Madhesh Journal of Interdisciplinary Research
Volume 01 Issue 01, 2026. pp. 87–100
Research Article

The Importance of Results-Based Management in Promoting Transparency and Accountability for Improved Development Initiatives

P. V. Prabha[1], P Radha[2], Sharath Kumar Y[3]
[1]Director, RVS Institute of Management Studies, India
[2]Professor, School of Commerce, JAIN (Deemed–to–be University), India
[3]Global Institute Of Business Studies (GIBS), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Corresponding Author
Sharath Kumar Yadav

Email
sharathkumary1996@gmail.com

Article History
Revised: March 26, 2026
Accepted: June 05, 2026

Cite
Prabha, P. V., Radha, P., & Sharath Kumar, Y. (2026). The importance of results-based management in promoting transparency and accountability for improved development initiatives. *Madhesh Journal of Interdisciplinary Research* (*MJIR*), *1*(1), 87–100.

Abstract

Results-Based Management (RBM) is an organizational approach centered on goals and measurable performance, whose global uptake accelerated after the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Prioritizing outcomes and impacts over inputs and activities, RBM is especially pertinent to strengthening governance and effectiveness in development interventions. This literature review examines how RBM fosters transparency and accountability by clarifying objectives, improving performance measurement and reporting, and promoting evidence-based decision-making. Implemented within transparent frameworks, RBM enables stakeholders to participate more effectively, monitor progress, and understand organizational performance against development goals. Synthesizing evidence from multilateral agencies, bilateral donors, development banks, and international NGOs, the analysis links core RBM principles with New Public Management (NPM) to show how RBM cultivates institutional openness, responsibility, and answerability for results. Findings suggest that RBM can build donor and stakeholder trust through clearer strategic planning, demonstrable effectiveness, and documented impact. Persistent technical, political, and capacity constraints, however, limit full implementation. To improve outcomes while sustaining transparency and accountability, the review recommends strengthening RBM via adaptive management, targeted institutional capacity-building, and incentive systems that reward meaningful, sustainable results rather than short-term gains.

Keywords: accountability, development initiatives, impact, result-based management, strategic planning, and transparency

Introduction

"A result is a describable or measurable change in state that is derived from a cause-and-effect relationship" (United Nations Development Group [UNDG], 2011). It signifies an outcome or consequence of a specific action. Results-Based Management (RBM) has been established for some time and is increasingly embraced by organizations seeking to promote transparency and strengthen accountability while demonstrating clear development gains to stakeholders. Following the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in 2005, RBM gained stronger global traction by reinforcing principles such as Ownership, Harmonization, Alignment, Results, and Mutual Accountability, which emerged as countries and development partners agreed to improve how aid and development cooperation are planned, delivered, and assessed (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2005). In many traditional project environments, management has focused heavily on controlling inputs, activities, and outputs and delivering within time and budget constraints. While important, this approach often makes it difficult to credibly demonstrate what changed, for whom, and why, thereby weakening public confidence and limiting stakeholder understanding of development performance. Donors, taxpayers, and communities increasingly demand evidence that resources are used responsibly and that interventions create tangible improvements in people's lives.

It is often stated that without a clear destination in mind, any path will suffice (Carroll, 1865). This uncertainty is precisely what RBM seeks to eliminate. RBM begins by clarifying the intended direction and end goals, mapping the causal pathway with realistic milestones, monitoring progress against agreed plans, and adjusting implementation based on evidence to remain aligned with expected outcomes. As a management strategy, RBM requires that all actors—directly or indirectly—work toward specified results while ensuring that processes, products, and services consistently support those results (UNDG, 2011; Rist et al., 2013). By doing so, RBM strengthens transparency through clearer goal-setting, measurable indicators, and structured reporting, and it strengthens accountability by defining responsibilities and enabling performance tracking across the results chain.

In 1997, former United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan introduced the "Programme for Reform," emphasizing planning frameworks that integrate budgeting, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and oversight—shifting attention from how activities are conducted to what outcomes are achieved. Since then, RBM has expanded globally across international organizations and has become central to building systems characterized by strategic thinking, accountability, transparency, coherence, collaboration, efficiency, and effectiveness, while remaining strongly results-oriented (United Nations General Assembly, 2020). This approach can increase donor confidence and support long-term partnerships when performance information is credible and openly communicated. A commitment to results must be sustained throughout the program cycle to ensure relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability (OECD, 2016). As RBM helps organizations maximize the effect of individual and collective interventions, managing for sustainable development results becomes essential. "This methodology offers the framework, tools, and guidance for strategic planning, risk management, performance monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge management. Its four complementary purposes include decision-making, learning, accountability, and communication" (OECD, 2021). These purposes directly reinforce improved development initiatives by ensuring decisions are evidence-based, learning is institutionalized, accountability is measurable, and communication is transparent.

"Results-Based Management (RBM) tools are the hands-on instruments used in strategic planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting of development results" (UNDG, 2011). These tools operationalize RBM by turning results frameworks into practical systems for implementation and oversight, thereby enabling greater visibility of progress and clearer accountability for performance. However, there is no single standardized roadmap for RBM implementation; each organization must adapt RBM to its mandate, operating context, and institutional capacity while aligning it with national priorities and stakeholder expectations.

The theoretical underpinnings remain highly relevant when integrating RBM into development projects. Collectively, these theories strengthen RBM's focus on transparency, accountability, and meaningful impact, positioning it as a foundational approach for improving governance and enhancing development performance. The following section presents an overview of key theoretical foundations commonly applied in development initiatives.

Theory of Change (ToC)

The Theory of Change lies at the core of Results-Based Management in development contexts because it explains how and why a set of activities is expected to produce outputs, outcomes, and long-term impacts. ToC clarifies assumptions, maps result pathways, and supports the identification of measurable indicators across the results chain (inputs, outputs, outcomes, impacts). By making causal logic explicit, ToC strengthens transparency in program design and provides a credible basis for accountability, since stakeholders can assess whether implementation is consistent with stated assumptions and whether observed results align with intended change. In complex, multi-site initiatives, a well-articulated ToC supports leadership decision-making on program priorities and resource allocation while providing an evaluative framework for performance review and accountability (DuBow & Litzler, 2018).

Logical Framework Approach (LogFrame)

The Logical Framework Approach is a widely used RBM instrument that promotes strategic clarity and disclosure by organizing objectives, activities, indicators, and means of verification into a structured matrix. It operationalizes the Theory of Change by translating results logic into measurable components, thereby improving transparency in what the initiative aims to achieve and how progress will be tracked. When well applied, LogFrames strengthen accountability by specifying performance targets, responsibilities, and verification sources that enable monitoring and evaluation. However, despite widespread use in development planning and assessment, the approach has attracted criticism regarding rigid assumptions, oversimplification of complex change processes, and challenges in practical implementation—limitations that may weaken learning and adaptive accountability if not carefully addressed (Bakewell & Garbutt, 2005).

New Public Management (NPM)

New Public Management is an influential public-sector approach aimed at improving operational efficiency through results-driven performance measurement, managerial autonomy, and a stronger focus on outputs and outcomes rather than procedural compliance. NPM reflects a shift away from traditional bureaucratic administration—typically characterized by rules, hierarchies, and input control—toward managerialism and performance-based accountability. Development agencies have increasingly adopted NPM principles to improve effectiveness and strengthen accountability in aid delivery. RBM aligns closely with NPM by emphasizing outcome-oriented planning, performance measurement, and evidence-based reporting, all of which can enhance transparency to stakeholders and reinforce accountability for development performance (Hood, 1991).

Participatory Development Theory

Participatory development emphasizes making development processes more inclusive and responsive by involving stakeholders—especially beneficiaries—in planning, implementation, and monitoring. It is useful to distinguish between "participatory development," often criticized as reflecting a more top-down design, and "participation in development," which is more authentically bottom-up and community-driven. Recognizing this distinction is essential to understanding participation as a mechanism for legitimacy and improved development effectiveness. Stakeholder engagement strengthens RBM by improving local ownership, contextual relevance, and responsiveness, while also reinforcing downward accountability (accountability to communities and end users). Participation also enhances transparency by enabling stakeholders to understand goals, monitor progress, and question performance, which supports more credible and equitable development initiatives (Wignaraja, 1991).

Learning and Adaptive Management Theory

Learning and adaptive management reframes RBM from being primarily a compliance or control mechanism into a system that supports continuous improvement. By assessing progress and evaluating outcomes, organizations can identify implementation gaps, adjust strategies, and improve effectiveness rather than using results reporting solely to satisfy external requirements. Adaptive management emphasizes feedback, reflection, and flexibility, prioritizing evidence-based adjustment over strict adherence to predetermined plans. It is particularly suited to complex development contexts characterized by uncertainty and changing conditions. Adaptive management is also described as a strategy that identifies key uncertainties through diagnostic experimentation and iterative learning. Within RBM, strong monitoring and evaluation systems can provide timely performance data to inform real-time decisions, which improves outcomes while strengthening accountability through documented learning and transparent justification for course corrections (Rist et al., 2013).

Governance and Accountability Theories

Governance and accountability theories emphasize transparency, participation, and institutional checks and balances as essential conditions for effective public administration and development performance. RBM supports these principles by establishing clear targets, performance indicators, reporting mechanisms, and evaluation processes that enable scrutiny by stakeholders and oversight bodies. Transparency is strengthened through public disclosure of goals, progress, and results; accountability is reinforced through performance audits, evidence-based reporting, and mechanisms for answerability and enforcement. Accountability has become widely recognized as a central criterion for development success and aid effectiveness, though debates persist regarding its precise meaning and operationalization. The concept of "mutual accountability" highlights shared responsibility among partners working toward common objectives and underscores the need for clear expectations, transparent reporting, and credible verification systems (Sustainable Development Goals Report, 2025). Governance accountability further stresses that accountability should be institutionalized through enforceable standards and oversight, ensuring that responsibility for results remains both visible and contestable within legitimate governance frameworks.

Novelty of the Work

Traditional literature on Results-Based Management (RBM) largely presents it as a value-neutral management tool used for planning, monitoring, and measuring performance. However, much of this literature provides limited analysis of the broader governance implications of RBM—particularly its influence on transparency, accountability relationships, and institutional decision-making. As a result, many existing RBM studies remain predominantly technical and procedural. This study addresses these gaps by advancing three novel directions for future RBM research.

First, the study reframes RBM from a purely managerial tool to a governance mechanism linked to broader debates on transparency, accountability, and public-sector governance. In doing so, it examines how RBM influences institutional behaviour, reshapes accountability arrangements between actors, and affects development decision-making and resource prioritization.

Second, this study proposes an RBM analytical approach that is sensitive to the realities of developing-country contexts, where institutional capacity, political incentives, and data constraints can significantly shape implementation. This perspective responds to critiques of one-size-fits-all RBM models and supports emerging calls—particularly from international organizations such as the United Nations—for RBM systems that are learning-oriented, adaptive, and contextually relevant, rather than compliance-driven.

Finally, the study contributes methodological advancement by moving beyond descriptive debates on whether RBM "works," toward an explanatory and exploratory approach that investigates under what conditions RBM strengthens transparency and accountability, how it is implemented in practice, and what effects it produces on development outcomes. This shift strengthens understanding of RBM not only as an administrative framework but also as an institutional arrangement that can enable (or constrain) improved development performance.

Research Objectives

The main objective of this study is to examine the role of Results-Based Management in promoting transparency and accountability among stakeholders through organizational processes of planning, implementation, monitoring, reporting, and evaluation of development initiatives, with the aim of improving development performance and trust in results.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative literature review approach, relying on secondary data drawn from established RBM guidance and evidence produced by international and non-governmental organizations. The materials reviewed include RBM handbooks and guiding principles, annual corporate results/performance reports, independent evaluation reports, and peer-reviewed research examining RBM either as a full system or through its specific components (planning, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting). This approach supports the paper's central objective—understanding how RBM promotes transparency and accountability and how those governance effects contribute to improved development initiatives—by synthesizing evidence across multiple institutional contexts rather than focusing on a single case.

The review emphasizes documents that (i) describe RBM architectures (results frameworks, indicators, and reporting systems), (ii) assess implementation quality and constraints (capacity, incentives, data systems, political economy), and (iii) provide evaluative findings on how RBM affects decision-making, credibility, and trust in development performance.

Annual Reports

With only five years remaining to the 2030 deadline at the time of publication, The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2025 provides the UN's official stocktake and concludes that the world is not on track to fully achieve the SDGs at the current pace, calling for stronger cooperation and accelerated implementation. This assessment reinforces the importance of RBM as a governance-oriented approach: when progress is lagging, development actors require transparent results frameworks, credible monitoring, and accountable reporting systems to identify what is working, what is not, and where corrective action is needed.

Relatedly, the Index of Countries' Support for UN-based Multilateralism (UN-Mi)—reported in the Sustainable Development Report 2025 ecosystem—highlights variation in country commitment to UN-based multilateralism (with Barbados ranked highest and the United States ranked lowest in the referenced release/ dashboard).For RBM, this is relevant because effective results delivery for global agendas depends on cooperation, shared accountability expectations, and transparent performance information across partners.

From a major development-finance institution perspective, the Independent Evaluation Group's Results and Performance of the World Bank Group 2024 (RAP 2024) reports that outcome ratings have plateaued, with downward pressure associated with a rising share of operations in fragile and conflict-affected situations (FCS) and persistent gaps in results monitoring and evaluation quality (World Bank, 2025). This evidence is directly aligned with the paper's topic: it shows how weaknesses in results frameworks and M&E systems can constrain transparency and reduce accountability for outcomes—even when project delivery (inputs/ activities) proceeds.

Finally, the African Development Bank's independent evaluation function (IDEV) provides evaluative evidence relevant to accountability and ownership in co-financing arrangements. The Evaluation of Counterpart Funding at the AfDB assesses the Bank's policy and implementation experience with counterpart funding and draws lessons for strengthening country ownership and implementation effectiveness—issues that connect closely to RBM's emphasis on aligned objectives, transparent responsibilities, and accountable delivery of results.

Evaluation Reports

The evaluation of FAO's Multi-Country Programme in the Pacific Islands was to assess the strategic relevance and contribution of the Organization in the Pacific in responding to national/subregional needs and challenges within its mandate. Findings show that FAO's programming is relevant to regional and national needs and priorities and is aligned with regional frameworks and national development and sector plans. Nonetheless, as a means of improving programme results, a wider stakeholder consultation at the project design stage, with a focus on the beneficiaries, was highlighted. Capitalizing on the opportunity for closer collaboration requires enhancing the human and technical capacities in the subregion, which were identified as a challenge. A project-based approach rather than a programmatic approach was another challenge highlighted (FAO. 2022). The evaluation of Global Affairs Canada's (2025) Climate Finance Programming examined climate finance programming delivered by Global Affairs Canada (GAC, 2025) as part of the Government of Canada's (GoC) public climate finance commitments. Findings indicate that GAC's climate finance has produced notable outcomes in mitigating climate change and has successfully attracted some private-sector investment, especially within middle-income nations. Nevertheless, the evaluation identified several discrepancies between Canada's overarching climate finance goals, the structure of the funding commitments, and budget objectives. There was insufficient prioritization of climate finance policy aims and a lack of clarity regarding success metrics (Global Affairs Canada, 2025). A mid-term review of the African Development Bank Group (AfDB, 2024) Policy on Results-Based Financing was conducted after five years in six pilot countries to examine its relevance, coherence, efficiency, and developmental effectiveness at both output and outcome levels. This evaluation concluded that Results-Based Financing is a pertinent mechanism for fulfilling the Bank's development mission and addressing the requirements of regional member countries, assuming certain conditions are fulfilled (AFDB, 2024) Additionally, CARE International's End of Project Evaluation Report for Safe Services for Minority Populations (SSMP) in Cambodia underscored the project's success due to its design fostering extensive collaboration and a strong emphasis on sustainability. However, it also noted deficiencies in support service resources beyond the project's influence.

Research and Reviews

Research studies and evidence reviews were included in this literature review because they help explain how RBM influences transparency, accountability, and development performance across diverse policy areas and institutional settings. Unlike organizational handbooks, these sources also highlight the political, structural, and contextual conditions that determine whether RBM strengthens governance and improves results in practice.

A UN system-wide review of RBM implementation assessed progress and effectiveness against RBM policy elements reflected in General Assembly Resolutions 67/226 (2012) and 71/243 (2016) on the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR). The findings indicate that while RBM has been increasingly integrated across UN entities, implementation remains uneven, with substantial variation in performance across the management areas assessed. Importantly, the review shows that RBM effectiveness is shaped not only by technical tools but also by conceptual clarity, organizational incentives, and structural/systemic constraints. It argues that addressing both conceptual and technical issues—alongside systemic limitations—will be necessary for RBM to better support the 2030 Agenda. From a governance perspective, these findings reinforce that transparency and accountability improvements depend on consistent results frameworks, credible performance reporting, and institutional conditions that enable learning and corrective action rather than compliance alone (United Nations, 2017)

Similarly, the European Commission (EC) Research and Evidence Facility (2018) review on migration management and sustainable development in Puntland offers evidence relevant to RBM's governance dimension. The review highlights that institutional actors often hold divergent perspectives on migration and that many stakeholders show limited buy-in to migration management programmes. Where programming operates in isolation from other parts of government, business, and society affected by migration, the likelihood of sustainable impact beyond implementation is reduced. This is highly relevant to RBM because stakeholder ownership and alignment are prerequisites for both accountability (shared responsibility for results) and transparency (shared understanding of objectives, trade-offs, and success measures). Without broad institutional engagement, results frameworks may become externally driven and less credible, weakening long-term development effectiveness (REF, 2018)

Finally, a major USAID analysis examined the relationship between total USAID funding and global health outcomes over two decades, and it modelled the potential consequences of funding reductions on mortality through 2030. The study underscores the role of sustained development financing in improving health outcomes in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs). It also connects directly to an RBM principle—sustainability—by showing that abrupt defunding could reverse progress and lead to preventable mortality. From an RBM lens, this evidence highlights why accountability must extend beyond short-term outputs to long-term outcomes and system resilience, and why transparent reporting of risks, assumptions, and financing scenarios is essential for responsible development decision-making (Cavalcanti et al., 2025).

Results and Discussion

Current Trends in Results-Based Management

RBM's value proposition lies in its potential to improve decision-making, accountability, and learning. Its effectiveness depends more on how RBM is used as a compliance tool or as a strategic management and learning approach, rather than on the technical design of the frameworks.

Table 1

Analysis and Interpretation of the Approaches and the Results

Approach/Tool	Evaluation/ Analysis	Interpretation
Results Oriented Planning	The use of results frameworks, logical models, and clearly articulated outcomes demonstrates a deliberate shift toward planning with results in mind.	This approach has improved strategic clarity and alignment with institutional priorities and the SDGs. To enhance accountability, there is a feasible shift from procedural compliance to performance accountability, especially with donor-funded initiatives that require evidence-based implementation and reporting. However, in some cases, planning remains overly ambitious relative to available resources and implementation capacity. The quality varies across programmes. Where capacity development and stakeholder engagement were prioritized, results appear more sustainable. In contrast, results driven mainly by short-term delivery have weaker sustainability prospects.

Approach/Tool	Evaluation/ Analysis	Interpretation
Theoretical Foundations (ToC, Log Frame, NPM)	These theories collectively reinforce accountability, transparency, and strategic alignment, offering a clear causal path for projects.	The foundational logic of RBM is quite comprehensive. The tools exist to logically connect resources to achieve results that will lead to change in development challenges. The challenge in attaining results is not the theory, but the application and quality of those tools.
Results-Based Financing (RBF)	Adopted by institutions like AfDB to align incentives and improve outcomes by tying disbursements to performance targets.	RBM is moving beyond reporting to management control. The use of RBF shows that RBM principles are being used as a strategic mechanism to influence behaviour and drive efficiency.

Note. Kusek and Rist (2004)

Currently, the trend in Results-Based Management (RBM) is less focused on creating new implementation frameworks and more focused on strengthening how existing RBM systems operate so they can better deliver their intended goals. The findings of this review indicate that RBM has contributed to building donor confidence by strengthening transparency and providing evidence of accountability, effectiveness, and development impact. At the same time, the review identifies persistent challenges that limit RBM performance in practice. These include implementation gaps and technical inconsistencies, difficulties in attributing results in complex and multi-actor environments, the risk of over-prioritizing easily quantifiable indicators at the expense of meaningful change, and continuing capacity and resource constraints.

For example, the SDG 2025 global assessment underscores the need for stronger results-oriented management because progress toward the 2030 Agenda remains off track, implying that sustained support for development initiatives must be grounded in more credible evidence, stronger performance systems, and renewed multilateral cooperation. In this context, RBM is increasingly important not only as a management approach but also as a governance mechanism that supports transparent reporting, answerability for results, and improved decision-making.

Overall, effective implementation of RBM remains essential for countries and multilateral organizations to improve the effectiveness and sustainability of development initiatives over time. However, technical inconsistencies in RBM design and application continue to constrain its full potential. Moreover, limited flexibility in RBM implementation—particularly in fragile and conflict-affected settings—along with resource shortages, further undermines results delivery and accountability. Future improvements should therefore focus on strengthening RBM through adaptive management, expanded institutional and technical capacity (including monitoring and evaluation systems), and incentive structures that prioritize meaningful, sustainable outcomes and strengthened accountability, rather than short-term gains.

Results-Based Management (RBM) is essential for promoting transparency and accountability in development initiatives by establishing clear performance indicators, enabling systematic monitoring, and facilitating evidence-based decision-making. The integration of AI-driven financial analytics enhances forecast accuracy, risk management, and decision-making capabilities that support RBM implementation (Celestin & Mishra, 2025). Performance assessment frameworks, as demonstrated in construction projects under Nepal's Town Development Fund, enable systematic tracking of project progress and accountability (Mishra & Bhandari, 2018). Financial mobilization monitoring in housing programs illustrates how RBM tracks resource allocation and ensures funds reach intended beneficiaries (Mishra et al., 2020). Additionally, AI-driven fraud detection technologies strengthen accountability by reducing corruption risks and enhancing financial reporting integrity (Celestin, Mishra, & Mishra, 2026). Price fluctuation monitoring further supports RBM by helping organizations anticipate financial stresses in contractor capacity (Mishra & Regmi, 2017). By adopting RBM principles alongside modern analytical tools, development organizations can enhance program effectiveness, build stakeholder trust, and achieve sustainable development outcomes while ensuring that resources are used transparently and accountably, particularly in Nepal's construction, housing, and financial sectors.

The interpretation and evaluation of variations in Results-Based Management (RBM) implementation across international organizations and donor agencies highlight three major areas where further improvements are needed to strengthen RBM as a mechanism for transparency, accountability, and improved development performance.

Variations and Fragmentation of RBM Systems

Evidence from system-wide reviews indicates that RBM is not implemented uniformly across organizations. For example, the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) has reported divergence in RBM approaches across UN entities, and evaluation findings from donor systems such as Global Affairs Canada (GAC) similarly point to misalignment between RBM practices and broader policy objectives. These inconsistencies reduce transparency because stakeholders receive results information that is difficult to compare across agencies, sectors, and portfolios. They also weaken accountability because fragmented standards allow uneven application of results frameworks, indicators, and evaluation quality.

A core governance question emerging from this review is—what structural and systemic changes—beyond a shared set of RBM principles—are required to ensure monitoring and evaluation practices are coherent and harmonized across multilateral and bilateral development systems? Addressing this question would support improved comparability, clearer reporting, and more credible accountability relationships between donors, implementers, governments, and communities.

Efficiency and Value for Money

A second area of attention concerns efficiency and value for money, understood as the relationship between resources used and results achieved. RBM encourages performance measurement, but it also raises practical and ethical challenges about how "efficiency" is defined and what outcomes are prioritized. The pressure to demonstrate rapid results can incentivize short-term outputs or easily measurable indicators at the expense of deeper, sustainable change. This tension can be sharper in fragile, conflict-affected, or capacity-constrained environments, where delivery costs are higher, risks are greater, and progress may be nonlinear.

From the perspective of transparency and accountability, value-for-money analysis must be communicated clearly: stakeholders should understand not only what was achieved, but also what it cost, what trade-offs were made, and why certain strategies were selected. Without such openness, efficiency claims can become simplistic and may undermine trust.

Attribution of Results in Complex Setting

A persistent challenge in RBM is how to attribute outcomes in multi-actor environments where results are influenced by multiple partners, contextual factors, and external shocks. Weak attribution reduces confidence in evaluation findings and therefore limits transparency—particularly when organizations claim success without sufficiently explaining contribution pathways or assumptions. Strengthening accountability under RBM requires clearer approaches to contribution analysis, realistic theories of change, and evidence standards that recognize complexity while still enabling credible learning and reporting.

Limitations and Challenges of Results-Based Management

While RBM provides a systematic approach to planning, monitoring, and evaluating development initiatives—particularly in public-sector and development contexts—it also faces several limitations that can reduce its effectiveness as a tool for promoting transparency and accountability.

Attribution Challenges and Over-Emphasis on Quantification

Attribution is often difficult to establish in complex, globalized development settings. As a result, important outcomes may be underestimated or ignored simply because they are not easily quantified or measured within short reporting cycles. Excessive reliance on quantitative indicators can therefore distort accountability, encouraging organizations to report what is measurable rather than what is meaningful.

Overly Prescriptive and Inflexible Planning

Some organizations operationalize RBM in ways that are overly detailed and rigid, leaving limited room for adaptation when conditions change. This is particularly problematic in conflict-affected or rapidly evolving contexts where development results require flexible delivery approaches. In such settings, inflexible RBM models can undermine effectiveness and reduce accountability by discouraging honest reporting of uncertainty, risk, and necessary course corrections.

Human Resource and Financial Constraints

RBM requires skilled personnel, functional monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, reliable data, and sustained funding. Many institutions—especially in resource-constrained contexts—lack adequate capacity to design results frameworks, collect and analyze performance data, and conduct credible evaluations. These constraints can weaken both transparency (limited quality of reporting) and accountability (weak verification and oversight).

Conflicts of Interest and "Gaming" Behaviour

RBM can unintentionally create incentives for individuals or units to overstate results, select easy-to-achieve targets, or focus on "quick wins" if promotions, funding, or performance ratings are directly tied to reported outcomes. This can lead to "gaming the system," where accountability becomes more about meeting indicators than delivering meaningful development change.

Managing this risk requires balanced incentive structures, independent verification, and organizational cultures that value learning and integrity alongside performance.

Conclusion

Following the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), Results-Based Management (RBM) gained prominence as a practical approach for improving the way development initiatives are planned, monitored, evaluated, and reported. Evidence reviewed in this study indicates that RBM has contributed to strengthening transparency and accountability, which are essential for building donor confidence, supporting learning, and sustaining development partnerships aimed at producing meaningful results. However, the review also concludes that RBM has not consistently achieved its full governance potential because persistent, systemic implementation challenges continue to undermine its effectiveness in practice.

Quality gaps in foundational RBM tools remain substantial.

Although RBM systems are widely institutionalized, core tools—such as results frameworks, indicators, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems—often display recurring weaknesses. These inadequacies limit the credibility of performance evidence, reduce learning, and directly weaken accountability mechanisms, particularly when results cannot be verified reliably or used for adaptive decision-making. Independent evaluation evidence (including assessments of country programme results frameworks) indicates that deficiencies in results design and M&E quality remain widespread, despite incremental improvements over time.

RBM Implementation is Fragmented and Lacks Coherence Across Institutions

RBM is applied inconsistently across agencies and donor systems. In the absence of uniformly enforced M&E standards, results reporting becomes difficult to compare and verify across organizations, which weakens transparency at the system level. In addition, misaligned incentives within and across institutions can encourage compliance-focused reporting rather than honest learning and improvement. Collectively, these challenges undermine the development of a coherent results culture that supports genuine accountability among partners.

RBM Should be Strengthened, Not Abandoned

The findings suggest that the goal of the international community should not be to discard RBM, but to improve its quality, adaptability, and governance orientation. Strengthening RBM requires investing in technical and institutional capacity (particularly for M&E systems), improving flexibility through adaptive management—especially in fragile and conflict-affected contexts—and realigning incentives so organizations prioritize meaningful, sustainable outcomes over short-term, easily measurable gains. With these improvements, RBM can more effectively function as a mechanism for holding both donors and implementing partners accountable while enhancing transparency and improving the effectiveness of development initiatives.

Ethical Consideration

This study is based solely on secondary data drawn from publicly available sources, including institutional reports, evaluations, and peer-reviewed literature. No personal identifying information was used, and the review did not involve direct interaction with human participants. No interviews, surveys, or focus group discussions were conducted. As a result, formal ethics approval was not required for this desk-based literature review. The article is an analytical synthesis of existing written materials and does not present original data collected from individuals.

References

African Development Bank Group. (2025). *Annual report 2024*.

Bakewell, O., & Garbutt, A. (2005). *The use and abuse of the logical framework approach: A review of international development NGOs' experiences*. Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.

Carroll, L. (1865). *Alice's adventures in Wonderland*. Macmillan.

Cavalcanti, D. M., de Oliveira Ferreira de Sales, L., da Silva, A. F., Landin Basterra, E., Pena, D., Monti, C., Barreix, G., Silva, N. J., Vaz, P., Saute, F., Fanjul, G., Bassat, Q., Naniche, D., Macinko, J., & Rasella, D. (2025). Evaluating the impact of two decades of USAID interventions and projecting the effects of defunding on mortality up to 2030: A retrospective impact evaluation and forecasting analysis. *The Lancet*, *406*(10500), 283–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(25)01186-9

Celestin, M., & Mishra, A. K. (2025). AI-driven financial analytics: Enhancing forecast accuracy, risk management, and decision-making in corporate finance. *Janajyoti Journal*, *3*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.3126/jj.v3i1.83284

DuBow, W. M., & Litzler, E. (2019). The development and use of a theory of change to align programs and evaluation in a complex, national initiative. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *40*(2), 231–248. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214018778132

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2022). *Evaluation of FAO's multi-country programme in the Pacific Islands 2018–2022*. FAO.

Global Affairs Canada. (2025). *Evaluation of Global Affairs Canada's climate finance programming*. Government of Canada.

Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration*, *69*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x

Kusek, J. Z., & Rist, R. C. (2004). *Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system: A handbook for development practitioners*. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-5823-5

Mishra, A. K., & Bhandari, S. (2018). Performance assessment of ongoing construction projects under Town Development Fund, Nepal. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Civil & Structural Engineering*, *1*(1–2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.26994.35521

Mishra, A. K., & Regmi, U. (2017). Effects of price fluctuation on the financial capacity of "Class A" contractors. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, *5*(4), 1920–1938.

Mishra, A. K., Aithal, P. S., & Saremi, H. (2020). Financial mobilization status of People Housing Program: A case of Rupandehi District of Nepal. *International Journal of Case Studies in Business, IT, and Education*, *4*(2), 193–202. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4108162

Mishra, A. K., & Bhandari, S. (2018). Performance assessment of ongoing construction projects under Town Development Fund, Nepal. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Civil and Structural Engineering*, *1*(1–2), 27–39. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7340177

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). *Paris declaration on aid effectiveness*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264098084-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2016). *Evaluation systems in development co-operation*: *2016 review*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264262065-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *Managing for sustainable development results*.

Research and Evidence Facility. (2018). *Assessing the impact of migration management systems on livelihoods and migration*: *Evidence from Puntland*. EU Trust Fund for Africa.

Rist, L., Felton, A., Samuelsson, L., Sandström, C., & Rosvall, O. (2013). A new paradigm for adaptive management. *Ecology and Society*, *18*(4), Article 63. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-06183-180463

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Statistics Division. (2025). *The sustainable development goals report 2025*. United Nations.

United Nations Development Group. (2011). *Results-based management handbook*: *Harmonizing RBM concepts and approaches for improved development results at country level*. United Nations Development Group.

United Nations Joint Inspection Unit. (2017). *Results-based management in the United Nations development system*: *Analysis of progress and policy effectiveness* (JIU/REP/2017/6). United Nations.

Wignaraja, P. (1991). Towards praxis and participatory development. In P. Wignaraja, A. Hussain, H. Sethi, & G. Wignaraja (Eds.), *Participatory development: Learning from South Asia* (pp. 195–205). Oxford University Press.

World Bank. (2025). *Results and performance of the World Bank Group 2024*: *Managing results in an uncertain world*. Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/IEG196287

World Bank. (2025). *Results and performance of the World Bank Group 2024*: *Managing results in an uncertain world*. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/IEG196287