IOCOM Chair/ President’s Message

The second issue of volume 02 is continuing to provide articles under the theme of “A holistic approach to Business and Organisational viability”.

On June 6, 2016, the Treasury Board of Canada announced the new Policy on Results and Resource Alignment. The intent of the policy is improving the achievement and enhancing the understanding of results the government Canada plans to achieve, does achieve and the resources used to do so. This Policy takes effect on July 1, 2016 and replaces the policies on Reporting of Federal Institutions and Corporate Interests to Treasury Board Secretariat (2007), Evaluation (2009); and Management, Resources and Results Structures (2010) and all associated directives and standards.

The objectives of this policy are to implement policies, programs and services that contribute to outcomes that benefit Canadians and the contributions to outcomes are demonstrated through evidence-based public evaluation and reporting.

The expected results or outcomes of this policy is to ensure government agencies and departments are: focused on outcomes meaningful to Citizens, actively generate and use performance measurement and evaluation information for continuous improvement, innovation and reporting. Funding decisions are clearly linked to departmental outcomes and are informed by measurement and evaluation information on past performance, spending is periodically reviewed and, where called for, realigned to ensure that funds are allocated to maximize government contribution to outcomes, and Parliamentarians and Canadians are provided with clear information about what government does and its contribution to outcomes.

The renewed policy reflects key government commitments and is an important instrument building a culture of measurement, evaluation and innovation in program and policy design and delivery. It will enable Cabinet Committees and ministers to track and report on progress of government commitments, assess the effectiveness of the work done and align resources with priorities in order to get the benefits (results and outcomes) citizens deserve.

The policy brings four elements that are required by government organizations to implement. First organizational Results or Outcome Framework focused on what the organization is doing, its core responsibilities that influence the outcomes and in what manner they will assess progress using indicators and evaluations. Second, is taking an inventory of programs that show how the organization fulfills its core responsibilities focused on understanding the delivery mechanisms. Third, developing program performance information profiles that focus on the key information to be measured and tracked for program management. The final element is renewed evaluation approaches which facilitates the practice that provides more flexibility and transparency in evaluation planning and improve the impact of evaluation on delivery and results or outcomes, while maintaining sufficient oversight for accountability. The Canadian experience in implementing the new Policy on Results will have an impact on governments worldwide. All governments have to deliver on the priorities that benefit their citizens.
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A policy framework on results and resource alignment is a key instrument to create an outcome or results based organizational culture for success. In this issue IDD is focused on the use of Scorecard as an organizational learning tool which allows you to compare current performance information metrics with what was planned. Social Impact Bonds (SIB), a relatively new social financial instrument which offers a market niche and a challenge for Outcome Management Professionals. SIBs contribute to the triple bottom line of governments, financial institutions, and investors if designed and implemented well. We also have an article on a success story about Designing and Implementing a Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation System in the Agricultural Research Council of Pakistan. Then we have a thought provoking very short discussion on the concept of “Glass Ceiling”. The authors claim that it is our “mind set standing as a rock doe not let the aspirations and vision of the affected people to pass through and create success”. The final article talks about “Developing Innovations Culture for achieving sustainable development goals”. The author highlights how crucial innovation culture is for socio-economic development of any country. It is my great pleasure to sharing this issue with you.

The Editorial team values your feedback. We encourage all of you to write short articles for future issues of IDD.

Sandiran Premakanthan
Social Impact Bond Model for achieving Social Outcomes – A Market Niche and a Challenge for Outcome Management Professionals

Sandiran Premakanthan
sandiran.premakanthan@iocomsa.org

Introduction

At the South African Monitoring and Evaluation (SAMEA) Conference in September 2013 in Johannesburg, I presented an overview of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs), a relatively new social financial instrument. During the question and answer session, I posed a challenge to outcome management professionals and evaluators on their readiness to exploit this new market opportunity worth billions of dollars. This article provides an overview of SIBs including benefits and challenges in SIB design, implementation and in evaluating success and payment. It discusses the current status of SIBs worldwide and readiness issues of outcome management and evaluation professionals to take advantage of the SIB business opportunity.

Four Step Common SIB Model

SIB is a contract between government, private investors and social services agencies (non-profit, charities, and social enterprises). The contract is a commitment made to pay for increased social outcomes to be accomplished within a designated time frame (performance results) that ensure value for money and public sector savings.

- **Step 1: A contract is negotiated:** In the contract, a government agrees to pay a rate of return on invested capital for improved social outcomes.
- **Step 2: The investor(s) fund the service — often but not always — through an intermediary:** Based on the contract, an upfront investment is raised, of which the majority will be used to fund the service delivery work.
- **Step 3: The social service delivery organization(s) receive(s) the funds to address the social issue:** Providers work with beneficiary population to deliver a program and report progress.
- **Step 4: An independent evaluator determines if outcomes are achieved:** Based on the degree to which the social outcome is achieved, government pays (via intermediary or directly to) the investors as specified in the contract.
Social finance is a term that refers to a range of instruments, including social impact bonds (SIB) and the related development impact bond (DIB), which blends public and private money to tackle tough social problems. SIB encourages outcome achievement by making repayment contingent upon success. It has been proposed as an innovative way to entice private investors to fund social services in addressing some of these challenges.

The world’s first SIB was introduced in the United Kingdom (UK) in September 2010. The Peterborough case as it was known is a brand-new type of social financial instrument. The UK SIB is targeted at reducing criminal reoffending rates. It impacted 3,000 short term prisoners serving less than 12 months, receiving intensive interventions both in prison and in the community. Target for payment for results (success) is 7.5% reduction in the rate of reoffending.

Source: The Potential and Limitations of Impact Bonds: Lessons from the First Five Years of Experience Worldwide
Global Economy and Development Program – BROOKINGS

SIB Pioneers and Followers - World’s First SIB Model

SIBs are also known as a Pay for Success Bond in the United States of America (USA) or a Social Benefit Bond in Australia. In May 2013, Canada in response to the perpetual shortage of funding for a wide range of social needs, announced its commitment to the use of social impact bonds.

Current Status of SIBs Worldwide

According to the Global Development at Brookings study of November, 2015, there are 38 active SIBs implemented in developed countries to address social issues ranging from providing high-quality preschool education, reduction of prison recidivism, avoiding foster care placement, and increasing youth employment. As of March 1, 2015, the highest number of 24 SIBs is found in the country of origin the UK followed by the USA with 7 SIBs. In continental Europe the first SIB was implemented in Germany and the Netherlands followed by Belgium and Portugal. Australia has implemented two SIBs and Canada has developed one in the province of Ontario.
As of March 1, 2015 there were two active impact bond funds in the world, the Innovation Fund and the Fair Chance Fund, both in the U.K. In addition, in March of 2015 the UK Youth Engagement fund was launched. These funds aim at improving education, employment and housing outcomes for youth in general including the homeless. A total of 21 SIBs were funded by these funds from April 2012 to March 2015.

There is one DIB contracted in a transitioning country. In April 2015, in Rajasthan India a DIB for girl’s education was signed.

**Benefits of SIBs - Ten Common Claims about SIBS**

Based on a comprehensive review of literature on SIBs, the Brookings Study (November, 2015) identified 10 common claims about what they are able to achieve.

1. Crowd-in private funding is a two part claim, additional capital from the same private sources and fresh capital from new and different investors.
2. Prioritize prevention services rather than the traditional remedial interventions.
3. A government pays only if the SIB is demonstrably successful. By design the third party investor bears all the risk of services being potentially ineffective.
4. The design demands evidence and metrics driven results approach to addressing social issues. It encourages key stakeholders to shift focus to outcomes.
5. Helps to achieve scale by providing access to growth capital to allow service providers to serve larger populations. Social venture capitalist and financial intermediaries act as enablers.
6. Have the ability to foster innovative social services delivery.
7. Drive performance management which in turn leads to the achievement of outcomes.
8. Service delivery providers with a common social objective could work collaboratively to solve the issue.
9. Build a culture of outcome management, measurement, monitoring, evaluation and continuous improvement.
10. The SIB design harnesses the expertise of participating organizations and sustains impacts.

**Challenges in SIB design, implementation and in evaluating success and payment**

The design of SIBS is complex and time consuming. Some of the design elements including sufficiently high net benefits, a well-defined treatment population and quantifiable (well defined metrics and goal) outcomes driven service delivery are essential for success. The ability to directly attribute outcomes to intervention is a key to the design of SIBs.
However, there are a number of challenges in isolating the contributory cause linked to a quantifiable outcome. Further, determining success based on a predetermined metric and a threshold for payment in a contract could be challenging.

One of the barriers in convincing investors to put their money into social impact investments is the need for a standard and reliable set of metrics to quantify social impacts for rewarding investors.

Government must have detailed understanding of quantifiable savings to benefit from issuing SIBs. The price the government is willing to pay investors for social outcomes achieved must substantially outweigh the cost the government would incur if they were not. Quantifiable savings associated with the outcomes must be clearly understood in setting the price or reward. Experts believe that the potential problems include the obsession with quantifiable performance outcomes. The unreasonable pressure that the funding formula can create to achieve outcomes that may be unattainable within the time frame set out to reward investors with the expected return for their investments.

Social impact bonds must allow several years for achieving positive outcomes. Private investors will have to be patient with their capital if these bonds are to become serious instruments to support real social change.

A credible assessment system to determine payment for success is another important design criterion. Well-designed independent evaluations could help gather conclusive evidence to determine the extent to which service delivery organizations achieved the desired social outcome results (goals).

Potential investors, intermediaries and service delivery organizations may face legal and administrative barriers as SIB is still an infant concept. There are upfront costs for legal advice and due diligence. These costs are most likely to diminish with the maturity of the SIB concept.

**Key findings from the first five years of experience worldwide**
A study by Global Economy and Development at Brookings (November, 2015) findings concluded that SIBs are:

- Focused on a handful of sectors and problems with certain characteristic;
- Have the potential to contribute to the improvement of social service delivery though thus far the deals have been complex and time- and expertise-intensive;
- Have an enormous variation in the deals with respect to the structure, mechanics, and stakeholder roles, demonstrating a great deal of flexibility;
- Rigorous (experimental or quasi-experimental) evaluations of the SIB interventions were not always necessary for measuring impact and determining repayment;
From the 38 SIBS studied, four factors came out as key to getting a deal together: measurable outcomes; evidence of intervention impact; government support; and dedication and collaboration of the stakeholders. However, each of these factors varied in importance.

The examination of 10 claims about the potential of impact bonds five years into their development, find that many of these claims do indeed hold true.

The existing individual impact bond deals are not achieving substantial scale in absolute terms, but impact bond funds can achieve greater scale.

Prospects are bright for the development of more impact bonds (or some derivative of them) worldwide, though this will take substantial effort on the part of many stakeholders. The challenges are likely to be much larger in developing country contexts; and,

It is very likely that the impact bond model development process, structure, and application will continue to be adapted in the future.

**Market Niche for Outcome Management Professionals**

SIB is a relatively new increasingly experimented social financial instrument. There is a market niche for outcome management professionals in designing and negotiating payment for results contracts. However, there is a need to further explore and to define the role of outcome management practitioners in the design and in evaluating success for payment of these initiatives in Canada, and in countries where SIBs were pioneered.

This brings me to the question of the readiness of Outcome Management Practitioner’s to take on the challenge of competing with Social Value Accredited Practitioners who belong to a global community referred to as Social Value International.

**Social Value International**

Social Value International UK is a membership organization with a common goal: to change the way society accounts for value. It specializes in social value measurement and analysis, to refine and share practice, and to build a powerful movement of like-minded people to influence policy. Members could become accredited practitioners by completing the required training in Social Return on Investment (SROI) and submitting a Social Impact Report for assurance to be assessed against the seven principles of social value.
Concluding Remarks

I think Outcome Management practitioners need to acquire new knowledge and skills in social finance and social value measurement, analysis and accounting. Membership and accreditation of a recognized professional body will facilitate the entry to the SIB market. Career advancement may also require a Master’s in Business Administration with specialization in social finance and associated body of knowledge.

Relevant resources


Reports on Social Impact Bonds

- From Investment To Impact: The NFP Experience With Social Impact Bonds https://mowatcentre.ca
Using your Scorecard as an Organizational Learning Tool
Gregory Richards, MBA, Ph.D, FCMC

Introduction
Scorecards, dashboards, and visualization are terms used to refer to the visual display of performance data. Although the terms are often used interchangeably, I use “scorecard” to refer to a visual display that contains information about current performance versus what was initially planned. This is because in my view, a scorecard is used to keep score, which implies drawing conclusions about how the organization is doing versus some pre-established standard. The best and highest use of a scorecard is to trigger single and double-loop organizational learning.

Learning from scorecards through Horizontal and Vertical Analysis
To be used as a learning tool, scorecards should be structured to mirror the performance expectations of the organization. In this case, indicators at lower levels of the scorecard represent activities, processes and resources that managers think will influence the strategic goals of the organization. Indicators for these strategic goals should be identified at the top of the scorecard. This structure permits the scorecard to be used as a learning tool by generating questions about operational activities that lead to strategic success. Two different types of analyses are possible: horizontal and vertical.

Table 1: Sample Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Satisfication rating</td>
<td>Score on client satisfaction survey</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational processes</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Percentage of time billable</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Percentage of projects within 1 standard deviation of expected completion time</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Billed/Worked</td>
<td>Ratio of hours billed to hours worked</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Percentage of re work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Attrition rate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horizontal analysis
I will use the sample scorecard card in Table 1 to illustrate these analytic approaches. The basic steps in Horizontal Analysis include:
1. calculating all variances;
2. identifying the historical trend;
3. forecasting future behaviour; and
4. taking corrective measures as needed.

You can see in Table 1 that a number of variances exist. The “variance” column shows the raw difference between the target and actual results. The “variance %” column converts this variance into a percentage. The percentage column allows us to compare variances across all indicators to identify those that might be of key importance. The colour coding uses 10% variance as the threshold to determine that a variance is in the “red zone” and therefore in need of attention. Note that the largest variances might not necessarily be the ones most critical at any point in time and, just because a variance is “green” does not mean we should ignore it. I’ll return to these points later.

For now, let’s focus our attention on the attrition gap noted in the last row in Table 1. In 2013, the average attrition rate across all industries was approximately eight percent.\(^1\) This organization aims to outperform this rate by two percent (they have set a target of six percent). The actual attrition rate is three percent, which beats the benchmark by five percentage points. Attrition is a cost for organizations, so clearly a low attrition rate helps to contain operating costs. At the same time, new employees tend to bring in fresh ideas, so a trade-off is implied by the target.

The PWC report\(^1\) indicates that the industry attrition rate for high-performing employees was approximately four percent. Therefore, a deeper analysis of who was leaving and who was staying would help managers better understand the meaning of this variance. The point here is this: just because a target is being met or exceeded doesn’t mean we can or should ignore it. Further analysis is always a good idea. A look at the historical pattern of attrition to understand if the trend is increasing or decreasing would help. Furthermore, based on historical data, a forecast can be created to get an idea of the likely movement of the trend.

Vertical analysis
The steps in vertical analysis include:
1. identify the variance;

---
2. identify linkages between the indicator and other indicators on the scorecard;
3. estimate the relationships between the indicators; and
4. take corrective action as needed

Examination of the vertical linkages between indicators can help validate an organization’s performance logic. Consider again the attrition rate noted in Table 1. The key linkage here is that a lower attrition rate likely leads to high quality work as measured by the percentage of re-work indicator. This linkage might result from the fact that long-term employees build strong relationships with clients and therefore understand their needs. If so, a low attrition rate might be a powerful leading indicator of quality work. Given that on the scorecard in Figure 1 the quality indicator variance is also positive (only 1% of re-work is required compared to the target of 3%), the hypothesis that low attrition influences quality work appears to be supported by the data.

The variances for operational processes however, are red. One might therefore ask whether employees are spending too long on client files because of these long-term relationships. Might it instead be a good idea to rotate clients among employees? There’s a risk in doing this because clients are often reluctant to change service providers. Alternatively, perhaps the level of quality being delivered means that a certain amount of inefficiency is to be expected and therefore the operational process targets should be adjusted. These and other strategic questions could be examined in more detail by collecting and analyzing data over several time periods permitting managers to compare trends in attrition to trends in some of the other indicators on the scorecard. Corrective action in this case often includes adjusting targets or realigning expected relationships among the indicators.

A final point needs to be made about the distinction between performance indicators and key performance indicators (KPIs) to explain why the largest variances might not necessarily be those that we would pay attention to first. Some indicators are deemed “mission critical” and are therefore designated as KPIs. For example, the attrition rate indicator could be a KPI for professional services organizations because each employee develops a network of client contacts. If the employee leaves the organization these clients might follow. It is a good idea to flag KPIs present on the scorecard and spend a bit more time exploring the implications of their associated variances on the organization’s long-term viability.

**Single and Double-Loop Learning**

In both horizontal and vertical analysis, managers learn about the impact of the activities they conduct in the organization to achieve results. Different levels of learning are implicated characterized by Chris Argyris and Donald Schon as “single-loop” and “double-loop” learning.²

Single-loop learning focuses on improving the ways things are currently being done, it seeks to examine whether the organization is “doing things right”. Horizontal analysis explores this issue because it highlights processes that need to be improved in order to close gaps noted between actual and targeted performance. In contrast, double-loop learning examines whether the organization is “doing the right things”. Vertical analysis generates this type of learning because it addresses the organization’s overall performance logic. For instance, the attrition rate targets discussed earlier might be called into question given the apparent longer term impact on the organization’s productivity. Alternatively, if the organization wants to maintain these attrition rate targets, then the efficiency-related targets might need to change. A well-designed scorecard can trigger the right types of questions to stimulate learning at both levels.

Designing and Implementation of Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation System: Success Story

Dr. M. Kamal Sheikh, Director Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation, Pakistan Agricultural Research Council, Pakistan

Background
The Pakistan Agriculture Research Council (PARC) is a federal apex research body in agriculture system in Pakistan. Traditionally, the exercise of planning was carried out on ad-hoc basis. Moreover, system of monitoring and control was weak. The most common issues included repetitive work on same gaps, duplication of projects, lack of focus/direction and absence of any documentation of success/failures and lessons learned. Above all, there was no mechanism of accountability of the workforce. Eventually, the research system was not producing any visible and tangible results.

Keeping in view these issues, the PARC management decided to design and launch a results based monitoring and evaluation (RBM&E) system at the institution level.

Stages of planning and implementation of the system

Stage 1: Approval from the Board of Governors (BoG): The BoG of the PARC in its meeting held in November 2011 decided to restructure PARC. It advised the management of PARC to prepare a medium term National Agricultural Research Strategy (2013-18) for rapid/sustained agriculture sector development and redesign the organizational structures and processes to help PARC re-focus on its functions. It also directed to conduct a Third Party Independent Evaluation of PARC to:

- Examine the existing agriculture research system of the country
Identify redundancies and duplications among national agriculture research system (NARS) partners

- Develop framework for developing a medium term research plan
- Recommendations for strengthening national/international linkages
- Identify areas to be taken by NGOs/Private Sector – up-scaling/out-scaling

**Stage 2: Independent Third Party Evaluation (ITPE):** The ITPE carried out by International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). It was more or less like a diagnostic study. It identified a number of weaknesses in system of technology/innovation generation system which included: 1) duplications of research activities; 2) redundancies; 3) lack of focus and directions of efforts. The study gave recommendations with a prime focus on changes in structure, staffing, accountability, research prioritization/organization.

**Stage 3: Development of Five Years PARC Business Plan (FYBP) (2013-18):** Following the directions of the BoG and the recommendations of ITPE, a five years business plan was developed with the help of Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and PARC experts through active participation of all stakeholders. An Electronic Monkey Survey was also conducted to prioritize PARC’s research agenda/focus. In total 177 experts from NARS and international partners/donors participated in the survey. The Business Plan was meant to addresses and operationalizes most of ITPE recommendations. It also guided in the development of Reforms Action Plan (RAP) and a prioritized Upstream/Strategic Research Plan (URP). The RAP consists of strengthening key institutional and processes aspects of PARC and actions to improve enabling environment for the NARS. On the other hand, the URP covered high priority upstream research areas for the NARS. The business plan, on overall basis, envisages financial outlay of PKR 24 billion.

**Stage 4: Development of Result Based Monitoring (RBM&E) Framework:** In order to implement and monitor rigorously Reforms and Research Action Plans provided by FYBP, a RBM&E Framework was designed with the help of International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD; a Nepal based organization). The RBM&E Framework adapted World Bank’s Ten Steps Model of RBME. PARC’s system of planning and RBM&E is depicted in Figure 1.
Stage 5: Capacity building of the scientists: A two-day training module was developed to enhance the capacity of the scientists in implementing the RBME model – covering planning, recording and reporting progress. Trainings were imparted at four national level research centers (Islamabad, Faisalabad, Karachi and Quetta). About 80 scientists participated in these trainings.

Stage 6: Execution of the RBM&E framework: The framework has been put into implementation in phased manners. In the beginning, it encountered several issues. However, regular trainings coupled with availability of online support and support of the top management has helped in its implementation.

At the end of physical/financial year each institute director prepares annual progress report indicating outcome of each activity and targets promised. These are also linked with the performance indicators prepared for each of PARC functions. These reports are evaluated and consolidated at respective division level which are compiled and refined and presented to Chairman, BOG and others for analysis of performance and further feedback/improvement. It is pertinent to point out that the formats, processes and guidelines have been continually improved and updated through feedback of the stakeholders and the experience of the M&E team. Third year of its operation is in progress and is now working smoothly.

Stage 7: Up-scaling/Out-scaling: The next and final stage is to replicate the system at the province level. It is being planned and designed with the financial assistance of the USAID.

Conclusion

The system has started generating useful information for the management to know who is doing what, how much targets have been achieved, where we are succeeding and where we are failing, what are the reasons of success/failure are and what are the lessons. The PARC is the second public sector organization in Pakistan after federal Public Procurement Regulatory Authority (PPRA) which has successfully implemented the institutional level RBM&E system.
Is the Glass Ceiling Unbreakable?

By

Dr. Syed Masroor Hussain Shah, CEO, People Talent Tech, Malaysia
Qurat Ul Ain Masroor, Director, People Talent Tech, Malaysia

While we were discussing the concept of the glass ceiling and its relevance in our times, our eldest daughter asked us what this glass ceiling was. Seeing her interest, we briefly explained that any unseen barrier that exists between women and those from minorities and career ladder is, in fact, a glass ceiling. For example those affected stand on the ground and can see the career ladder through the glass but they cannot touch or access it. This state of deprivation and frustration and not getting to the desired goal validates existence of glass ceiling. This aroused our daughter’s interest and we kept on talking about glass ceiling and its effects since time immemorial. Women, minorities or underprivileged have suffered at any time of human history. A few got out of this trap either by stroke of luck or through sheer hard work and commitment, yet it remained an unbreakable barrier for the majority.

Without going into its history, we decided to reflect further on this phenomenon that continues to haunt almost every society in this age of modernization and communication. It, actually, is not the individuals who suffer due to their lack of courage or sense of effort but it is the mindset and their resultant behaviours become obstacle in the way of breaking the glass ceiling and achieving their desired goals. This mindset standing as a rock does not let the aspirations and vision of the affected people to pass through and create success.

We then talked about the glass ceiling gaining popularity today. Breaking the glass ceiling is an epitome of the ongoing election campaign of Hillary Clinton for US presidency. She is the first woman candidate in the American history to have reached this landmark of becoming US presidential candidate, and she is yet to be the elected president. The US has already established history when Barrack Obama became the first black US President.

Today it is the age of information and communication that has revolutionized the world. Internet has made the world very small. Thousand miles distance has vanished thus has become immaterial. Yet glass ceiling is deeply ingrained in the human mind. Essence of SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals) is breaking through the glass ceiling and providing easy and equal access to basic facilities by all human beings without discriminating on the basis of gender, colour, nationality or race and religion.

We thought and talked that no charity or social work is worthwhile than changing mind an individual mind so that progressive thoughts of caring for humanity on equal basis are produced. We need to start breaking this unseen barrier first in our mind thus creating opportunities first in our own house, locality and country. Few of us shall argue that this is an ideal impossible to achieve. We counter this agreement and emphasized that nothing that human mind imagines, for bettering lives of fellow beings, is an ideal but achievable. Desire to see peace and happiness in this world is not difficult if we commit to break the glass ceiling that encircles our mind in different shapes. Ongoing disharmony, conflict, hatred, bloodshed and reckless maltreatment of human beings in various parts of the world are owing to our vested interests and closing our mind for humanity. What is clash of civilizations, socio-economic inequality, gender and class segregation. It is nothing but glass ceiling that does not allow us to think and let those around us to educate and grow and contribute to collective global peace and happiness. Countries, organizations and intellectuals hold conferences and seminars every now and then to talk about glass ceiling but still effects of this unseen barrier are visible everywhere.

Let us begin from our own self first, change our mind, and take the first step. More will join this holy campaign if we have positive intention and unswerving commitment. No weapons are needed to fight against this scourge but cracking and breaking this mental barrier in us. Instead of talking and looking at others, we begin with changing our mind and persuading our friends, nears and dears to join the club and work for creating awareness and breaking the glass ceiling to pave the way for future generations. We strongly urge that at least our children should enjoy the fruits of equal opportunity and progression.
Developing Innovations Culture for Achieving Sustainable Development Goals

By Atiq ur Rehman
Chief Operating Officer, People Talent Tech, Cyberjaya, Malaysia

Introduction
Development challenges continue to challenge humans on the earth. Poverty, inequality, insecurity and exclusion have not yet been overcome despite massive investment made by the philanthropists, governments, NGOs and international development agencies. Although Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) helped in liberating over one billion people from extreme poverty, yet it is not enough. About 836 million people are still trapped in the clutches of extreme poverty; 57 million children are still out of schools; and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions continue to rise – have increased by 50% since 1990 (UNDP, 2015). Children under 5 in Africa are 15 times more vulnerable to death than those in high income countries (Childs, 2015). Battle is not yet over.

Many countries including Pakistan missed the targets of MDGs. Situation in Pakistan worsened to such an extent that during 2000-2015, although ranking of Pakistan on the front of GDP improved from 35th to 23rd, however, on the criterion of inequality, Pakistan slipped to 113th position (Subohi, 2015). Failure of the country to achieve the MDGs has been recognized and accepted by the government (The Daily Dawn, 2015). The MDGs met almost similar patterns of failure in many other countries too (Child, 2015).

After the conclusion of MDGs, the United Nations launched 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 to address the challenges of poverty, inequality, injustice and climate changes by 2030 (The United Nations, 2015). In order to avoid similar fate for the SDGs, there is need for some innovative strategies to be worked out and put in place.

Need for innovations for development
The current situation calls for more innovative solutions to these chronic problems. Helen Clark (UNDP Administrator) rightly said, “To contribute to sustainable and equitable development, the UN system must continue to invest in innovation in its programing and in its ways of working”. More recently (June 2016), the FAO Director General José Graziano da Silva, while highlighting the need of innovation, in a meeting of agriculture ministers of the G20 held in China, said, “Promoting sustainable agriculture requires a renewed focus on innovation and investment in research, technology and capacity development” (FAO, 2016).
However, the responsibility of overcoming these challenges does not lie only on the shoulders of the UN. The government of the developing countries will have to take the lead and own the challenges. They will have to devise and put in place a proactive strategy to achieve or exceed the targets set under SDGs.

The governments must focus on the development of pro-poor technologies. Pro-poor technologies have the traits like: they bring value addition in the economic activities of the poor, they build their capacity to earn more, they are culturally, socially and commercially viable, and so on. Innovation is required in all fields which are or can directly or indirectly affect livelihood of the poor. It could cover almost all streams of goods and services including education, health and value chains of food, agriculture, livestock, fisheries, forestry, cottage industry, and agro-based industries like textile and clothing.

**Islands of successes**

Fortunately, many islands of successes on the front of innovation have been reported from different parts of the world which provide ample evidence to prove that innovations can be developed even in transitional countries and can help in social and economic development of any community/country. Few examples of such innovations are:

- **Telecommunication**: A study in Nigeria (Oluwatofunmi, Kayode & Adebola, 2015) has revealed that access to telecommunication services reduced poverty.
- **Mobile banking** – to provide access to the financial resources, to help the poor save money and to secure their savings. In Pakistan non-conventional banking services e.g. Easy Paisa, U-Paisa and Mob-Paisa have been very successful. However, their current function is limited to transfer of money.
- **Market information system**: E-Zaraat initiative of the Government of Punjab (Pakistan) is meant to provide quick extension services to the farmers. However, its full scale usage might take time.

**Innovation capacity**

Innovation capacity varies from country to country, region to region and from person to person. It is very critical to the achievement of SDGs. OECD (2012) Report rightly points out that, “… innovation capacity has to be built early in the development process in order to possess the learning capacities that will allow “catch up” to happen”.

Development of innovation capacity requires building a culture of innovations in the country. This article suggests some considerations which the policy makers of the developing countries may consider to develop innovation capacity:

**Approach to the development of innovation culture**

Tellis, Prabhu & Chandy (2009) opine that radical innovation is the key to growth of any nation. However, innovations culture doesn’t develop overnight. It takes time. Incremental approach works well and more easily helps in managing the challenges of sustainability. In this connection it is crucial that innovations should be built around the existing production systems and integrated with the markets. Public sector support is critical to the success of innovations (OECD, 2012).

Many programs look impressive on papers. However, when they are put into implementation results are not congruence with the expectations. In Punjab (the biggest province of Pakistan in terms of population), ICT based advisory services were offered to farmers, however, not much success could be achieved.

**Key considerations for developing innovation culture for development**

**Global innovation networks**

Global innovation networks in China, India, Brazil and Russia are working well (OCED, 2012). The other developing countries can draw lessons from such networks.

During 1990s the UN had launched a program “Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries” (TCDC). It was meant to foster collaborations among the developing countries to promote the development and use of technology. Similar programs need to be launched in the regions and within the countries.
Approach to development

The approach of development influences the patterns of innovation. Hence, the poor countries will have to clearly define their development paths. Although India and China are cited as success stories. However, in order to draw meaningful lessons from their experiences we would need to keep in mind that prime focus of these countries was ‘growth’, not the ‘development’. India followed the path of information technology industry while China concentrated on the manufacturing business (OECD, 2012). They progressed to such an extent that they caused a significant influence on the global value chains in their respective domains.

OCED (2012) says, “Countries that start to industrialize today may choose a different development path and specialize in specific activities within value chains”. Value chain development is critical to the success. In Balochistan (South-Western province of Pakistan) olive orchards have been grown up but the biggest constraint for the growers is where to sell them. Oil extraction capacity is quite limited which is discouraging the farmers.

Key lesson which can be drawn from their experiences is that the poor countries will have to specialize in certain areas so as to become a significant player in the global value chain.

Economic policies

Traditionally, economic policies, programs and projects used to focus on creating a push effect to bring a change in some domain of society and/or economy. However, such interventions could not show much success. Analysis of the experience of many countries suggests that market forces create a pull effect in developing innovation culture. If the state institutions work on the efficiency and effectiveness of the market forces, it is very likely that innovative culture will start nurturing.

Institutions

Who should lead the initiative of developing innovative culture? NGOs usually carry higher delivery costs while the government institutions of the least developed countries are usually blamed for inefficiency, corruption and malpractices. The governments of poor countries would have to innovate some more effective and efficient strategies to provide leadership on the front of innovation.

Intellectual property rights

Procedures for registration of patents might need to be simplified so that even a motor mechanic may approach the patent office and get his ideas/innovations registered/patented.
Financial resources

Access to financial resources continues to be a big constraint especially for the poor. Moreover, in many countries it is relatively more expensive too. The Maya Declaration can prove to be a landmark initiative if it helps in providing access to the banking system to even half of the two billion unbanked populations in the world. The initiative was launched in 2011. It is encouraging that so far 58 countries (as of 2016) have made commitments to the Maya Declaration.

Access to communication technologies

Poor need to be equipped with skills and access to knowledge base. Communication technologies are proving to be very effective. Communication helps the poor in making informed decisions and (FAO, 2006) it also helps in developing innovation culture and capacity.

Social networks

Experience suggests that farmers learn more quickly from their peers than from the extension workers. In view of this, formation of innovative and progressive small and medium farmers could help development of innovation culture. Secondly, such groups and groups of groups should be developed hierarchically, from village to national level.

Monitoring and evaluation

Last but not least, it is the monitoring and evaluation system which places a key role in keeping the policies, strategies and programs on the track.

Concluding remarks

Innovative culture is crucial for socio-economic development of any country. Fortunately, innovation culture can be developed if appropriate policies, strategies and programs are put in place.
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IOCOM Board News

Quarterly IOCOM Board e-meeting was held on 12-17 June, 2016. Key decisions of the Board are:

- The IOCOM Board appointed Mr. Awuor Ponge as a Board Member. He is from Kenya.
- The Editorial Team of the IDD – IOCOM’s e-journal will develop a database with contact names e-mails addresses including high profile management experts and professional bodies such as Auditing, Accounting, Academia is an immediate priority to improve the distribution and reach of the IDD

Message from the editorial team

Second issue of 2016 of the IDD is before you. This issue contains a variety of articles from outcome management disciplines to enrich our worldwide reader knowledge. We hope you will find the articles very informative and useful. The editorial team thanks all authors for their contributions for the present issue.

Let us reemphasize that we are striving to promote research and disseminate both research and practice in the discipline of outcome management. We urge upon readers to join our hands to enhance quality, effectiveness and outreach of this e-journal. Provide us your comments/feedback on the articles published in this and the previous issues. Also please send your articles for publication in the next issue.

The next issue will be released in the first week of November. Interested authors may send us their articles latest by 30th September 2016 for inclusion in the next issue.
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- **Muhammad Knal Sheikh:** He has a PhD in Project Management. He is currently serving as Director M&E in Pakistan Agriculture Research Council, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- **Atiq ur Rehman (Pakistan):** He holds a PhD in HRD. He is the Chief Operating Officers of the People Talent Tech, Cyberjaya, Malaysia.
- **Syed Masroor Hussain Shah:** He has a PhD in Management Sciences. He is the CEO of People Talent Tech (MSC), Malaysia. Earlier, he worked with UN System as Chief HR Department.
- **Qurat ul Ain:** She is Director, People Talent Tech (MSC), Malaysia.
Introduction of IOCOM

IOCOM is a not-for-profit Corporation registered in Canada. An organization of professionals, academia and an alliance of international and national associations, societies and networks engaged in the discipline of outcome management.

IOCOM invites professionals and academics to create a forum for the exchange of useful and high quality theories, methodologies and effective practice in outcome management drawn from all management disciplines. IOCOM encourages management practitioners contributing to outcome management in all fields to make use of our resources, to participate in our initiatives and to contribute to our goals as individuals or through outcome management organizations. We offer global linkages to outcome management professionals, organizations and networks, news of events and important initiatives, and opportunities to exchange ideas, practices, and insights with peers throughout the world.
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To create a world where professionals, academia, organizations and networks with a focus and interest in effective outcome management, collaborate to strengthen the theory and practice of the discipline that benefit society.

IOCOM’s Mission

To promote the growth of outcome management in the world at large through multidisciplinary professional and academic collaboration and the quest for evidence influenced decision making for business and organizational viability.
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IDD Vision

The IDD to be recognized as a world class Outcome Management Journal/Periodical.

IDD Mission

"IDD Mission is to provide useful, timely and thought provoking content in Outcome management driven disciplines that address a broad spectrum of practices for knowledge exchange among academicians, researchers and practitioners”.

IDD Objectives

1. To bridge gap between the academicians and practitioners in the discipline of outcome management
2. To provide a platform to the academic researchers and practitioners for disseminating their research work.
3. To promote adoption of innovative outcome management disciplines
4. To highlight challenges being faced by the outcome managers (practitioners)

IDD Scope

1. IDD journal will cover application of the cross cutting themes of Outcome management disciplines. No other journal in the world is having such orientation.
2. IDD journal’s main emphasis is on applied research.
3. IDD journal will accommodate article based on both qualitative and or quantitative approaches. However, preference will be given to mixed methods and action research.
4. Geographical territory of our journal is the entire globe
5. Our target audience include academics and practitioners in outcome management.