actors whose behaviour changed, as well as government officials or allies in the process such as colleagues or organisations with whom PITCH has collaborated. Conny participated in the selection of and training of the national consultants, supporting them

online during their outcome harvesting reflection meetings, as well as during the preparation and follow up process. Conny facilitated the pilot reflection workshop, which was held online with partners from Kenya. Based upon the Kenya experience, Conny adjusted and finalised the methodology, including the workshop agenda and guidance for the national consultants. The Kenya experience gave a better understanding of the PITCH programme which was useful for later analysis and the interpretation of outcomes from all countries. In addition, Conny facilitated the reflection workshop with representatives from the PITCH Global Policy programme. Conny led the analysis of the harvested outcomes and shared the finalized outcome statements with her ResultsinHealth colleagues in preparation for the development of the stories of change. Conny led the process of interpreting the harvested outcomes as part of the data analysis phase in which the Netherlands-based evaluation team worked the PITCH country focal points, the M&E Working Group and the Programme Team.

National consultants: the national consultants participated in the outcome harvesting training and carried out a literature review in preparation for the outcome harvesting exercise. They then facilitated the reflection meetings with partners from the countries in which they were based, and went on to facilitate the substantiation process. They then worked to categorise the outcomes in an excel database, and provided a report with all finalized, agreed, partially substantiated and categorized harvested outcomes.

PITCH Country Focal Points (CFP): The CFP served as the key country level contact for the national and international evaluation consultants. Questions about potential outcome statements were posed to the CFP who was able to channel requests for information through to the most knowledgeable partner representatives. The CFP also supported the national consultants with logistical arrangements, while also guiding the selection of workshop participants. CFPs also worked with partners to discuss the possibility of inviting PITCH allies to the reflection meetings, where they saw this as relevant and helpful to support the outcome harvesting process. The CFPs also played a supporting role in the categorization of the outcome statements.

PITCH implementing partners: Partner staff participated in the reflection workshops as outcome sources, i.e. the people best positioned to reflect and comment on the outcomes contributed to by PITCH. Due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, partners were mostly involved in this process online, both in the context of planning and following up after the reflection meetings.

PITCH M&E Working Group: The M&E Lead has been the first point of contact for the evaluation team when discussing modifications and specifications to the evaluation design. They participated in the online data interpretation working session in September 2020, which was facilitated by the evaluation team. The PITCH M&E Working Group was involved in decisions throughout the outcome harvesting process.

PITCH Programme Team: The Programme Team participated in the interpretation work session.

4. Outcome harvesting activities

- a. **Recruitment** of national consultants in nine countries with outcome harvesting experience. The ToR for the recruitment can be found in Annex 03a.
- b. **Training and coaching of national consultants.** Conny Hoitink coached the national consultants in this process through the use of 90-minute webinars. The training involved:
 - i. Preparation by the national consultants, which involved a desk review of PITCH annual and country reports, advocacy logs, and Mid Year Change reports, as well as relevant literature on the Outcome Harvesting methodology. National consultants were tasked with extracting two potential outcome statements and identify information gaps
 - ii. Webinar 1
 - a) Short Conceptual explanation about outcome harvesting
 - b) Presentation of the PITCH evaluation: objectives, process, tasks
 - c) Discussion of the outcome statements prepared by the consultants, review

- d) Reflection. Focus on specificity (eg gender and KP disaggregated data; collaboration between partners at different (country/region/global) levels and with MoFa; engagement with non-HIV/KP/AGYW related CSOs).
 - e) Agree on homework: Engage with informants – CFP in the first place- to arrive at good quality outcome statements
 - iii. National consultants refined the initial outcome statements by engaging with informants over email or via skype during and after the training, and prior to the reflection meeting. Conny coached the national consultants individually through email and used Skype to share feedback.
 - iv. Webinar 2 (90 mins)
 - a) Collective review of the revised outcome statements.
 - b) Reflection: What makes a good quality outcome?
 - c) Substantiation
 - d) Categorisation
 - e) Reporting
 - f) Facilitating the workshop – discuss the draft workshop outline, preparations and logistical needs (consider inviting the CFP)
- c. **Desk review:** National consultants harvested potential outcome statements from the annual reports, Mid-Year Change reports, and advocacy logs and prepare input for the workshop.
- d. **Selection of workshop participants.** Participants were selected based on their involvement in implementing the programme, and thus their knowledge about potential outcomes. The CFP in consultation with key staff opted to invite external key informants, such as a beneficiary or an advocacy target with whom they engaged.
- e. **Pilot reflection workshop in Kenya** facilitated by Conny.
- f. **Finalised guide for national consultants** to guide the facilitation of the reflection workshops and work towards finalized, agreed, partly substantiated and categorized outcome statements. After the first reflection workshop in Kenya, Conny developed a proposal for analyzing the outcomes in categories that can be used by all countries. After agreeing on the categories with the M&E working group and the Kenya CFP, the tool for categorising outcome statements was made.
- g. **Reflection workshops** for PITCH partners in each of the nine PITCH countries, as well as at the Global Policy level. All meetings took place in June and July 2020, while representatives from the regional programme partners joined in with the Zimbabwe (Southern Africa partners) and Ukraine (EECA partners) reflection meetings. The majority of meetings were carried out online and used Zoom, while only Vietnam and Myanmar conducted their meetings face-to-face. The face-to-face meetings took two days while the online meetings were adapted to three or four sessions totaling an average of 12 hours with individual or small group work in between sessions. For the online meetings, participants were supported with airtime, data bundles and in some instances, laptops were hired to support participation. The selection of the reflection meeting participants was done in consultation with the PITCH Country Focal Point with the aim to have 2 persons per partner participating. On average, each reflection meeting had 20-25 participants.

The outcome harvesting methodology ensures that for each and every outcome, a plausible link between the outcome and the contribution of PITCH is identified and described in a verifiable way. This was done during and after the reflection meetings with PITCH partners where they were guided to formulate outcomes and to describe convincingly what they did to contribute to those outcomes. In this process, PITCH partners used their own records (usually their annual country reports and to a varying extent their advocacy logs), online research, and had conversations with contacts with external stakeholders in order to refine their outcome statements. Guiding questions from the evaluators helped steer this process. The evaluation team found that A total of 80 outcomes include evidence by either a weblink (e.g. to a law or policy) or additional sources in the form of names of people, documents such as formal invitations, Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) or partner annual reports. These

documents were used by the evaluators to assess the validity of the outcome. However, in some countries such as Mozambique or Nigeria certain partners had to rely mostly on their memories as they did not have access to a reliable record of monitoring data. This may have influenced the outcomes that have and have not been harvested.

Additional evidence was obtained through the substantiation process, which was intended to enhance the credibility of the outcomes. Stakeholders who are independent to PITCH, yet knowledgeable about the programme were asked for their degree of agreement with the outcome description, its significance as well as PITCH contribution to the outcome. It was beyond the scope of this evaluation to actually verify all outcomes but a total of 39 outcomes were put forward for substantiation. The full substantiation process is described in detail in Annex 4 Substantiation Process. While the main purpose of substantiation was to enhance credibility of the outcomes, additional valuable insights were also obtained.

This evaluation did not systematically identify the contribution of other advocates and other stakeholders to outcomes harvested by PITCH partners. This is not standard practice in outcome harvesting, given that it entails significant additional data collection. In most if not all advocacy programmes, several actors and factors contribute to outcomes. While we do not know exactly what these contributions were, we do know that in most cases, these outcomes are the result of collaborative efforts with other, non-PITCH actors. Each outcome presented in this section is referred to with (*# ID number*) and has been contributed to by PITCH partners in a plausible and verifiable way. For a full description of these outcomes, including their significance and what PITCH exactly did to contribute to the outcomes, please see annexes 5a (substantiated outcomes) and 5b (non-substantiated outcomes). Also, the section/chapter in the evaluation report on EQ 1.3 explains more about the details of the PITCH contribution to these outcomes.

- h. Analysis: categorisation of outcomes.** Outcomes were categorized (in excel) and developed in consultation with the PITCH M&E Lead. Draft outcome categories were developed following the desk review, and included: the PITCH goal to which the outcome contributes; the type of actor that has changed (eg inter/national/local government, CSOs, KP, health workers); a change in policy/practice/investment, the KP (sex worker, drug user, LGBTI, AGYW, MSM) concerned in the outcome, and the type of strategy PITCH has used and level of sustainability. These were further developed once a body of harvested outcomes had been made available, which was after the first reflection meeting. Having allowed for the modification of categories once insight was gained, a set of categories was settled on that was considered relevant for all PITCH partners and colleagues participating in the outcome harvesting process.
- i. Substantiation** took place once the harvested outcomes have been finalized (completed, reviewed, and assessed by the OH consultant as of good quality). See Annex 04 for the details about the substantiation process.
- j. Analysis and interpretation of the harvested outcomes.** At this stage, the harvested, substantiated and categorized outcomes and their significance were the basis to answer the harvesting questions
 - 1) *What are the -positive and negative, intended and unintended - outcomes and how do they demonstrate (potential) significant progress towards equal access for all to HIV-related services, to sexual reproductive health rights (SRHR) for all and/or to reduced stigma and criminalization of sex workers, LGBTI and drug users?*
 - 2) *What did PITCH (Aidsfonds, Frontline AIDS and implementing partners) do that contributed to these outcomes? and*
 - 3) *What are the indications that the (processes of) change that PITCH contributed to, will sustain beyond the lifetime of the programme and in the absence of significant external funding?*

During this process of sensemaking, the evaluation team looked to identify patterns and processes of change. The harvested outcomes were also used to support the development of nine stories of change, and the subsequent analysis of the response to evaluation questions 1.3, 1.5-1.8 and evaluation question 2.6. An analysis of the contribution made by PITCH partners to the harvested outcomes allowed the evaluation team to answer evaluation question 1.3 *'Which PITCH advocacy strategies have been most effective in allowing PITCH partners to achieve their advocacy asks? What lessons can be learned from this?'*

5. Tools

- Detailed agenda and facilitation guide for online training of country consultants
- Detailed agenda and facilitation guideline for the reflection workshops including PowerPoint presentation and categorisation of outcome statements
- Guideline for substantiation by country consultants
- Excel database with harvested outcomes, categorization and substantiation

6. Definitions

- *Outcome*: A change in a societal actor's behavior – in the actions, activities, relationships, policies or practices of an individual, group, community, organisation or institution.
- *Outcome statement*: The written formulation of (a) who changed what, when and where and (b) how the intervention plausibly influenced them. May include the outcome's significance, context, contribution of other actors, history and other information if it is useful. NB: in the PITCH evaluation we only include the outcome's significance and contribution.
- *Substantiator*: Informant, knowledgeable about the outcome but independent from PITCH, who is asked to confirm the substance of an outcome statement. *Sustainability* The continuation of benefits from a development intervention once it has been completed.

7. Outcome Harvesting Tool and Outcome example

PITCH Outcome Statements

Name of the person:

Date:

#	Positive Outcomes	Significance of the Outcome	PITCH' contribution to the Outcome	Sources	Substantiators
	In 1–2 sentences please specify when did who do what , and where , that potentially or actually represents progress towards equal access for all to HIV-related services; to sexual reproductive health rights (SRHR) for all and/or to reduced stigma and criminalization of people who use drugs, LGBTI persons, Sex Workers, and Adolescent Girls and Young Women .	In another 1-2 sentences, please describe why the outcome represents progress towards sustainable change, that is, achieving equal access for all to HIV-related services; to sexual reproductive health rights (SRHR) for all and/or to reduced stigma and criminalization of people who use drugs, LGBTI persons, Sex Workers, and Adolescent Girls and Young Women	Again briefly, describe how and when PITCH activities or outputs influenced the outcome. What did you do that directly or indirectly, in a small to large way, intentionally or not contributed to the change?	Name of person or document who provided the information and date they did so.	Name and contact (phone, email) of 3 independent knowledgeable persons who can substantiate the outcome statement.
1					
2					
3					
4					

<< ADD ROWS IF NECESSARY >>

If all the outcomes you have identified are positive, that is they represent progress towards equal access for all to HIV-related services; to sexual reproductive health rights (SRHR) for all and/or to reduced stigma and criminalization of sex worker, LGBTI and sex workers, are there any others that undercut, weaken, impair or otherwise undermine achieving these objectives? Please formulate them below.

#	Negative Outcomes	Relevance of the Outcome	PITCH' contribution to the Outcome	Sources	Substantiators
	In 1–2 sentences please specify when did who do what , and where , that potentially or actually <u>undermines</u> achieving equal access for all to HIV-related services; to sexual reproductive health rights (SRHR) for all and/or to reduced stigma and criminalization of people who use drugs, LGBTI persons, Sex Workers, and Adolescent Girls and Young Women.	In another 1-2 sentences, please describe why the outcome is undermining progress towards equal access for all to HIV-related services; to sexual reproductive health rights (SRHR) for all and/or to reduced stigma and criminalization of people who use drugs, LGBTI persons, Sex Workers, and Adolescent Girls and Young Women	Again briefly, describe how and when PITCH activities or outputs influenced the outcome. What did you do that directly or indirectly, in a small to large way, intentionally or not contributed to the change?	Name of person or document who provided the information and date they did so.	Name and contact (phone, email) of 3 independent knowledgeable persons who can substantiate the outcome statement.
1					
2					
3					
4					

<< ADD ROWS IF NECESSARY >>