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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Learning Brief is to share key lessons to inform future efforts to effect systems-level change in humanitarian response, seeking to create positive transformational change. Given that transformation is an unfolding, open-ended process, we acknowledge that our learning is an ongoing journey.

Our key lessons derive from the systems impact assessment of the Renewable Energy for Refugees (RE4R) project, supported by the IKEA Foundation and implemented in a partnership between Practical Action and UNHCR, the UN Refugee Agency between April 2017 and February 2022. RE4R sought to reshape global humanitarian response to adopt (and adapt) market-based renewable energy (RE) models demonstrated in three refugee camps and host communities in Rwanda and the city of Irbid in Jordan. In addition to providing sustainable, efficient, affordable, and reliable RE solutions for refugees, host communities, and institutions in humanitarian settings, the market-based RE approaches piloted by RE4R sought to provide long-term economic improvement for target populations.
The **systems impact assessment** informing this Learning Brief was conducted between October 2021 and January 2022. The exercise assessed the extent of or prospect for systems change as a result of RE4R, and its wider influence to reshape the global humanitarian system in the recognition, uptake, and mainstreaming of RE in humanitarian response. It drew upon secondary sources, as well as primary data collected through remote key informant interviews. The systems impact assessment was one of three RE4R assessments; the other two were focused at the national level in Jordan and Rwanda.

### Key definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rubric</strong></th>
<th>A framework that sets a standard for what ‘good’ looks like and creates a shared language for describing and assessing it using qualitative and/or quantitative evidence. It provides a scoring guide to assess performance and/or a product (BetterEvaluation).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems change</strong></td>
<td>Refers to shifting the interconnected conditions that are holding a given problem in place. This encompasses structural elements, including the physical environment (terrain, climate, water), the built environment (housing, transportation), and political and socio-economic dynamics (legal system, policy, religious groups); attitudinal elements, including widely held beliefs, values, norms, and intergroup relations (ethnic tensions, gender biases, level of trust in government, religious beliefs); and transactional elements, including the interactions among key people (e.g. leaders) and how they deal with issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational change</strong></td>
<td>A deep and fundamental change in a system’s form, function, or process (Transformational Change Learning Partnership, 2021).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Streetlights in Nyabiheke.  
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‘SYSTEMS THINKING’ REVISITED

If we are to effect systems change then adopting a systems perspective is critical. At Practical Action, systems thinking refers to analysis that pushes beyond immediate problems to see the underlying patterns (problem analysis), the ways to leverage systems towards positive change (intervention design and implementation), and how to learn and adapt as systems inevitably change (monitoring, evaluation, and learning). Fundamental to systems thinking is the premise that our interventions operate in complex contexts in which many independent elements or agents interact, leading to emergent outcomes that are difficult (if not impossible) to predict. Systems are dynamic networks of interactions where the sum (and resultant changes) is much greater than the parts. While systems thinking doesn’t make reality less complex, it provides a lens through which to acknowledge and embrace complexity to work towards a healthier system.
AN ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR SYSTEMS CHANGE

Evaluation criteria typically form the backbone of an evaluation framework. However, the OECD Development Assistance Committee (2019) acknowledges that its evaluation criteria, the most widely used in the world, ‘are not a particularly useful tool for descriptive analysis of transformative change or systems change’. Given this, and the underlying premise that
systems change is context specific, it is important for interventions seeking systems change to tailor their evaluation criteria according to the specific goals and context in which they operate.

**Five core evaluation criteria for systems change**

Table 1 summarizes the evaluation framework that was designed for this assessment, centred on five core evaluation criteria to assess systems change. In addition to a review of the project data and consultation with Practical Action's evaluation management team, the design of the rubrics was informed by recent examples of evaluation criteria for transformational change. RE4R's five transformational evaluation criteria are sequenced to assess the extent of, or prospect for, global systems change in humanitarian response as a result of the project.

---

1 Transformational evaluation is a relatively new area in the evaluation field, largely prompted by the transformational aspirations of the UN's 2030 Global Agenda. Examples of existing evaluation criteria for transformational interventions include Climate Investment Funds' Transformational Change Learning Partnership (TLCP), Patton (2020b) and IEG, World Bank (2016).
### Table 1: RE4R transformational evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational relevance</strong></td>
<td>What is being done to effect systems change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refers to the extent to which the project was planned, implemented, and assessed to advance transformational learning and change to mainstream RE in the global humanitarian system. <strong>It focuses on the process-related aspects of the project</strong> to assess the extent the project applied systems thinking to achieve systems change in humanitarian response. Given the inherent limitations of attribution analysis of a single intervention such as RE4R to effect systems change relative to the many other factors and actors that can affect any observed change, this project narrative is an important source of evidence for contribution analysis. The criterion includes <strong>five sub-criteria</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. <strong>Systemic assessment</strong> (including initial assessment, as well as midline, endline, and ex-post evaluations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Project design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Project implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <strong>Project monitoring and communication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. <strong>Capacity development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems change</strong></td>
<td>What systems change has occurred?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refers to the extent to which the project contributed to key conditions for transformational learning and change for the uptake of RE in the global humanitarian system. Whereas Criterion 1 focuses on the project process to deliver systems change, <strong>this criterion focuses on the degree to which systems change has occurred</strong>. It consists of <strong>four sub-criteria</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. <strong>Structural</strong>. How much a project contributes to structural change in the policy, regulatory, financial, and institutional frameworks that support and leverage the uptake of RE in the global humanitarian system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Attitudinal</strong>. How much a project contributes to shifts in beliefs, values, and norms for the uptake of RE in the global humanitarian system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Transactional</strong>. How much a project contributes to processes and interactions among relevant stakeholders for the uptake of RE in the global humanitarian system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <strong>Speed</strong>. How much the pace of a project’s processes and outcomes is aligned with and realistic to the need for systems change for the uptake of RE in the global humanitarian system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scalability</strong></td>
<td>Extent to which systems change has increased or can increase at a broader scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In essence, it focuses on the <strong>extent to which RE has been mainstreamed to replace non-RE in humanitarian response</strong>. It consists of <strong>three sub-criteria</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. <strong>Vertical scalability</strong>. How well RE4R scales-up impact through institutional and policy reform to mainstream RE in the global humanitarian system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Horizontal scalability</strong>. How well RE4R scales-out impact through wider geographic or demographic diffusion of and coverage by RE to mainstream it in the global humanitarian system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Functional scalability</strong>. How well RE4R adapted and improved its original strategy to increase scope, pace, or scale to mainstream RE in the global humanitarian system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational coherence</strong></td>
<td>Extent to which systems change work integrates with other transformational work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which RE4R aligns with and integrates relevant social, economic, and environmental transformational goals (e.g. Sustainable Development Goals) and benchmarks for cross-cutting priorities (e.g. leave no one behind, equity, and gender-sensitivity and inclusion). If project outcomes are not compatible with other transformations for a sustainable system, then the desired change, and for that matter the system itself, is not sustainable. For example, the pursuit of livelihood goals should not hinder or harm the land or water that constitute the resource base necessary to sustain long-term well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptable sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Prospect of systems change to persist and adapt in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which RE4R contributed to conditions or trajectories in the global humanitarian system for mainstreamed RE to persist and adapt to new circumstances as the market and external environment changes. This encompasses the <strong>extent or potential for institutional systems, values, and behaviours for RE in the global humanitarian system to be firmly embedded and dominant</strong> (hence, closely related to the scalability criterion).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employing rubrics and evidence examples to refine systems change understanding and assessment

Rubrics offer a process for making explicit the basis for evaluative judgement, supporting transparency and systemic use of evidence to assess and then summarize evaluative assessment for effective communication and learning. The systematic use of rubrics can also support assessments that can be replicated over time or place for comparability. This can help track systems change, with the rubric rating from this exercise establishing a baseline for the RE4R project that can be assessed ex-post, as well as in another context with different RE projects as part of scale-up to effect systems change in the global humanitarian system.

Rubrics were assigned to each evaluation criterion to further specify what systems change looks like for RE4R, informing data collection and sensemaking for assessment. Table 2 illustrates the four level rubrics scale (Harmful – Partial – Sufficient – Exemplary) used for each criterion and sub-criterion in the evaluation framework. Descriptive characteristics for each level of performance were tailored to the criterion and sub-criterion. In addition to the rubrics definitions, illustrative evidence examples or progress markers were identified and listed below each rubric in a rubrics rating table to help guide rating for each criterion.

Table 2: Example of the rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 2 Systems change criterion</th>
<th>Rating rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which RE4R has contributed to key conditions for transformational learning and change for the uptake of renewable energy (RE) in the global humanitarian system (GHS).</td>
<td>Extent to which RE4R has contributed to key conditions for transformational learning and change for the uptake of renewable energy (RE) in the global humanitarian system (GHS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions result (from RE4R) that retard or harm the uptake of RE in the GHS.</td>
<td>Conditions result that partly contribute to the uptake of RE in the GHS, but significant limitations remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions result that contribute to the uptake of RE in the GHS, but gaps remain.</td>
<td>Conditions result that significantly contribute to the uptake of RE in the GHS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concluding reflections on utilizing a transformational evaluation framework for systems change work

The above evaluation criteria and use of rubrics ratings were informed by and tailored to RE4R and its assessment needs. Systems change evaluation criteria and rubrics ratings for other interventions should be adapted according to their specific assessment contexts and needs. It is also important to note that these evaluation criteria are both interrelated and interdependent, as are the elements in the systems in which they are applied. For example, functional scalability (the extent of strategy adaptation) is closely related to adaptive sustainability.

Recognizing these caveats, the design of these evaluation criteria, elaborated with the rating rubrics, not only constituted the core framework for assessing RE4R’s systems change aspirations, but also contributed to a shared understanding of what systems change means in Practical Action’s work. Use of the evaluation framework also underscored that the process is just as important as the product, where meaningful stakeholder participation not only ensures that the criteria and rubrics are accurate given the operational realities but they also build understanding, capacities, ownership, and support for systems change work.

Use of the evaluation framework also underscored that the process is just as important as the product.
Solar panels linked to solar home systems on the rooftops of refugee households in Kigeme refugee camp. Credit: @Practical Action / Yves Sangwa

**KEY LESSONS FROM THE RE4R SYSTEMS IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

The remainder of this Learning Brief will focus on nine key lessons from applying the framework to assess RE4R’s systems impact work. Most lessons have been framed to inform systems change work in general, drawing upon learning examples from RE4R, but some learning is more specific to RE work. As the cross-referencing between lessons reflects, they are very much interrelated. Also, learning from the project is an ongoing process, highlighting the longitudinal nature of systems change work – a critical aspect of systems change work that is referred to throughout this section.
1. **Be aspirational, but realistic and explicit in systems change work**

If there was ever a time to be ambitious, it is now, echoed by the aspirational SDGs of the 2030 Global Agenda. However, it is important to qualify systems change goals and frame expectations of what is and is not feasible to achieve within the typically limited timeframes of a project. It is not just OK, but important to articulate the causal links of smaller, discrete projects with larger global systems change goals such as RE4R’s goal to reshape humanitarian response. It is for this reason that global frameworks such as the SDGs and Sendai Framework (2015) are created, as well as organizational strategy, missions, and vision. What is important is to make explicit and manage expectations that while the project is aligned with higher level systems change goals, it aims to contribute to them rather than achieve them in and of itself. Related to Lesson 2, this is easier to convey as part of a larger, coherent strategic portfolio approach to global systems change.

2. **Recognize, design, and implement global systems change work differently and unconstrained by conventional project budgets and timelines**

The longer-term timeframe for systems change work entails considerably different design and budget requirements from those of conventional project workstreams. This is especially true when seeking to trigger and scale-up structural change in policy, regulatory, financial, and institutional frameworks for systems change.

For instance, RE4R’s theory for systems change centred on the hypothesis that market-based RE solutions demonstrated by the project would inspire other humanitarian actors to shift and mainstream RE in humanitarian response. However, the timeframe (and for that matter the skill sets) required for the strategic communications and advocacy work targeting humanitarian decision makers is quite different from the timeframe (and skill sets) required at the local project level to interface with refugee camps, host communities, local market actors, and the technical expertise to source, install, and maintain RE hardware.

RE4R’s workstream to strategically communicate and effect systems change based on the learning from the RE solutions demonstrated on-the-ground will need to continue after that fieldwork is completed (and this Learning Brief is part of that endeavour). This illustrates the importance of anticipating and planning for the longitudinal timeframes involved with systems change work.

3. **Pursue global systems change objectives such as RE as part of a comprehensive, coherent strategy that extends beyond discrete projects**

Given the geographic and temporal scale and scope of global systems change, organizations seeking to effect systems change are advised to adopt a systems design where individual interventions (projects and
programmes consisting of multiple projects) are woven together as part of a comprehensive, coherent strategy. Such a strategic portfolio approach should be aligned with and reinforce overarching organizational strategy to sustain longer-term objectives such as advocacy and the reform of policy and institutional frameworks for RE in the humanitarian sector.

Rather than theories of change, theories of transformation can be used to support a coherent strategy that integrates and weaves together nested theories of change operating at different levels and timeframes. As evaluation thought leader Patton (2020a) explains, a meta-strategy designed around a theory of transformation can essentially knit together different projects and programmes (and their respective theories of change) to leverage multiple nudges to deliver a coordinated push targeting tipping points for overall systems change.

For instance (and related to Lesson 2 above), a strategic portfolio approach can support the design, staffing, and budgeting for a systems change workstream as a designated project that accommodates the longer timeframe of policy, regulatory, financial, and institutional frameworks. Such a project can cut across and complement other projects focused on workstreams that have shorter timeframes and different requirements.

4. **Adopt ‘transition’ rather than ‘exit’ strategies for global systems change work**

The idea of an ‘exit’ strategy can reinforce the notion that there is a project end. However, given the longitudinal nature of global systems work, such as the need to sustain advocacy campaigns and the dissemination of lessons learned through knowledge sharing outputs, global systems change interventions should be planned to support the continuation of their workstreams after funding for the intervention runs out.

Therefore, this lesson is an addendum to Lesson 3 above, supporting coherent strategy to sustain systems change work. Indeed, funding is not limitless in real-world programming and project budgets have limits. However, adopting a comprehensive organizational strategy can allow systems change workstreams to be channelled and continued through other projects in a given portfolio focus area, or by linking the systems work with strategic partners who can sustain it (see Lesson 6).
5. Utilize systems maps to support comprehensive, informed strategy for systems change

Systems maps are important visual aids in the systems change toolbox. They provide a simplified conceptual understanding of a complex system. They help identify key factors, actors, and their interactions to inform systems change planning, and the implementation, monitoring, and course correction of systems change work. Systems mapping provides a bird’s-eye view of opportunities and threats to inform the pursuit of systems change. Systems maps can help identify gaps that point to underserved needs, potential partners and champions to support objectives, gatekeepers with whom to contend, and ‘roadblocks’ around which to navigate. Just as important as the product (the maps) is the process of developing a systems map, for which stakeholder engagement is critical because it contributes to the collective sensemaking of contextual factors. For collective action to support systems change, systems maps can put partners on the same page, and help coordinate and complement systems change work within and across investment portfolios.

6. Utilize strategic partnerships and alliances to leverage systems change

Strategic collaboration, partnerships, and alliances are critical enablers for effecting systems change. This is especially important when seeking to build collective momentum for the uptake of new practices like RE in humanitarian response. Few organizations are a jack of all trades, and just as a strategic portfolio approach can configure specific interventions (e.g. projects) towards systems change goals, it can also assemble and arrange strategic partnerships to best capitalize on respective strengths and networks. A robust stakeholder assessment supported by systems mapping (above) is a valuable tool in this process.

RE4R provides several examples of a strategic configuration of partners across project workstreams. At the global level, the joint partnership between Practical Action and UNHCR for RE4R is in itself a particularly notable example of a strategic partnership. Given UNHCR’s critical position in the humanitarian space, it is an influential ally to drive the uptake of RE, and its engagement in RE4R helped to advance RE within the agency itself as well as among its network of humanitarian partners.

Another valuable global partnership in RE4R was with the Global Platform for Action on Sustainable Energy in Displacement Settings (GPA). Given the gap in the global cluster coordination mechanism for humanitarian response, GPA is a significant enabler to leverage dedicated funding, subject matter expertise, and technical support for RE in the global humanitarian system, and served as an important platform to support knowledge sharing and advocacy efforts to contribute to global systems change for RE. Similarly, RE4R’s systems change work benefitted from the subject matter expertise in its partnership with Chatham House to prepare and package RE research for strategic communications targeting the humanitarian sector.

At the national level, RE4R partnered with the Norwegian Refugee Council (2019) for the local implementation of RE and interfacing with the national government for RE policy and institutional reform in Jordan. This partnership illustrated how NRC’s national expertise and networks
were used to promote the uptake of RE at the country level, but also with a multiplier effect globally given NRC’s international footprint and influence. An important consideration when establishing partners is to ensure initial buy-in from the highest level in the organization as it can then be easier to later negotiate downwards with middle and lower management. Another important consideration when working with multiple partners (at any level of work) is to coordinate the branding protocol to ensure project work properly recognizes partners and their contributions. Although often behind the scenes, the branding of interventions can play an important role in reflecting a collective identity and motivating partners to engage in systems change work.

7. Pursue capacity development for systems design, monitoring, and assessment within implementing organizations and among its partners

Given the interdependencies between today’s local and global challenges, a shared understanding and appreciation of systems thinking concepts is especially relevant in humanitarian work. Humanitarian response, by its nature, often focuses on addressing the immediate vulnerabilities of those impacted by disaster and adversity at the ground level, which can distract from a global systems perspective. In the context of Practical Action’s ‘Small is beautiful’ heritage, specific efforts to socialize systems thinking is reflected in its motto, ‘Big change starts small’.

RE4R’s experience highlighted that it is especially important to socialize the concept of systems thinking when the intervention includes stakeholders working on different workstreams that may contribute to, but not directly involve, systems change work. That is, stakeholders supporting RE4R’s local work delivering RE solutions in refugee camps versus knowledge generation, strategic communications, and advocacy work for systems change. Socializing systems thinking concepts is not only an investment in the specific initiative at hand (RE4R), but also supports the longer-term objectives of systems change over time.

Capacity development for systems thinking (or any capacity area) can be delivered through multiple formats, outlets, and mediums, tailored to different audiences ranging from senior leadership to local staff and partners. It can take the form of targeted guidance notes, trainings, or online webinars, or can be incorporated as a chapter/module in existing project management guidance or training.

In addition to planned capacity development exercises and resources supporting systems change work, it is important to remember that much learning can occur on the job and be supported through mentoring and coaching. For instance, the monitoring and evaluation workstream for RE4R was an important avenue for capacity development related to systems thinking among stakeholders, spearheading the articulation of a theory of change for the systems change work.

It is also important to recognize that, to a large extent, systems thinking capacity development is related to and can be packaged with strategic communications and awareness raising for systems change work. Related, it is a valuable opportunity to utilize strategic partners and their networks to co-create and disseminate knowledge products and to leverage systems change.
8. Pursue collaborative RE data collection and sharing to better support collective RE learning and implementation in the global humanitarian system

Related to the importance of strategic partnerships in systems change work (Lesson 6 above), there are multiple benefits of collaboration in the design, collection, and analysis of RE data in humanitarian contexts. **Coordinated data collection can conserve time and resources among implementing organizations, avoid duplicating data collection efforts and reduce survey fatigue among target populations, and support collaborative sensemaking that can scale up and contribute to a global humanitarian system knowledge base for RE.**

Collaboration can also spearhead standardized measurements and data collection tools to support industry-recognized baselines to inform benchmarks and targets, as well as consistent measurement for reliable comparison across time, place, and measurer. However, as RE4R learning has already highlighted, data collection will nevertheless need to be tailored according to context. At a minimum, the survey will need to be translated and back-translated. Nevertheless, a library of shared RE data collection tools (quantitative and qualitative) would be a benefit for RE work in the global humanitarian system.

9. Explore joint ex-post meta-evaluations that pool (and hence conserve) resources while supporting more longitudinal assessment realistic to the timeframes required to inform and effect global systems change

Given the longitudinal nature of systems change work, it is important to **consider how to support impact assessment over time.** Related to Lesson 3, ex-post evaluation can encompass multiple interventions and their respective timeframes, providing a meta-evaluation on longer-term efforts to effect systems change, and supporting a strategic portfolio approach to systems change work.

However, ex-post evaluations are not business as usual. Projects and programmes are typically restricted in their ability to budget for and assess longer-term impact after the project end, and instead opt for the conventional end-of-project evaluation.

Alternatively, a strategic portfolio approach can allocate a percentage of multiple project budgets for the ex-post assessment of more longitudinal phenomena like effecting global systems change. Related to partnering for collaborative data collection (Lesson 8), resources (financial and human) for ex-post evaluation can also be pooled from multiple partner organizations. In addition to efficiency, joint ex-post evaluations have the added benefit of supporting collaborative knowledge sharing and learning.
Transformational evaluation is a relatively new area in the evaluation field, largely prompted by the transformational aspirations of the UN’s 2030 Global Agenda. Examples of existing evaluation criteria for transformational interventions include:

- Climate Investment Funds’ Transformational Change Learning Partnership (TLCP),
- Patton (2020b) Evaluation Criteria for Evaluating Transformation,
- World Bank Independent Evaluation Group’s Supporting Transformational Change for Poverty Reduction and Shared Prosperity.
Jackline lives in Kigeme camp which has benefited from solar powered streetlights. Jackline said that before the streetlights were installed she feared for her safety and would always return home in daylight. Now she no longer has these worries and walks around the camp freely. She has also been able to extend her business opening hours and is thinking of opening her own bar.

Credit: @Practical Action / Yves Sangwa
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